



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Flint, Joshua

A new reassessment of the importance of gunpowde weapons on the battlefields of the Wars of the Roses

Original Citation

Flint, Joshua (2014) A new reassessment of the importance of gunpowde weapons on the battlefields of the Wars of the Roses. Masters thesis, University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/25433/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

**A new reassessment of the importance of gunpowder
weapons on the battlefields of the Wars of the Roses**

Joshua Flint

Masters by Research

2014

Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Hypothesis and Practice	6
2.1 Hypothesis	
2.2 Methodology	
2.3 Initial findings from Appendix 1	
3. Historiography	11
3.1 Artillery	
3.2 Handguns	
3.3 The importance of gunpowder weapons during the Wars of the Roses	
3.4 Conclusion	
4. Critical analysis of the primary sources	21
4.1 London chronicles	
4.2 Warkworth's Chronicle and newsletter	
4.3 Foreign sources	
4.4 Sixteenth century sources	
4.5 How the sources represent battles	
4.6 Conclusion	

5. Investigation of each gun reference	32
5.1 The Rout of Ludford Bridge, 12 th October 1459	
5.2 The Battle of Northampton, 10 th July 1460	
5.3 The Second Battle of St Albans, 17 th February 1461	
5.4 The Battle of Empingham, 12 th March 1470	
5.5 The Battle of Barnet, 14 th April 1471	
5.6 The Battle of Tewkesbury, 4 th May 1471	
5.7 The Battle of Bosworth, 22 nd August 1485	
6. Did the use of gunpowder weapons develop during the Wars of the Roses?	55
6.1 Artillery	
6.2 Handguns	
6.3 Conclusion	
7. Conclusion	63
8. Appendices	66
1 Primary source table	
2 Timeline of the Wars of the Roses	
3, Full primary source battle references	
9. Bibliography	85

1. Introduction

The Wars of the Roses, between 1455 and 1487, are known for the fierce struggles between the houses of York and Lancaster for the crown of England. These years included usurpation, treachery and bloody battles, while presenting English history with some of the most iconic characters, from the Earl of Warwick, known as the Kingmaker, to Richard III. The amount of literature dedicated to the battles of the Wars of the Roses conceals the fact that we know very little about these important events. Despite this lack of information the battles have been notorious for the brutality with which they were fought, typically comprising fierce hand to hand combat following a hail of arrows.¹ The common interpretation fails to mention the role of gunpowder weapons during the battles. The traditional portrayal of gunpowder weapons during this period was that they were used in limited numbers, normally on the periphery of the battle and in some cases were more problematic than effective.² This interpretation must be re-examined due to the archaeological finds at the recently discovered site of the Battle of Bosworth. The archaeological excavation found 34 round shot which is more than on any other medieval battlefield.³ These finds demand that the role of gunpowder weaponry be re-evaluated. This investigation will test the traditional portrayal and re-examine the role of gunpowder weaponry. It has been thirty years since Goodman attempted to use the primary sources to investigate the development of the weaponry during this period, however Goodman attempted to understand the development of all weapons rather than looking only at the development of guns. Goodman, unlike this investigation, did not have the findings at Bosworth to allow him to reassess the traditional role of guns. This present study will assess whether the findings at Bosworth was the culmination of the development of guns during the Wars of the Roses, or that the number of guns used at Bosworth was only an anomaly.

This will be the first investigation that will examine the primary sources and battles as a whole rather than individually to understand the developing importance of gunpowder weaponry. Due to covering the entire period, a great number of primary sources will be consulted for this study. This investigation will use a variety of contemporary sources which will include: monastic chronicles, London chronicles, ballads, newsletters, personal letters, later histories and French and Burgundian sources. Each of these relevant primary sources will have to be critically analysed and questioned for this investigation to understand the reliability of these texts. First, however, we must consider the development of gunpowder weaponry as presented in the historiography, such as Maurice Keen's

¹ V. Fiorato and A. Boylston and C. Knusel (ed.) *Blood Red Roses, The Archaeology of a Mass Grave from the Battle of Towton AD 1461* (Oxford, 2000) p. 22

² M. Strickland and R. Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* (Stroud, 2011) p. 372

³ G. Foard, and A. Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* (Oxford, 2013) p.135

opinion that the development of guns as weapons which changed later medieval warfare.⁴ Each reference of the use of guns will be examined and placed within the context to the battle in order to understand the role and importance of the guns during the battle. Comparing each battles gun references will allow this investigation to determine whether there is a development in the use of guns during the course of the battles. This study will use the primary source references to examine the role of gunpowder weaponry, and will compare this interpretation to the traditional views on the importance of guns during the Wars of the Roses.

⁴ M. Keen (ed), *Medieval Warfare A History* (Oxford, 1999) p.273 M. Keen, *The Changing Scene: Guns, Gunpowder, and Permanent Armies*

2. Hypothesis and Practice

2.1 Hypothesis

The role of guns during the Wars of the Roses has to be re-evaluated due to archaeological finds at the recently discovered Bosworth Battlefield. The archaeological excavation found 34 round shot which is more than any other medieval battlefield.⁵ These findings demand that the role of both artillery and handguns in late medieval battles must be re-examined. The traditional portrayal of guns during the Wars of the Roses was that they were used in limited numbers during the battles and in some battles were more problematic than effective.⁶ This investigation will test this traditional view and re-evaluate the role of guns during the Wars of the Roses. The hypothesis to be tested is that the gun references will become more concentrated towards the later battles of the Wars of the Roses, placing a greater emphasis on their use and if this occurs then this would correlate with the archaeological finds at Bosworth. The present study will assess whether the findings at Bosworth were an anomaly, or whether there is sufficient evidence within the primary sources to determine whether guns became more important during the Wars of the Roses. This will be the first investigation that will examine the primary sources and battles as a whole rather than individually to understand the developing importance of gunpowder weaponry. It is thirty years since Goodman attempted to use the sources to investigate the development of weaponry during this period; however he did not use as many sources as this investigation and was not looking solely at the development of guns.⁷

2.2 Methodology

To investigate the development of guns during the Wars of the Roses all of the primary sources that refer to the battles will be examined to create an overview of documented gun use. The table in Appendix 1 presents the primary source references for all of the battles during the Wars of the Roses, highlighting where they mention the use of guns. The primary sources are presented in chronological order to show whether, and if so how, the references to guns change over time. The information from Appendix 1 will allow this investigation to distinguish which primary sources reference the use of guns; the analysis of these gun references will test the hypothesis. Examining how guns were portrayed in each individual reference may show whether guns became more important as the Wars of the Roses progressed. Understanding how the sources represent the use of guns will allow this investigation to evaluate the sources perception of the significance of the

⁵ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.135

⁶ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p. 372

⁷ A. Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 – 97* (London, 1991) p.173

gunpowder weaponry. It is important to understand the tactical context of the use of guns during the battle, such as investigation into when and where the guns were used will allow this study to analyse the change in use, which could lead to a change in importance. Any reference to guns must be examined, and references about the importance of guns must be seen in context, for example did the writer understand how the guns were being used on the battlefields? This is why the investigation will critically analyse the primary sources. The historical context of the references will allow this investigation to examine the importance of the guns.

Throughout this investigation it is imperative to distinguish between the use of artillery and handguns during these battles, because they were developing at different rates.⁸ This distinction is vital as the investigation will be focused on understanding the developments of both weapons but with differing expectations.⁹ Artillery was thought to have been used from the early battles of the Wars of the Roses where English handgunners are not.¹⁰

The traditional interpretation often only evaluates the contemporary sources from one battle, or from the battles of a certain section of the Wars of the Roses. This investigation will further this understanding by researching and analysing all of the gun references from the battles of this period. These traditional interpretations will be reconsidered as this investigation will be able to analyse the development of guns during the entire period, rather than looking at the role of guns at solitary battles.

2.3 Initial findings from the table

This section will be solely using the primary source table in Appendix 1, and analysing the information from this table. The table in Appendix 1 shows the battle references from fifty different primary sources. This investigation used different types of primary sources, including governmental documents, monastic chronicles, continuation chronicles, London chronicles, foreign sources, contemporary newsletters, ballads and sixteenth century histories. This study had to use a large variety of sources because it allowed this investigation to gain a comprehensive understanding of the roles of gunpowder weapons during this period. This investigation will concentrate on the conclusions that can be made from examining the sources from all of the battles as a whole. Initially, the table will be used to see which sources reference the use of guns at certain battles. This investigation has analysed fifty contemporary sources but only fourteen of them mention the use of guns during the battles. How the guns were being used was only referenced in seven out of the

⁸ Strickland and R. Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.372

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 372

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.373

sixteen battles of the Wars of the Roses. During the battles, guns have been referenced in more than one primary source for five out of these seven battles. The battles with multiple gun references offer an opportunity to compare how the writers presented the role of guns during the different battles. Appendix 1 has allowed this investigation to compare how frequently the primary source reference both battles and the use of guns.

The table in Appendix 1 shows the sources that reference the use of gunpowder weaponry often reference the use of guns in more than one battle. For example, *Gregory's Chronicle* references ten battles and mentions the use of guns in three of them; this is in contrast to the *Crowland Chronicle* that has no references to guns being used despite chronicling the events of ten battles. This would suggest that the writer of *Gregory's Chronicle* had an interest in the use of guns during the battles, or that Gregory had access to eyewitness accounts that could provide more detailed information from these three battles than the Crowland chronicler. A source analysis will allow the investigation to examine the strengths and weaknesses of each contemporary source.

Appendix 1 includes how many references the sources make to other weapons that were used during the battles; this information shows how many battles reference the use of weaponry. The weapons that were referenced were swords, bows, handguns and artillery. It is important to understand the number of references to each weapon because this would put the amount of references to guns into perspective. For example, the *Chronicle of London* does not mention the use of any guns throughout any of the battles, however the *Chronicle of London* does not mention any use of weaponry including bows and swords, this leads to the conclusion that the writer may not have seen the importance of which weapons were involved during the battles. The majority of sources that mention the use of guns also reference the use of other weapons. For example, the *Arrivall of Edward the IV* mentions the use of swords, bows, handguns and artillery during the battles. This leads to the question why would the writers not mention the use of weaponry when writing about battles? To understand this question a study of the primary sources is critical.

The evidence of the battles, drawn from Appendix 1, supports the secondary perception that artillery is mentioned more frequently than handguns during the Wars of the Roses. Artillery has been referenced twenty one times in the seven battles referencing guns; however handguns are only referenced four times. Using these conclusions, this investigation should focus on the role and development of artillery, because handguns were less prominent during this period. The traditional perception would also expect that handguns would be used by foreign handgunners rather than

English handgunners.¹¹ This investigation also used the *Coventry Leet Book*, which does not mention the use of handguns on the battlefield but suggests that handguns were available for the battle of Edgecote, but not used. Why the *Coventry Leet Book* suggests this will be examined.

The primary sources from the table are in chronological order, with this information a pattern emerges. The pattern shows that the references to guns in the earlier battles come primarily from the earlier sources, and the later gun references come from the later sources. From this, one could conclude that the earlier chronicles and their references to the use of guns are reliable, as they were written close to the date of the battle. The later chronicles of the early sixteenth century, such as Polydore Vergil, are still valuable because Vergil had access to different information, possibly eyewitness statements. However, one problem with this conclusion is that the references from earlier chronicles come predominantly from London Chronicles. The London Chronicles are notorious for their overlapping authors, so even though three separate London Chronicles reference the use of guns during the battles, it cannot be assumed that the three chronicles were written by three separate authors, or that the sources did not use information from each other.¹² If the chronicles are credible then this would lead to the conclusion that guns, artillery in particular, was used from the very beginning of the Wars of the Roses. The sources need to be scrutinised in order to understand the independence of the gun references. This has shown the value of the table in Appendix 1 because it has given an overview of the gun references, allowing comparisons to be seen.

The references to guns in the later battles raise a series of problems. The gun references from the later battles of the Wars of the Roses, Bosworth in particular, come from late sixteenth century sources, except for Molinet, Commines and Vergil. The problem with the late sixteenth century histories and ballads are that they were written nearly a century after the battle. This creates a problem of reliability from these sources when they mention new information. In order to investigate the reliability of these later sources, one must examine the references that the sixteenth century sources used in order to write these histories and ballads. If these later sources use contemporary sources, then their gun references and work as a whole can be treated as more reliable.

The hypothesis would expect that the gunpowder weapon references would increase throughout the Wars of the Roses and that the later battles would have the most consistent gun

¹¹ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

¹² M. McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century A Revolution in English Writing* (Woodbridge, 2002) p.13

references. However, Appendix 1 shows that the gun references are consistent throughout the Wars of the Roses. The use of guns at the earlier battles was expected, but the importance of the guns was expected to develop during the battles, resulting in more primary references. However the examination of Appendix 1 suggested that this investigation needed to change the hypothesis to place more emphasis on the individual gun references, leading to this new hypothesis

'The role of the gunpowder weapons developed and changed through the battles of the Wars of the Roses indicating changes in the usage of guns over time.'

Using Appendix 1 to see the overview of the gun references has been an important process in trying to understand the development and importance of guns during the Wars of the Roses. This analysis has not just given an overview but suggested a need to develop the hypothesis. The table has shown that this investigation will have to rely on a very limited number of primary source references of not only the use of guns but also the use of any weapon during the battles.

Though many conclusions can be made from the table in Appendix 1, a more comprehensive study must now occur. This study will now investigate the primary sources, in particular the primary sources that reference the use of gunpowder weapons. This critical analysis of the primary sources will examine the sources that mention the use of guns but will also investigate why many of the sources do not mention any reference of guns. This critical analysis of the sources will assess the reliability of the sources and determine how important the references will be moving forward in this investigation. Compiling the primary sources and creating the table in Appendix 1 has allowed this study to determine the primary sources that reference the use of guns during the battles. A secure understanding how the contemporary sources wrote about guns and what they were seeking to convey will allow a rereading of the battle accounts.

3 Historiography

The importance and development of gunpowder weapons during the Wars of the Roses has been a contentious issue which is still debated. This section will analyse previous arguments about gunpowder weapons, while identifying the main issues that this investigation will examine when analysing the primary sources and gun references.

There were many types of gunpowder weaponry in use during the fifteenth century. These are often classified today under two terms: handguns and artillery. Foard and Walton in their review of early European guns distinguished them by the diameter of the bore. Over 100mm the gun was considered large artillery while those less than 100mm were considered to be small artillery and thus more practical for battlefield use. However, many problems arise when trying to divide the type of guns because different specialists use different methods to categorise the type of guns. Foard has given one example but there are many others. He uses handgun for all hand-held gunpowder weapons.¹³ Handguns were known by many different names in England during the fifteenth century. These include handcannons, arquebus, hakeguns, hagbusshes, hackbuts and handgonnes.¹⁴ Though gunpowder weapons can be defined either as handguns or artillery, during fifteenth century the name for most projectile weapons was artillery.¹⁵ This can cause confusion when trying to distinguish the type of gun recorded in the primary accounts as being present at a battle. This study must carefully analyse the context of the gun use in order to understand whether the primary source mean handguns or artillery. The separation of artillery and handguns is necessary due to the differences of their historical representations.

The growing significance of gunpowder weapons changed warfare in the later middle ages.¹⁶ Armies in the late fifteenth century increasingly included artillerymen, handgunners or trained men to handle larger guns. Artillery by the Bosworth campaign was seen as an important force.¹⁷ There were great developments in guns between the fourteenth and sixteenth century. By the second quarter of the sixteenth century, guns were seen as a decisive weapon in warfare. Improvements in gunpowder, introduction of cast iron projectiles, bronze gun barrels and improvements in gun carriages made gunpowder weapons a developing force in the fifteenth century.¹⁸ However, we still have a poor understanding of the capabilities of gunpowder weapons during this period.¹⁹

¹³ Foard, and A. Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.135

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.140

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.136

¹⁶ Keen, *Medieval Warfare A History* p.273

¹⁷ P. Hammond, *Richard III and the Bosworth Campaign* (Barnsley, 2010) p. 83

¹⁸ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.136

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.136

3.1 Artillery

The manufacture of artillery was an expensive and difficult skill in the late fifteenth century.²⁰ Goodman notes that the cost of moving the heavy artillery would have been great and as a lot of the armies would have to be assembled in haste, it is likely that it would have been difficult to assemble a formidable artillery train. This might be especially the case for the rebelling army, because they would not have had access to the Tower, which kept a large amount of ordinance, unless they controlled the other major magazine at Calais, and were also stored at Middleham and Carlisle.²¹ The importance of the Tower and the control of the Calais Garrison cannot be underestimated when examining the availability of guns. Henry VI's army in 1460, while preparing for the battle of Northampton, lost their strategic initiative because they were unwilling to leave the Midlands due to their reluctance to leave their entrenched artillery.²² Goodman explains how the Lancastrians had to decide whether they wanted to move quickly, and leave their artillery, or slow their movements in order to keep their weaponry together. Goodman's explanation of the problems concerning the access and movements of guns in the early stages of the wars would agree with the assessment from Keen that the guns would have been used within a defensive encampment.

Keen, who focuses on the Burgundian development of artillery at the same time as the Wars of the Roses, states that artillery was being developed during the late fifteenth century, however this development was slow. He notes that in 1471, the Duke of Burgundy had a very large army with numerous munitions and artillery, but that the artillery in the Burgundian army was still too cumbersome to manoeuvre quickly in a tactical emergency.²³ However, by the late fifteenth century artillery's mobility improved.²⁴ Keen raises the issue over the different types of artillery: heavy artillery was being used for sieges and lighter pieces of artillery would be able to be taken with attacking armies to the battlefields.²⁵ This can be seen by the speed at which Edward IV moved in order to reach the Lancastrians, at Tewkesbury in 1471; Edward IV brought with him a large amount of light artillery.²⁶ Gravett agrees that the artillery used here must have been the lighter pieces, which could have been transported easily.²⁷ In contrast, Hammond argues even the lighter artillery was heavy and rather difficult to manoeuvre, but could be very effective if they could be placed on a flat field. Guns were an important part of Edward IV's and Richard III's armies, Richard even

²⁰ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

²¹ *Magazine – The part of the gun which holds the projectiles.*

²² Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 – 97* p.173

²³ Keen, *Medieval Warfare A History* p.287

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 277

²⁵ A. C. Manucy, *Artillery Through the Ages* (Washington, 1949) p. 54

²⁶ P. Haigh, *The Military Campaigns of the Wars of the Roses* (Stroud, 1997) p. 128

²⁷ C. Gravett. *Tewkesbury 1471, The Last Yorkist Victory* (Oxford, 2003) p.28

attempted to organise his own artillery train at the Tower.²⁸ Richard's guns were lighter and slightly more manageable which enabled greater mobility than the larger, heavier and more impressive artillery pieces of the past.²⁹ Hammond contradicts the view that some soldiers had significant exposure to artillery by stating the artillery was used to shock the opposing troops, most of who would not have seen or heard them before.³⁰ This analysis is challenged by both Goodman and Gravett, as they suggest that the artillery was a constant during the Wars of the Roses, but was certainly used in different amounts and for a variety of reasons.

By the 1470's the English Kings seem to have adopted the developing gunpowder artillery as enthusiastically as the rest of Europe.³¹ Edward IV, with his ally the duke of Burgundy, committed large amounts of resources for the production of field and siege artillery.³² Huge amounts were spent on field artillery, even though they could only fire one or two shots before the infantry came to handstrokes, this shows the importance that Edward placed on artillery and developing his guns. Gravett supports this development by noting that the age of the large immobile artillery units, which were difficult to redeploy and aim, seem to be ending during the 1470's.³³ Foard agrees with Gravett's assessment, as the large immobile units, which were difficult to redeploy, was coming to an end by this time with the duke of Burgundy at the forefront of these advancements through holding key industries in the Low Countries.³⁴ The improvements during this period may have allowed the guns to be re-aimed during the battle, which would have led to dramatic tactical changes in warfare. However, it was still difficult for the guns to re aim when they came under attack quickly by cavalry.³⁵ Improvements in mobility would be expected to result in tactical changes in the use of artillery in battle.³⁶

3.1.1 Where the artillery came from

Where the armies of the Wars of the Roses got their artillery from is a debated issue. Artillery was gained mainly through the Tower and arsenals located in Calais, Carlisle and Middleham, however artillery could be obtained from a variety of places.³⁷ Smith discusses how the

²⁸ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.135

²⁹ Hammond, *Richard III and the Bosworth Campaign* p. 83

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 84

³¹ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.136

³² *Ibid.*, p.136

³³ Gravett *Tewkesbury 1471, The Last Yorkist Victory* p.28

³⁴ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.136

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p.136

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p.137

³⁷ D. Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison, War and Military Service in England 1436 – 1558* (Woodbridge, 2008) p. 124

Burgundians authorised the loan of gunpowder weapons to Henry VI in 1463.³⁸ Edward IV's invasion of France was able to create a formidable artillery train from the artillery from Calais, as well as the transferred artillery from the Tower of London; this was even noted to be on par with that of the Duke of Burgundy.³⁹ It is important to examine where artillery was stored when examining how much artillery could be obtained by a rebelling army, which was not in control of Calais or the Tower of London.

According to Molinet Richard III brought and used his artillery during the battle of Bosworth; however where Richard gained his artillery from is unclear. Richard III, who had a similar interest in artillery as Edward IV, would probably have had an artillery train at Bosworth. It is reasonable to suggest that Richard would have used his access to artillery from the Tower of London as Sir Robert Brackenbury, who joined Richard at Bosworth, was the constable of the Tower. Brackenbury could have brought a train of artillery with him from London.⁴⁰ The leaders of smaller companies could also have brought their own arsenal of artillery with them to the battle. For example the Duke of Norfolk had aboard his ship four breech loaded artillery pieces and a number of hand gunners who could have been brought with him to Bosworth.⁴¹ Henry moved quickly through England during 1485, so probably did not have a vast amount of artillery with him. Henry could have gained other guns from Wales and the North East before the battle, or could have used the Stanley's artillery unit at Bosworth.⁴² Goodman, who agrees with both Grummitt and Smith, shows the importance of the artillery that was kept at the Tower during this period. The person who controlled the capital and had power over the Tower had access to the largest arsenal of weaponry in England.⁴³ Grummitt's argument is disputed by Bell, who states that the Tower sent their guns to Calais to supplement their weaponry. Bell makes a compelling argument and it would be probable that the Calais garrison would be supplemented by the Tower of London's arsenal.⁴⁴ This would limit the importance that can be placed on the amount of artillery kept in Calais.

3.1.2 How the artillery was used

Artillery is recorded in use at many of the battles during the Wars of the Roses, but how it was used is still debated, as is how the armies contended against their opponent's artillery. Foard and Strickland both argue that armies used existing structures to defend their artillery.⁴⁵ In other

³⁸ R. D. Smith and K. De Vries, *The Artillery of the Dukes of Burgundy 1363- 1477* (Woodbridge, 2005) p. 135

³⁹ Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison, War and Military Service in England 1436 – 1558* p. 124

⁴⁰ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.135

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.135

⁴² *Ibid.*, p.135

⁴³ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.174

⁴⁴ A. R. Bell, A. Curry, A. King and D. Simpkin, *The Soldier in Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 2013) p. 194

⁴⁵ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.372

cases existing terrain could be used. The Duke of York in 1452 at Darford drew up his army in a defensive position with the Thames and the River Cray protecting his flanks. The choice of this strong defensive position was to protect his artillery that was placed at the front of his army. The artillery was large and bulky but an effective defensive weapon.⁴⁶ The Duke of York would revert to the Dartford tactics at other battles, when a defensive position was needed.⁴⁷ At Ludford Bridge, York adopted a defensive position which was surrounded by a ditch and was defended with guns.⁴⁸ Alternatively, his carts could have been used as a defence for guns in an open field battle.⁴⁹ This may have been how the carts were used at the Battle of Blore Heath and Rout of Ludford Bridge, in 1459.⁵⁰ At the Battle of Northampton, in 1460, the Lancastrian army defended a camp with their artillery placed behind an existing pale.⁵¹ The initial Yorkist attacks were repelled due to the strong Lancastrian position, but due to the heavy rain the Lancastrian guns were rendered ineffectual. The range of structures that the artillery was placed behind varies but what each of these examples show is that the commanders considered that they needed defensive structures when using artillery. Goodman argues that at Barnet in 1471, although Warwick outgunned Edward, likely because Warwick had access to the Royal Ordnance, this superiority did not benefit him.⁵² Warwick drew up a strong defensive position at the Battle of Barnet in 1471, using hedges and natural obstacles. All night long the Earl of Warwick's gunners kept firing their artillery on the Yorkists, however they overshot.⁵³ Night-time firing happened at many battles including Blore Heath and Ludford Bridge.⁵⁴ Goodman and Hammond both show how Warwick used his artillery at night before the battle started. Smith accepts that Warwick used the artillery at Barnet, but argues that guns were peripheral to the battle, as they caused panic before the armies engaged. Smith states that guns were never decisive in the battles during the Wars of the Roses.⁵⁵ Eventhough Goodman and Hammond place greater emphasis on the use of artillery than Smith, they both show how the artillery was used primarily before the battle started. Strickland argues that after the second battle of St Albans, the use of defensive positions when using artillery featured less prominently, this may

⁴⁶ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.370

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.372

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p.372

⁴⁹ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.30

⁵⁰ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.137

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.137

⁵² Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.172

⁵³ P. W. Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury* (Gloucester 1990) p.74

⁵⁴ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.148

⁵⁵ Smith and De Vries, *The Artillery of the Dukes of Burgundy 1363- 1477* p. 12

be due to the emergence of younger commanders, such as Edward IV, who was trying to use offensive tactics rather than defensive.⁵⁶

Richard, from his experience at Barnet may have thought that artillery was a key weapon to use. Richard must have seen how the artillery at Barnet fired over the Yorkist army, possibly due to the height that the artillery was being fired from. This may have influenced the type of flat ground that Richard chose at Bosworth. Foard suggests that artillery was best used on a flat ground with a slight advantage of elevation in order for the artillery rounds to bounce after being fired.⁵⁷ However, Foard does acknowledge that more research must be conducted to test this theory. Richard deployed behind a marsh at Bosworth, making the need for man-made defences for the artillery unimportant at Bosworth due to the marshy land and a stream that defended Richard's army.⁵⁸ This may have been important for Richard's artillery, which would have been difficult to move and re-aim under a swift attack.⁵⁹ The chosen battlefield at Bosworth may have taken into consideration the need for defensive cover and that is why Richard chose the marshy terrain at Bosworth.

This evaluation of previous historical perception of artillery has found much debate into where the artillery was obtained from, where the artillery could be positioned on the battlefield and how effective the artillery was. There was a consensus about the need for a defensive structure to help when using the artillery, but there is no such agreement on when these defensive structures became less prominent. The use of artillery developed, but it is interesting that this development may not have been due to technical advancements, but could be because of new commanders who wanted to use the artillery in new ways.

3.2 Handguns

Tout, writing in 1911, recognises the difficulties when trying to research the importance of handguns, arguing that it is difficult to gain an understanding of handguns because the origin and early history of firearms in England is difficult to understand, as many chroniclers offer casual statements about the uses of these weapons. The written information on firearms is so widely scattered that it is understandable that many military historians neglect such inaccessible material.⁶⁰ This argument does not fully reflect the modern understanding of the importance and developments of handguns in the late fifteenth century. Grummitt acknowledges this difficulty but still asserts that Henry VI was not interested in gunpowder weaponry, but in 1461 this changed with the accession of

⁵⁶ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.374

⁵⁷ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.148

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p.137

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p.148

⁶⁰ T. F. Tout, *Firearms in England in the Fourteenth Century, The Historical Review*, 26,104, (1911) p. 666- 702

Edward IV. Edward and his brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester had a personal interest in the development of gunpowder weapons. Edward's alliance to the Duke of Burgundy energised the development of guns during this period.⁶¹ Grummitt states that due to this alliance Edward's reign must be considered a period of technological development.⁶² However, how much of this was because of Edward and England's contribution? This is an interesting argument by Grummitt, but is there the evidence to suggest that this development promoted the use of handguns on the battlefield?

New developments with the longer barrel, different gunpowder and the first type of matchlocks created a new more effective design for the handguns; this allowed more effective firing and aiming. However, handguns were still an expensive weapon, and seem to be restricted to small select forces, such as the fleet of the Duke of Norfolk who accompanied Richard, Duke of Gloucester, against Scotland in 1481.⁶³ The design of the handguns had changed towards the late 1460's. This new efficiency could be explained by more effective gunpowder and a smaller bore; allowing the handguns to be more manoeuvrable.⁶⁴ The English and Burgundian relationship under the leadership of Edward IV and Charles the Bold, the Duke of Burgundy, allowed the English to increase their development of handguns.

3.2.1 How Handguns were used

Eventhough it is a contentious issue whether English handgunners were used on the battlefields, there are records of mercenary handgunners being used at two battles during the Wars of the Roses.⁶⁵ At the second battle of St Albans in 1461, the Yorkists lined up their artillery and Burgundian mercenary handgunners behind defences, including pavises.⁶⁶ The Lancastrians would have expected to have been cut down before they even made it through the fortifications. However, they attacked from another direction and quickly outflanked the Yorkists.⁶⁷ McLaughlan notes how the Battle of Barnet saw an increase in the number of handguns being used. Edward had five hundred Flemish gunners for Barnet, which comprised a sizable component of his army.⁶⁸ The number of Flemish handgunners is contentious, with Strickland noting that Edward IV, when returning from exile in 1471, brought around three hundred 'black and smoky Flemish gunners' with him, which is still a large number of handgunners. Edward and Warwick with their close connections

⁶¹ Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison, War and Military Service in England 1436 – 1558* p. 124

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 124

⁶³ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.372

⁶⁴ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.140

⁶⁵ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.377

⁶⁶ *Pavises – A medieval shield, long enough to over the whole body.*

⁶⁷ S. Mclachlan, *Medieval Handgonnes, The First Black Powder Infantry Weapon* (Oxford, 2010) p. 45

⁶⁸ Mclachlan, *Medieval Handgonnes, The First Black Powder Infantry Weapon* p. 49

to the Duke of Burgundy must have been aware of the new importance that handgunners had in the Burgundian army.⁶⁹ Strickland notes that Edward brought over the handgunners because the Duke of Burgundy recognised the importance of them. The increasing importance of handguns does not suggest the decreasing value of archers, as the Duke of Burgundy borrowed many English archers during this period. One could presume that the borrowing of archers and handgunners by the English and Burgundians is an acceptance of each country's superiority in these fields.

Grummitt argues that handguns were commonplace on the fifteenth century English battlefields. Their lack of narration in the chronicles is because they were common in the armies and the chroniclers only noted when something new happens such as the Flemish handgunners at the second St Albans, or the mercenary handgunners at Barnet.⁷⁰ Grummitt notes that the Calais evidence for handguns offers a need to re-evaluate English military technologies of the late fifteenth century. England has long been assumed to have been slow to adapt to the development of handheld guns. It is argued that the use of handheld weapons in battles was restricted to foreign mercenaries during the Wars of the Roses, however Grummitt argues that while in Calais, the Calais Garrison was using handheld firearms all throughout the fifteenth century and by the 1460's they were using the newer, matchlock arquebuses, similar to the developments in France and Burgundy.⁷¹ Grummitt notes that the use of mercenaries was not due to underdevelopments but was the practice that all European countries used.⁷² Grummitt is using the Calais records and assumes the same for battles in England; however Gunn states that Calais was stockpiling handguns as early as 1470, but it took the Tower a lot longer to begin to stockpile handguns in the same numbers.⁷³ Grummitt attempts to explain why there is no evidence to say that handguns were being used by the English during the battles, however whether the English had the capabilities to stockpile or manufacture the handguns is not the issue, it is whether the English used them on the battlefield. Strickland notes that effective use of the warbow lessened the need for handguns in English armies.⁷⁴ This would explain why the English and Burgundians traded archers and handgunners with each other, because the English trained soldiers who could effectively use the warbow. The archaeological evidence from Bosworth suggests that artillery was used but that there is no clear evidence of handguns.⁷⁵ Eventhough Grummitt offers a persuasive argument and Foard accepts that there is a lack of contemporary evidence of handguns, both Strickland and Foard agree that it still

⁶⁹ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.372

⁷⁰ Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison, War and Military Service in England 1436 – 1558* p. 135

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 135

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 135

⁷³ S. Gunn, *Archery Practice in Early Tudor England, Past and Present*, 209, (2010) p. 53- 81

⁷⁴ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

⁷⁵ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.148

does not replace the importance that the English army placed on the warbow during this period. Grummitt gives examples of handguns and other guns being used outside of battles but is unable to give categorical evidence of English handgunners being used during any of the battles.⁷⁶

3.3 The importance of gunpowder weapons during the Wars of the Roses

It is difficult to ascertain how effective the artillery was during the Wars of the Roses. Some Chroniclers felt that it was necessary to mention them, so they must have been part of the army, but these are only noted on occasion.⁷⁷ English handguns were not deployed in vast enough numbers to replace the bows during this period. Neither did English artillery play as dominant a role during the Wars of the Roses as they would in the sixteenth century or in Europe in the late fifteenth century.⁷⁸ However, Hammond challenges this by questioning the effect the guns had at Bosworth. Eventhough, the end of the battle was due to a cavalry charge Hammond does note that the use of artillery may have brought about the need for Richard's cavalry charge.⁷⁹ This Hammond claims could show the importance that the gunpowder weapons had during these battles.

Foard is attempting to see if the archaeological evidence can give us an idea of the character of the guns in use and the scale of that use; this may possibly include the effectiveness of the weapons.⁸⁰ At Towton, an early battle in 1461, only two round shots were found where as at Bosworth, fought in 1485, at least 33 projectiles were found. Survey on the other battlefields may show this pattern of development through this period.⁸¹ It is unlikely that all of the projectiles that were used during the battle have been found at Bosworth.⁸²

3.4 Conclusion

The development of gunpowder weapons during the Wars of the Roses is a debated issue; some argue that due to a lack of evidence from the chronicles that guns were not an important weapon. However, due to the new archaeological evidence from Bosworth and the Burgundian development of gunpowder weapons , this should lead to a re-examination of all of the battles from the Wars of the Roses. The analysis of the contemporary sources will determine whether guns have

⁷⁶ Grummitt, *The Defence of Calais and the Development of Gunpowder Weaponry in the Late Fifteenth Century*, *War in History* vol 7 p. 253- 272

⁷⁷ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.173

⁷⁸ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

⁷⁹ Hammond, *Richard III and the Bosworth Campaign* (Barnsley) Pen and Sword Military (2010) p. 84

⁸⁰ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.148

⁸¹ *Ibid*,. p.148

⁸² *Ibid*,. p.148

been misrepresented, as guns have not been judged as a important component of an English army during the Wars of the Roses.

4 Critical Analysis of the Contemporary Sources

The contemporary sources from the Wars of the Roses have been problematic for historians, due to the lack of detailed primary sources from this period. The thirteenth and fourteenth century chronicles are vastly superior to their fifteenth century descendants. The fifteenth century saw the rise of the London chronicles and decline of monastic chronicles.⁸³ These sources were written by the people of London rather than clerics in monasteries. This analysis will evaluate the importance of the change from monastic chroniclers to London chroniclers in how the battles have been represented. The lack of chronicle evidence from the later fifteenth century has been seen as a difficult issue to overcome, however this can be viewed as an opportunity to gain a more varied account of this period from other sources. These other sources include: newsletters, chronicle continuations, personal letters, later histories and a reliance on foreign sources. These sources together give a unique view of the Wars of the Roses. This reliance on a variety of sources means that a critical analysis must be undertaken to understand the origins and the reasons behind the different contemporary sources. This critical analysis of the sources will examine the different factors that shaped the writing of these sources, from where the source was written, when the source was written and who wrote the source. Evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the sources can allow this investigation to decide how much emphasis will be placed on each sources battlefield gun reference.

4.1 London Chronicles

Two London chronicles reference guns being used during the battles of the Wars of the Roses, *Gregory's Chronicle* and the *Short English Chronicle*. This analysis will evaluate why these sources were written and how useful these sources are when investigating the battles of this period. The London chronicles represent a development of chronicle writing during this period, especially in the capital. The rise of the London chronicles coincided with the decline of the traditional monastic chronicles, though they were still important during this period.⁸⁴ They seem to have emerged and vanished with remarkable speed.⁸⁵ The work that was conducted in London, which was central to the countries affairs, is of great value to historians.⁸⁶ Historians have been too concerned with the author and date, often unknown, of the London chronicles rather than focusing on their complete

⁸³ G. R. Elton, *England 1200- 1640 The Sources of History, Studies in the uses of Historical Evidence* (London 1969) p. 17

⁸⁴ A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London 1982) p.249

⁸⁵ McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century A Revolution in English Writing* p.4

⁸⁶ Elton, *England 1200- 1640 The Sources of History, Studies in the uses of Historical Evidence* p. 17

information and significance to understanding important events of the time.⁸⁷ Many of the chronicle accounts are short, authors are often anonymous and their sources of information are often unclear or unknown.⁸⁸ However, the chronicles are still an indispensable source. Much of the chronology for the Wars of the Roses comes from these chronicles.⁸⁹

The authors of the London chronicles are believed to have been Londoners, and thus would have been Yorkists during the Wars of the Roses⁹⁰ They were some of the first non-cleric historical writers. The chronicles were continuously shared, borrowed and copied.⁹¹ Many of the London chronicles were written by merchants, who probably held office in London. This can be known from the few chroniclers whose identity is known and also from the tone of the chronicle. Of all of the London chronicles only two authors are known – and even this can cause problems. Of the two London chronicles that reference the use of guns during the battles, only *Gregory's Chronicle* has a known author.⁹² This is of great value, as this allows a critical understanding of the context that this chronicle was written in.

Gregory's Chronicle, was almost certainly written by William Gregory, sheriff of London from 1436 to 1438. He was later the mayor from 1451 to 1452. Evidence of Gregory's authorship comes from the 1450/1 annal.⁹³ However, a common problem with London chronicles appears here as William Gregory could not have written the chronicle alone. William Gregory died in 1467 and the chronicle ends in 1470. From 1452 until the end of the chronicle there are subtle individual touches which suggest that the chronicle from this point was written by one man. Gregory omits Cade's rebellion in 1450 and stops writing in 1452. The chronicle resuming in 1453 has an independent account of the events and includes Cade's rising in the text. The evidence suggests that William Gregory wrote up until 1452, but his chronicle was continued by an anonymous author until 1469.⁹⁴ This continuation by an anonymous second author is problematic when using the source. *Gregory's Chronicle* offers a great account of the second battle of St Albans, with Strickland making the claim that Gregory may have been present at the battle, offering an eyewitness account.⁹⁵ Gregory's

⁸⁷ M. Hicks, 'The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century: A Revolution in English Writing', *English Historical Review* (479) 1366 – 1368 (2003) p. 1367

⁸⁸ Dockray, *Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and the Wars of the Roses A Source Book* p. x

⁸⁹ McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century A Revolution in English Writing* p.4

⁹⁰ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.222

⁹¹ Hicks, 'The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century: A Revolution in English Writing', *English Historical Review* p.1367

⁹² E. Veale, *William Gregory, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2008)

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/11470?docPos=1> [Accessed 23 May 2014]

⁹³ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.230

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.231

⁹⁵ Strickland and R. Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.372

numerous accounts of guns being used at the battles are indispensable for this investigation. Eventhough, *Gregory's Chronicle* continues up until 1470, his early accounts of the battles offer the most detail. Therefore, although Gregory's Chronicle may be written by an unknown author, the detailed information certainly comes from a well-informed writer, who must have been close to the early battles.

Much about the London chronicles remains a unknown, such as when or why these chronicles were written. The popularity of these manuscripts suggests that during the mid-fifteenth century there were hundreds in circulation.⁹⁶ Both the value and limitations of the London Chronicles can be determined by the way that they were put together and by the audience that were expected to read them.⁹⁷ The *Short English Chronicle* offers a limited account of guns being used during the battle, probably because the author was not an eyewitness at any of the battles. This source, though offering a more limited account of the use of guns is still of great value for this investigation as it shows an interest in the weaponry used in the battles of this period.

These chronicles were written in London, which was central to the country's affairs, and so is of great value to historians.⁹⁸ Due to this most chroniclers reflect a southern, often London, bias, and their accounts of events in the north can be thin and often inaccurate.⁹⁹ Many of the London chronicles are comparable, with *Benet's*, *Bale's* and *Gregory's Chronicle* displaying signs of similar narratives and perspectives. This is probably due to the location that they were written in. The London chronicles do not solely base their knowledge from London as they write about the battles in France; there is evidence that these writers used soldiers as informants. The London citizens were in close touch with the English army, either through merchants or because many of the soldiers were from London.¹⁰⁰ This led to a close relationship between the people of London and the important events of the time.

The London Chronicles, despite their problems, offer a unique insight into the events of the Wars of the Roses, *Gregory's Chronicle* especially offers the most detailed account of guns beings used from this period. The London chronicles, though often anonymous offer such detail that it is sensible to state that they were either informed by eyewitness or that they were eyewitnesses to battles of this period, this makes these sources invaluable.

⁹⁶ McLaren, *The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century A Revolution in English Writing* p.3

⁹⁷ Ross, *Edward IV* p.431

⁹⁸ Elton, *England 1200- 1640 The Sources of History, Studies in the uses of Historical Evidence* p.17

⁹⁹ Dockray, *Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and the Wars of the Roses A Source Book* p. x

¹⁰⁰ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.236

4.2 Warkworth's Chronicle and Newsletters

Warkworth's Chronicle, Chronicle of the Lincolnshire Rebellion, 1470 and the *History of the Arrivall in England of Edward IV and the Final Recovery of his Kingdoms from Henry VI, 1471* are dedicated to the battles of the fourth section of the Wars of the Roses, 1469- 1471. Though the sources originate from different places, these sources represent unique perspectives of the battles, which cannot be found elsewhere. Both *Warkworth's Chronicle* and the *Arrivall of Edward IV* give accounts of guns being used at multiple battles from this period. In order to evaluate these gun references the sources must be analysed.

Thomson argues this about the *Warkworth's Chronicle*

*"It is the best of the limited sources that are available during the Yorkist era."*¹⁰¹

This quote represents how important *Warkworth's Chronicle* is perceived to be. The *Warkworth Chronicle* is a valuable and unique text from the middle years of Edward IV's reign. Despite being written under a Yorkist king, its interpretation can be viewed as mildly pro-Lancastrian.¹⁰² Warkworth, who was writing under Edward IV, between 1478 and 1482, shows sympathy towards the fate of Henry VI. This may be because of sympathy towards Henry VI, after his murder in 1471. The other contemporary chroniclers respond to the political situation of the day, showing no real loyalty towards the Lancastrians or the Yorkists. This may show that Warkworth felt that he had fewer government restrictions placed upon his writing. *Warkworth's Chronicle* shows that some writers were able to write without fear of the repercussions during the late fifteenth century. Warkworth's supposed Lancastrian sympathy may have been because of the lack of power that the Yorkist government had outside of London. Warkworth even presented his mildly pro-Lancastrian chronicle to his college, even with a Edward IV on the throne.¹⁰³ *Warkworth's Chronicle*, appears to have been written by a Northumberland writer, offering greater importance to the events in the north.¹⁰⁴ Both Ross and Gransden have suggested that *Warkworth's Chronicle* has particular knowledge of events in the north. This may point to Warkworth being both author of the chronicle and living in the north, probably Northumberland.¹⁰⁵ However, Thomson disputes that Warkworth was the author, which causes the argument that the chronicle is northern to be reconsidered. Historians, such as Ross and Gransden, have often argued that the chronicle is a northern work, because it adds detail to northern events which are not found elsewhere. However,

¹⁰¹ J. A. F. Thomson, 'Warkworth's Chronicle' Revisited, *The English Historical Review* 116 (2001) pp.657 - 664

¹⁰² Thomson, 'Warkworth's Chronicle' Revisited, *The English Historical Review* 116 p. 657

¹⁰³ Given- Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England* p.211

¹⁰⁴ Ross, *Edward IV* p.432

¹⁰⁵ Thomson, 'Warkworth's Chronicle' Revisited, *The English Historical Review* p.658

this is not conclusive proof of the chronicles origin. These northern events often have different details from other chronicles, which clearly do not have a northern background.¹⁰⁶ Kennedy disagrees with Thomson stating that John Warkworth was the author because there is evidence that he gave the chronicle to the Peterhouse library in 1481.¹⁰⁷

The *Warkworth Chronicle* ends in 1474, but when the chronicle was composed is debatable. The chronicle reads like a contemporary account, but was probably written after 1478. Warkworth presented his chronicle to the library of Peterhouse in 1481, and so must have been completed before this date.¹⁰⁸ This chronicle remains one of the most detailed contemporary sources available. His references to guns at the battles of Empingham and Barnet offer great detail when trying to investigate the battles. Warkworth may have taken his name from either Northampton or Northumberland which may explain his northern interest. *Warkworth's Chronicle* is the only chronicle that gives a detailed description of the events in the north during this period, such as Edward's landing in York in 1471.¹⁰⁹ There are often descriptions of events within the *Warkworth Chronicle* which are attributed to the northern information that he must have had. However, this information is often found in other chronicles, such as the *Great Chronicle of London* and may have been common knowledge rather than especially northern knowledge. There are also cases where the *Warkworth Chronicle* is less informed than other sources about the north. When comparing Warkworth to the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, there are many incidents where *Warkworth Chronicle's* information is incorrect, such as the livery badges that Edward IV wears when entering London.¹¹⁰ This challenges the belief that the *Warkworth Chronicle* is a wholly northern text.¹¹¹ *Warkworth's Chronicle* offers a detailed account of events in the midlands, such as the flooding of certain rivers. The chronicle was possibly written at the monastery in St Albans and the pro Lancastrian agenda may have been a continuation of the monastery's tradition.¹¹² Where the chronicle was written is still unclear, but its location outside of London does give the author more power to criticise the king. *Warkworth's Chronicle* is a very valuable source, despite the problems over where it was written. The chronicles willingness to be mildly pro-Lancastrian offers a unique perspective on the battles of the fourth section of the Wars of the Roses. Though problems over authorship and where the

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p.660

¹⁰⁷ E. D. Kennedy, *John Warkworth, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/28747> [Accessed 24th May 2014]

¹⁰⁸ Kennedy, *John Warkworth, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

¹⁰⁹ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.260

¹¹⁰ Thomson, 'Warkworth's Chronicle' Revisited, *The English Historical Review* p.661

¹¹¹ Ibid., p.663

¹¹² Ibid., p.664

chronicle was written have to be assessed, the detail that Warkworth offers is only second to the *Arrivall of Edward IV* for the battles from this fourth section of the Wars of the Roses.

The *Chronicle of the Lincolnshire Rebellion, 1470*, and the *History of the Arrivall in England of Edward IV and the Final Recovery of his Kingdoms from Henry VI, 1471*, were both written by royal servants.¹¹³ Despite this propagandist nature of *the Arrivall of Edward IV* and *the Chronicle of Lincolnshire*, they are indispensable contemporary accounts because they were written so soon after the events; by an author or authors who was an eyewitness at these battles.¹¹⁴ Both accounts offer the information of a newsletter, legitimating Edward's rule, rather than a chronicle of the time; this is not the first time that English kings have used this tactic. This shows that Edward was concerned with his public perception, making him want to vilify his opponents in 1471.¹¹⁵ This does not diminish the historical use of *the Arrivall of Edward IV* and *the Chronicle of the Rebellion*. Edward sent an abbreviated version to his foreign allies; this could be because he wanted his restoration chronicled accurately, showing his allies that he was God's choice as King of England, as well as vilifying his enemies.¹¹⁶ Both the official histories of this period, the *Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire* and the *History of the Arrivall of Edward IV* are designed to be government propaganda tools, however any type of official history is rare in medieval England. The purpose of the *Lincolnshire Chronicle* was to discredit the Duke of Clarence and the Earl of Warwick, while the purpose of *the Arrivall of Edward IV* is to glorify Edward IV. *The Arrival of Edward IV* not only speaks about Edward's courage but also his piety and his love of peace. Possibly to suppress public criticism of the death of Prince Edward at Tewkesbury, this is ignored in detail.¹¹⁷ The unique value of these sources was that they were written by members of Edward IV's own party during the campaigns of 1470- 71.¹¹⁸ This means that when the *Arrivall of Edward IV* references the use of guns at Barnet and Tewkesbury, this is very likely to have been how they were used. How these sources represent the guns at these battles are thought to be accurate because they were written by eyewitnesses or people who had access to eyewitness accounts.

4.3 Foreign Sources

Due to the close relationships between England, France and Burgundy during the late fifteenth century, the contemporary sources from these countries offer valuable information about the events in England during the Wars of the Roses. These foreign sources had access to information

¹¹³ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.249

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.263

¹¹⁵ C. Given- Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London 2004) p. 204

¹¹⁶ Given- Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England* p.206

¹¹⁷ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.263

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.261

coming from England and English nobles in exile. Two of these foreign sources reference guns being used during the Wars of the Roses, *Memoirs of Philippe de Commines* and Jean de Molinet. Jean de Waurin does not reference guns during his accounts but does reference the battles in great detail.¹¹⁹

The *Memoirs of Philippe de Commines*, for the years 1464 to 1498 is a definitive French text.¹²⁰ Commines was initially in the Burgundian court under Charles the Bold but transferred his loyalty to Louis XI of France, in 1472. He had continued influence on Louis XI until his death in 1483. Commines often negotiated with the English and so had a close relationship with them.¹²¹ Charles the Bold sent Commines to England in 1470, when Warwick was attempting his coup. He was later sent by Louis XI to negotiate with England in 1475. Edward, while negotiating with Commines after his failed invasion of 1476, could have given him information about the 1470 exile.¹²²

Memoirs of Phillippe de Commines does have limitations and inaccuracies because Commines was writing some time after the events, and his narrative is often misleading due to his Burgundian and French bias. The contact that Commines had with leading English officials enabled him to describe these officials in detail. He personally met Edward IV, George, Duke of Clarence, Richard III and Henry Tudor.¹²³ Commines did not have a favourable opinion of Edward IV, calling him avaricious and despite his courage he was not suited for conquest in France. Above all else Commines emphasises Edward's self-indulgence.¹²⁴ Commines' opinion of Richard III was hostile, most likely reflecting the sentiment of the French court, noting that Louis XI thought Richard was cruel. He was favourable towards the invasion of Henry Tudor, eventhough he states that he had no claim and no respectable position with people who were not in his own company.¹²⁵ The *Memoirs of Phillippe de Commines* description of the use of guns comes from Bosworth, 1485, his reference only acknowledges that Henry had artillery from France but is still valuable, as he would have had good knowledge of this event.

Jean de Molinet, a historian for the Burgundian duke, was not influenced by the anti-Ricardian Tudor propaganda of the early years of Henry VII.¹²⁶ Bennett argues that Molinet is an under-utilised source when it comes to the battles of this period. Molinet offers a very detailed account of the tactical manoeuvres from the Battle of Bosworth, but only a scarce account of the

¹¹⁹ L. Visser- Fuchs, *Jean de Waurin*, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/54420> Accessed 23 May 2014

¹²⁰ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.294

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p.295

¹²² *Ibid.*, p.296

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p.297

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p.298

¹²⁵ M. Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, (Stroud 1985) p. 4

¹²⁶ Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, p. 4

Battle of Stoke, 1487. It is very important that Molinet, within his detailed description of the battle, references the use of guns during the battle, making Molinet's account for this investigation important.¹²⁷

Jean de Waurin fought for the Duke of Burgundy against the French at many battles, he served Phillip the Good and Charles the Bold after retiring from the army. Waurin was sent as an ambassador for the Burgundian's during this period, even going to England in 1467 and meeting Warwick in Calais.¹²⁸ Waurin wrote the history of England, continuing from Brut, along with the *English Chronicle*. Waurin came into contact with exiled English nobles while in Burgundy. Waurin transcribed both *the Arrivall and the Chronicle of the Lincolnshire Rebellion* and were both included into his work.¹²⁹ Waurin acknowledged that the sizable number of sources he used were both English and continental.¹³⁰ He gives a full account of the Wars of the Roses and offers detailed information on the battles. His accounts offer greater emphasis on the battles, likely due to Waurin's soldier background and military understanding. Waurin was not only interested in the battles, as he comments on the political uncertainty of England.¹³¹ He often writes in great detail, which often separates his accounts from others of the Wars of the Roses. There is a real question over Waurin's reliability, as he is often inaccurate and has been criticized for using his imagination to complete missing events, such as the Battle of Mortimer's Cross, 1461.¹³² It is very important to understand that Waurin does not mention any reference to guns being used during the battles; this is very strange because the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, which he references, mentions the use of guns in great detail. This is peculiar because Waurin, being a soldier, would have known the use of guns on the battlefield, but still omits this information from his account.

4.4 Sixteenth Century Sources

Many sixteenth century sources offer a more detailed account of the battles than the contemporary sources; this has led many of these sources to be discounted, because the reliability of this new information is questionable. However, these sources can offer more evidence for how the guns were thought to have been used during the battles of this period. The sources that these sixteenth century sources used become very important when evaluating the legitimacy of their accounts.

¹²⁷ Bennett, *The Battle of Bosworth*, p. 4

¹²⁸ Gransden, *Historical Writing in England ii c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* p.289

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p.290

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.291

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p.292

¹³² Dockray, *Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and the Wars of the Roses A Source Book* p. xvii

Polydore Vergil, who wrote after the Wars, had access to contemporary knowledge including eyewitnesses from the court of Henry VII. Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia* completed in 1531, is an extensive history of England. Whether Vergil's history can be seen as a contemporary source for 1450- 71 is a moot point, due to the contemporary sources that Vergil used and also the oral testimonies from eyewitnesses that Vergil had access to.¹³³ Eventhough Vergil had access to oral testimonies from the earlier battles of the period, his later work is seen as more reliable. This makes Vergil's history an indispensable primary source for the Wars of the Roses.¹³⁴ He consulted many men who could remember the Yorkist period (probably some who played a prominent role in the government); Vergil is clearly aware of the conflicting interpretations on the Wars of the Roses. Although Vergil does write detailed accounts of the battles, he does not mention any use of guns during these battles. This makes Vergil's importance to this investigation limited.

The summary chronicles of Stow, Hall and Holinshed were written in the sixteenth century. They use earlier works and offer some original information; however the main purpose of these chronicles was to find the moral purpose of the conflicts.¹³⁵ Stow was concerned with the historical accuracy of his work and this led him to consult many contemporary sources when researching for his work.¹³⁶ Richard Grafton, a printer, was the first; Ralph Holinshed composed the largest compilation; and John Stow published the most carefully compiled chronicle.¹³⁷ *Holinshed's Chronicle*, though a later sixteenth century text, deserves be studied more closely as they show the political and cultural atmosphere of the Elizabethan era towards the Wars of the Roses period.¹³⁸ Comparing Holinshed's account of the fall of Henry VI to contemporary texts shows how attitudes had changed.¹³⁹ Holinshed's chronicle is one of the largest accounts of the period and details most of the battles of the Wars of the Roses; he was influenced by other contemporary sources of the time.¹⁴⁰ Stow and Holinshed's gun references are useful for this investigation because they allow this investigation to understand how the later sixteenth century thought that the guns would have been used.

¹³³ Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses Politics and the constitution in England, c. 1437 – 1509* p. 5

¹³⁴ Dockray, *Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and the Wars of the Roses A Source Book* p. xxii

¹³⁵ Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses Politics and the constitution in England, c. 1437 – 1509* p. 5

¹³⁶ B. L. Beer, *John Stow Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004)

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/26611?docPos=4> Accessed 35th May 2014

¹³⁷ Elton, *England 1200- 1640 The Sources of History, Studies in the uses of Historical Evidence* p.18

¹³⁸ F. Heal, 'Holinshed's Nation: Ideals, Memory and Practical Policy in the Chronicles', *English Historical Review* 128 (2013) p.426

¹³⁹ Heal, 'Holinshed's Nation: Ideals, Memory and Practical Policy in the Chronicles', *English Historical Review* 128 p. 427

¹⁴⁰ C. Clegg, *Raphael Holinshed Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2008)

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/13505?docPos=1> Accessed 17th May 2014

4.5 How the sources represent battles

Chroniclers who wrote about battles would have been concerned by the 'facts' of what happened: especially the sizes of the armies, tactical manoeuvres and significant events during the battle. At the same time there is a troubling formulaic description of what happened during the battles. For example, how the victorious armies had God on their side that roused them at the end of the battle to gain victory against the defeated army, who had been villainous leading up to the battle, this is shown in the *Crowland Chronicle* account of Richard III's nightmare before Bosworth.¹⁴¹ This shows that even though chroniclers wanted to write about what happened during the battle, at the same time they wanted to consider the role of universal truths, such as how battles ought to have been fought and why they were fought. Concentrating in particular on how men should behave not just before the battle but after as well.¹⁴² Chroniclers thought about battles not just as events but also as lessons and models of how to conduct a successful military campaign. This is why many chroniclers describe similar traits in many victorious armies.¹⁴³ A description of a battle was not just a recounting of events, but also a description of how a battle should have been fought, as chroniclers did not see the lessons that they were writing about as separate to the events of the battle.¹⁴⁴ This is not to say that medieval chroniclers' are largely inaccurate in the portrayals of battles; many chroniclers of the time researched the battles using many different sources, either narrative or administrative, however it must be recognised that what the chroniclers chose to emphasise is determined by how they are trying to portray the two armies during the battle. The universal truths must be considered when using chronicles for battle research.¹⁴⁵

Letters from this period show how both the Yorkists and the Lancastrians used the history of battles and events as a propaganda tool. This creates two different histories for this period; this can be seen when comparing the propagandist *Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire* and *The Arrivall in England of Edward IV* to monastic chronicles, such as the *Crowland Chronicle*. History was also used by the chroniclers to persuade the government to act for example John Hardyng wrote his chronicle to warn of the Scottish threat.

4.6 Conclusion

The difficulties that arise from this analysis centre on the anonymous nature of many of the sources. With the author being anonymous it is difficult to know the history and political

¹⁴¹ *Continuations of the Crowland Chronicle* (1492) trans H. T. Riley (London 1893) p.454

¹⁴² Given- Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England* p. 2

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p.2

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p.3

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p.3

affiliation of the writers. However, this can be partly overcome by the tone of the chronicle itself, whether the source is pro Yorkist or Lancastrian; this shows where or when the source could have been written. The variety of sources that have to be used can be seen as a problem, but this analysis shows that each source has unique merits that need to be recognised. The sources have to be used within the context that they were written in, but this does not diminish the validity of their information. This analysis of the sources has shown that together the varied contemporary sources can create a detailed depiction of the Wars of the Roses that is more comprehensive than from just using one type of source, such as monastic chronicles. This study will have to be cautious when analyzing the individual primary source gun references. Only a analysis of the individual gun references will allow this investigation to test the hypothesis, which states that the use of gunpowder weapons will develop and change in use during the Wars of the Roses.

5. Investigation of each gun reference

This section will examine each gun reference and place the gun reference into the context of the battle; allowing the investigation to analyse the importance of guns and compare how the guns are presented within the primary sources compared to the secondary sources. This will allow the investigation to distinguish the differences between the primary and secondary interpretations. The six battles and one rout that reference the use of guns are Ludford Bridge 1459, Northampton 1460, Second St Albans 1461, Empingham 1470, Barnet 1471, Tewkesbury 1471 and Bosworth 1485. Five of these battles have multiple gun references from different sources; this will allow the investigation to compare how the use of guns was perceived in different primary sources. The battles have been split into five sections, St Albans 1455 is the first section, the second section consists of the battles between 1459 – 1461, the third section consists of the battles in 1464, the fourth section consists of the battles from 1469-71 and the fifth and final section consists of the battles between 1485- 87. Dividing the periods of the Wars of the Roses into five sections will allow this investigation to analyse the battles from the same section and then to compare the sections from different periods. The hypothesis states that

'The role of the gunpowder weapons developed and changed through the battles of the Wars of the Roses indicating changes in the usage of guns over time.'

This section will analyse every gun reference from the primary sources to understand if the use of gunpowder weaponry developed during this period.

5.1 The Rout of Ludford Bridge, 12th October 1459

The Rout of Ludford Bridge was fought between the Yorkists, under the leadership of the Duke of York and Earl of Warwick with his Calais regiment, and the Lancastrians, whose commander is unknown.¹⁴⁶ The Lancastrians, who had superior numbers, defeated the Yorkists, without a battle occurring, after the defection of the Calais regiment, under the leadership of Andrew Trollop, causing a rout. This was the first Lancastrian victory of the Wars of the Roses.¹⁴⁷ There is a lack of evidence that the sources give about this rout, only twelve sources mention the rout and only *Gregory's Chronicle* offers any detail. The quotation below is the most detailed reference of the events from Ludford Bridge. The only weapon that is mentioned by any of the sources was the use of artillery in *Gregory*.

¹⁴⁶ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.30

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.30

'The Duke of Yorke lete make a grete depe dyche and fortifyde it with gonnys, cartys, and stakys.,'¹⁴⁸

Gregory is stating that the Duke of York decided on his defensive position and fortified this with artillery, stacks and a great ditch, this reference suggests that artillery was static.¹⁴⁹ This notes the importance that the Duke of York placed on a strong defensive position, and that the use of artillery was of great importance for this position. Gregory probably acknowledged the use of artillery at this rout as it was an important fixture of York's defensive position; this would explain why Gregory does not mention the use of other weapons.

In order to understand the importance of Gregory's account to the events of the rout must be understood. The size of the armies at Ludford Bridge is unclear, with *Benet's Chronicle* suggesting that there were 25,000 Yorkists and 40,000 Lancastrians, this is an exaggeration but it is likely that the Lancastrians outnumbered the Yorkists.¹⁵⁰ The *Crowland Chronicle* states that the Earl of Warwick brought to Ludford Bridge a regiment from the Calais Garrison, under the leadership of Andrew Trollop.¹⁵¹ The Duke of York positioned his army in a defensive position, fortified by stacks, artillery and a great ditch.¹⁵² It is unclear what happened during the battle; Gregory does note that the Yorkists were overwhelmed and routed by the Lancastrians.¹⁵³ Waurin agrees and explains that the Yorkist defeat was the result of treachery from the Calais regiment, under the leadership of Trollop.¹⁵⁴ The Calais regiment switching sides is agreed by the *Crowland Chronicle*, stating that this led to the Lancastrian victory.¹⁵⁵ After the rout, York fled to Ireland as this was his first defeat of the Wars of the Roses.¹⁵⁶

Though the events are unclear; the primary sources depiction of the use of guns during the Rout of Ludford Bridge is valuable for this investigation. The Duke of York and the Earl of Warwick, knowing that they were outnumbered, decided to commit to a defensive position. Gregory only

¹⁴⁸ 'Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (ed.) J. Gairdner, *Historical Collections of a Citizen in the Fifteenth Century* (1876), pp. 196- 210, URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45559> Date accessed 01 June 2014

¹⁴⁹ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

¹⁵⁰ *Benet's Chronicle For the years 1400- 1462* ed. G.L and M. A. Harriss in *Camden Miscellany* (1972) p.224

¹⁵¹ *Continuations of the Crowland Chronicle* (1492) trans H. T. Riley (London 1893) p.454

¹⁵² *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 196- 210,

¹⁵⁴ J. de Waurin, *Recueil des Croniques et Anchiennes Istories de la Grant Bretagne, a present nomme Engleterre*, ed W. and E. Hardy, Vol 5, 1447 – 1471 (Rolls Series, 1891)

¹⁵⁵ *Continuations of the Crowland Chronicle* p.454

¹⁵⁶ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (1876), pp. 196- 210,

references the use of artillery and no other weapon; this may be because artillery was an important part of York's defensive position.¹⁵⁷ Gregory also states that the Yorkists used carts to help defend their position alongside the artillery; this is evidence of how Keen depicts artillery being used. The decision of the Duke of York to position his forces defensively dictated the type of weaponry that was going to be important. Strickland states that York had to use his defensive position, strengthened by carts and artillery, because he was outnumbered.¹⁵⁸ Both the primary and secondary sources agree that the use of artillery was important for a strong defensive position.

The problem with the representation of Ludford Bridge comes from the statement from Haigh,

*'York fled the battlefield under a hail of artillery fire. Without a commander the Yorkists disbanded and the Lancastrians were victorious.'*¹⁵⁹

At no point do the contemporary sources reference the attacking Lancastrian army using any artillery, or even that they had artillery. This statement from Haigh, which emphasises the use of artillery at this battle, is an assumption on what may have happened, and not what the contemporary sources actually say. Haigh's suggestion that the Lancastrians could have used their own artillery is plausible, but not referenced by any primary source. What is known is that York had artillery at Ludford Bridge, but it is unclear whether York was able to use his artillery before his army was routed, despite his defensive positioning. This would question the effectiveness of the artillery when the defending army was being overrun by the enemy.

5.2 The Battle of Northampton 10th July 1460

The Battle of Northampton, on the 10th July 1460, was the second battle from the second section and the third battle of the Wars of the Roses. At the Battle of Northampton, the outnumbered Lancastrian army was defeated by the Yorkists, under the leadership of the Earl of Warwick and Edward, Earl of March. Three accounts reference the use of artillery at this battle, and these accounts offer different perspectives about the effectiveness of the weapon. Northampton, as is evident from the table in Appendix 1, is a well documented battle from the period; this allows the investigation to evaluate the role of the guns in the battle. The references to guns from the three primary sources will be investigated in chronological order.

¹⁵⁷ Gregory's *Chronicle: 1451- 1460*, *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (1876), pp. 196- 210,

¹⁵⁸ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.372

¹⁵⁹ Haigh, *The Military Campaigns of the Wars of the Roses* p. 22

*'The ordanauncs of the kings gones avayled nat, for that day was so grate rayne, that the gones lay depe in the wate, and so were quyent and myghte nat be shott.'*¹⁶⁰

This claim in the *English Chronicle*, that the Lancastrians could not fire their guns might seem to be contradicted by Gregory who says that:

*' And that goode knyght Syr Wylliam Lucy that dwellyd be-syde Northampton hyrde the gonne schotte, and come unto the fylde to have holpyn [t]e kyng, but the fylde was done.'*¹⁶¹

However it is possible that both were correct, for the guns which Lucy heard could have been with the Yorkist army.

*'The king's ordinance of guns could not be shot, there was great rain that day.'*¹⁶²

John Stow, a writer whose chronicle was published in 1580, has clearly used the *English Chronicle* when writing his description of the battle, Stow is known for using a variety of contemporary sources for his chronicle. Stow states that the guns could not be shot due to the great rain of the day. Eventhough this is from a later source, it still represents the popular view that many historians have of the events of this battle. Stow's reference does not support the claim from Gregory that guns must have been shot during the battle. As *Stow's Chronicle* uses the *English Chronicle* as a source, this investigation will reference the *English Chronicle* as the primary source when discussing the events of the battle.

In order to understand the role of the guns during the battle, one must understand the events from the Battle of Northampton. The size of the armies at Northampton is unclear, with Benet noting that the Yorkists brought 20,000 men, but Bale suggests that the Yorkist army was closer to 60,000 men, with modern estimates being closer to Bale's estimate.¹⁶³ The *English Chronicle* states that the battle lasted for less than an hour, because Lord Grey, who was in the Lancastrian vanguard, changed sides to join the Yorkists.¹⁶⁴ *Whethamstede* suggests that the Yorkists

¹⁶⁰ *An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V and Henry VI written before the year 1471* Ed. The Rev, J. Silvestre Davies (London) J. B. Nichols and Sons (1855) p. 97

¹⁶¹ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

¹⁶² J. Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England by John Stow* (ed.) Edmund Howes (London, 1631)

¹⁶³ *Benet's Chronicle For the years 1400- 1462* (ed.) G.L and M. A. Harris in *Camden Miscellany* (1972) p.224

Bale's Chronicle, in Six Town Chronicles (ed.) R. Flenley (Oxford, 1911) p. 151 *Battle of Northampton,*

Battlefields Trust <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=33> Accessed 24th June 2014

¹⁶⁴ *Vanguard – The foremost division or the front of the army.*

An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V and Henry VI written before the year 1471 p. 97

positioned their army into three battles and attacked together rather than one at a time, which overwhelmed the Lancastrian defences.¹⁶⁵ The Lancastrian guns could not be shot because of the great amount of rain.¹⁶⁶

Northampton was a battle where a larger force attacked an army in a defensive position. Just as at Ludford Bridge the defending side had an array of artillery within their army. Goodman suggests that the battle could have ended differently if the Lancastrian guns could have been fired.¹⁶⁷ This interpretation of the battle from Goodman, Strickland and Haigh uses the reference from the *English Chronicle* and states that the guns were ineffective. However, *Gregory* suggests that guns were fired during the Battle of Northampton, which brought Sir William Lucy to the battlefield.¹⁶⁸ Gregory is the only writer who states that the guns brought an overhearing person to the battlefield, leading to the question, why would Gregory include this statement in his chronicle? Gregory likely would have been told about this, either from William Lucy or by another informant. These chronicles can be used together to suggest that the artillery was fired during the battle, but that the heavy rain made some of the Lancastrian's artillery ineffective. It is likely that some of the Lancastrians artillery, which was able to fire as *Gregory* suggests, could not change position against the Yorkists, who were attacking from other directions, due to the heavy rain. This would suggest that the guns were used, but that the rain caused the artillery to be ineffective against the majority of the attacking Yorkists. However, Gregory could be noting that the guns were being fired by the attacking Yorkists, which could have attracted William Lucy, though the Yorkist guns are not referenced in the primary sources. This shows the limitations of the primary sources, as they result in more questions than answers.

The primary sources from the Battle of Northampton again emphasise that the guns were being used within defensive encampments. Both Ludford Bridge and Northampton reference the use of artillery being used, but both accounts agree with the popular interpretation, that guns were used as a defensive weapon during the early stages of the Wars of the Roses. However, guns could have been used within the attacking army; but this analysis shows that the guns were being referenced within a defensive position by the contemporary sources. The contemporary sources reference the use of guns by the defending Lancastrians, however it is plausible to suggest that the attacking

¹⁶⁵ 'Battles' - When the army is split into section, this is called split into 'battles.'
J. Whethamstede, *Register in Registra Quorundam Abbatum Monasteri S. Albani* (ed.) H. T. Riley, I (Rolls Ser 1872)

¹⁶⁶ *An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V and Henry VI written before the year 1471* p. 97

¹⁶⁷ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.39

¹⁶⁸ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

Yorkists would have had guns with their army, this suggestion may be tested by an archaeological study of the battlefield. Why were the guns, if they being used by the Yorkists were not being mentioned by the primary sources? This is likely because the sources are only referencing the guns that were being used within a defensive structure at these early battles.

5.3 The Second Battle of St Albans, 17th February 1461

The Second Battle of St Albans was the fifth battle of the second section, and the sixth battle of the Wars of the Roses. The Yorkist army, under the leadership of the Earl of Warwick, took up a strong defensive position before the battle. The Lancastrians attacked from a different direction and defeated the Yorkist army, who were struggling to chance position. The Second Battle of St Albans has only two sources that reference the use of guns, in fourteen sources. *Gregory's Chronicle*, again offers the most detailed account of how guns were used during this battle, offering an invaluable detail of how guns were perceived at the Second Battle of St Albans. The two sources that reference the use of guns are *Gregory's Chronicle* and the *Short English Chronicle*.

*'Duke of Northfolke, the Erle of Warwyke, and many lordis with Kynge Harrye and grete multitude of comynes and ordynaunce mett with hem with batayle, and slewe myche pepull on bothe the parties.'*¹⁶⁹

The *Short English Chronicle* states that the Lancastrian forces brought with them a great amount of ordinance in order to defeat Warwick, who was in a good defensive position, within the city of St Albans. This source notes that guns were brought to the battlefield, but does not give any information about how they were used during the battle.

'And ar the goners and borgeners couthe levylle hyr gonnys they were besely fyghtyng, and many a gynne of wer was ordaynyd that stode in lytylle a-vayle or nought; for the burgeners hadde suche instrumentys that wolde schute bothe pelletys of ledde and arowys of an elle of lenththe with vj fetherys, iij in myddys and iij at the othyr ende, with a grete myghty hedde of yryn at the othyr ende, and wylde fyre with alle. Alle thes iij thyngys they myght schute welle and esely at onys, but in tyme of nede they couthe not schut not one of thes, but the fyre turnyd backe a-pon them that wold schute thys iij thyngys. Also they hadde nettys made of grete cordys of iiij fethem of lenththe and of iiij fote brode, lyke unto an haye, and at every ij knott there was an nayl stondyng uppe ryght, that there couthe no man passe ovyr hyt by lyckely hode but he shulde be hurte. Alle so they hadde pavysse

¹⁶⁹ 'A Short English Chronicle: London under Henry VI (1422-71)' (ed.) J. Gairdner, *Three fifteenth-century chronicles* (1880), pp. 58-78. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=58661> [Accessed 24 May 2014]

*bore as a dore i-made with a staffe foldyng uppe and downe to sette the pavys where the lykyd, and loupys with schyttyng wyndowys to schute owte at, they stonyng by hynde [t]^e pavys, and the pavys as fulle of iij^d nayle aftyr ordyr as they myght stonde. And whenn hyr schotte was spende and done they caste the pavysse by-fore hem, thenn there myght noo man come unto them ovyr the pavysse for the naylys that stode up-ryghte, but yf he wolde myschyffe hym sylfe.*¹⁷⁰

This is the most detailed account of how effective handguns were during the Wars of the Roses. Gregory is scathing about the ineffectiveness of the handguns, stating that they were useless and the soldiers picked up swords and mallets casting aside their handguns.¹⁷¹ Gregory states that the handguns were in the possession of Burgundian handgunners, but they kept firing back onto themselves, injuring more of them than the opposition.¹⁷² Gregory's account is the first mention of handguns being used on the battlefield during the Wars of the Roses, and they are not by the English, but by Burgundian handgunners. Gregory does note that handgunners used pavises as a defensive structure during the battle. Gregory notes that the handgunner and the artillery soldiers attempted to move the pavises when they were attacked from a different direction; this suggests that these handgunners were reliant on defensive structures when using the guns.¹⁷³ This proposes that the handguns were slow and difficult to use, needing additional defensive structures for protection. Gregory states that Warwick used nets and other materials to strengthen his defensive position, this shows how vulnerable Warwick felt, as he needed a significant defensive position.¹⁷⁴ Gregory dismisses the effectiveness of gunpowder weapons because they were ineffective during this battle as the opposing army attacked from a different position; however the amount of gunpowder weapons that Warwick had within his defensive position, both artillery and handguns, must suggest a growing importance on guns during the early battles of the wars.

In order to understand the importance of the Burgundian handgunners, the events of the battle must be understood. Warwick, moving into St Albans, created a strongly fortified position. The Lancastrians, who brought a large army to St Albans, caught Warwick by surprise as they attempted to attack his army from behind.¹⁷⁵ This manoeuvre caught the Yorkists off-guard as they then needed to reposition their army while being attacked by the Yorkists. Initially, the Yorkist's newly positioned vanguard matched the Lancastrians, but a Lancastrian contingent attacked from the side and this

¹⁷⁰ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 196- 210,,

¹⁷² Strickland and R. Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

¹⁷³ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,,

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 196- 210,

¹⁷⁵ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

caused the Yorkist vanguard to break and then the soldiers fled.¹⁷⁶ The *Short English Chronicle* states that a Yorkist contingent switched sides causing their defeat.¹⁷⁷ Gregory noted that the Burgundian handgunners and the artillery were unable to reposition themselves and level their handguns before they had to face the Lancastrians in a hand to hand battle.¹⁷⁸ Strickland claims that the Yorkists' defensive fortifications were of little use due to the Lancastrians attacking from the rear.¹⁷⁹ Haigh agrees that the Lancastrian victory was due to their surprise attack.¹⁸⁰

According to Gregory's *Chronicle* Second Battle of St Albans shows the limitations of handguns during this period.¹⁸¹ Handguns have been perceived to be unfavoured by the English and this reference from Gregory would agree with this perception, as the ineffective handguns were being used by the Burgundians. This suggests that there was a difference between the English and Continental armies weaponry, possibly because the English favoured the warbow over handguns.¹⁸² Though the reference to handguns is compelling, it must be stated that artillery was mentioned by both *Gregory's Chronicle* and the *Short English Chronicle* and Gregory does not combine the useless handguns with the use of artillery during the battle.

The Second Battle of St Albans is the last battle from the second section which references the use of guns during the battles. It is worth noting that only three of the seven battles from the second section reference the use of guns, this is an example of the limitation of the primary sources from this period. Artillery was being used in defensive formations and is being portrayed as a necessity to maintain a strong defensive position. What these sources do not state is that artillery was being used on open field battles.

Gregory's Chronicle has been a vital source for this investigation when analysing the battles and rout from the second section of the Wars of the Roses. Gregory not only references the guns being used two battles and a rout, but offers the most amount of detail in his descriptions. Why Gregory has placed such an emphasis on the use of guns during these battles is unknown, but he seems to have been able to access different information than the other chronicles and contemporary sources from the period. Strickland states that Gregory may even have been close to St Albans during the Second Battle and that is why he was able to write such a detailed account of

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 196- 210,

¹⁷⁷ 'A *Short English Chronicle: London under Henry VI (1422-71)*', pp. 58-78.

¹⁷⁸ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

¹⁷⁹ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

¹⁸⁰ Haigh, *The Military Campaigns of the Wars of the Roses* p. 50

¹⁸¹ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

¹⁸² Gunn, *Archery Practice in Early Tudor England, Past and Present* ,209, p. 53- 81

the handgun problems.¹⁸³ It is important to note that Gregory only references guns being used in three of his accounts, when he chronicles the events from ten battles. One must ask whether this means that guns were not being used during these battles. However, due to archaeological evidence from the Battle of Towton we know that guns were being used, even though only the small artillery pieces were being used.¹⁸⁴ So why did Gregory omit the use of guns for these other battles? Gregory may have been interested in the larger and more defensive artillery pieces, and so the smaller artillery at Towton did not interest Gregory. Another answer may be in the number of times that Gregory gives to other weapons. Gregory only references archers being used twice out of the ten battles. This would suggest that Gregory does not reference every weapon that was being used in the battles, Gregory is referencing the important events during the battles and at these three engagements guns were an important part.

5.4 The Battle of Empingham, 12th March 1470

The Battle of Empingham, also known as the battle of Losecote, was the second battle of the fourth section, and the eleventh battle of the Wars of the Roses. This battle was instigated by the rebellion in Lincolnshire, under the leadership of Robert Welles against the Yorkist king, Edward IV. Edward quickly suppressed this rebellion but the legacy of the battle was the treachery from the Earl of Warwick and Duke of Clarence against the king.¹⁸⁵ The Battle of Empingham is one of the least documented battles of this period with only seven sources detailing the events of the battle. Appendix 1 shows that the use of artillery was referenced in *Warkworth's Chronicle*; and this is the only source that mentions any type of weapon being used during this battle.¹⁸⁶

*'And so the king took his oste and went towards his enemyes, and loosed his gonnyes of his ordynaunce uppon them, and faught them.'*¹⁸⁷

Warkworth states that Edward IV used guns against his enemies during this battle. Warkworth is suggesting that Edward preferred the use of guns within his army; this is the first time that guns have been shown as an attacking weapon, rather than being used as a defensive weapon.

¹⁸³ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

¹⁸⁴ R. Hardy, *Towton Battlefield Society Archaeology*, (2014) <http://www.towton.org.uk/archeology/#> [Accessed 4 June 2014]

¹⁸⁵ M. Hicks, *Robert Welles Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/28998/28999?docPos=5> Accessed 21st June 2014

¹⁸⁶ J. Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*. Ed J. O. Halliwell (London, 1839)

¹⁸⁷ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*. p. 8

Warkworth is suggesting that Edward used his guns during the initial stages of the battles and then engaged with his opponents.

There is no detailed source that states the events of the Battle of Empingham. What is known is that Edward, when approaching the Lincolnshire rebels, pushed his army forward with a large amount of artillery and attacked, the rebels quickly disbanded and fled.¹⁸⁸ Edward IV's victory had shown his decisiveness, but we still have no clear depiction of the battle from other contemporary sources.¹⁸⁹

Edward IV was victorious at the Battle of Empingham because he aggressively attacked the rebels and Warkworth suggests that Edward used his guns when attacking the rebels.¹⁹⁰ This is the first time that artillery is referenced in the offensive army, but what is important about Empingham is that Edward attacked quickly and the artillery was a large part of this attack. This use of guns rejects the idea that guns were capable of being used within a defensive structure.¹⁹¹ When examining the gun references from Gregory, it was stated that Gregory only mentioned the use of guns when they played an important part during the battle. Warkworth briefly recounts the Battle of Empingham and noted that Edward used his guns to attack the rebels. If we analyse Warkworth the same as *Gregory's Chronicle*, then Warkworth would only have mentioned the use of guns if they were an important part of the battle. With this theory we can therefore suggest that this is the first time that the guns were used as an important part of an offensive attack. This is the first time that guns have been specifically mentioned as being used by the attacking army, though an argument can be made about the attacking use at Northampton. This change in representation suggests an evolution in perception. This could be the beginning of the development in the use of gunpowder weapons proposed by the hypothesis.

5.5 The Battle of Barnet, 14th April 1471

The Battle of Barnet was the third battle of the fourth section, and the twelfth of the Wars of the Roses. The Earl of Warwick and Duke of Clarence had successfully exiled Edward IV and reinstated Henry VI as king in 1470. Edward, returning from exile in 1471, fought Warwick at Barnet in one of the largest battles of the wars. Warwick, having been betrayed by the Duke of Clarence, took up a defensive position on the battlefield and waited for Edward to attack. Edward defeated the Lancastrians and one of his most powerful enemies, the Earl of Warwick, was slain during the

¹⁸⁸ *Chronicles of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire 1470*, ed. J. Gough Nicolls (London, 1867), Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* p. 8

¹⁸⁹ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.71

¹⁹⁰ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* p. 8

¹⁹¹ Gravett. *Tewkesbury 1471, The Last Yorkist Victory* p.28

battle. Guns have been referenced by four sources and the battle is mentioned in nineteen sources. The sources that reference the use of guns at Barnet are the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, *Warkworth's Chronicle*, *John Stow* and *Holinshed's Chronicle*. These are a variety of sources with the *Arrivall of Edward IV* and *Warkworth's Chronicle* being contemporary sources and *John Stow* and *Holinshed's Chronicle* are histories written in the sixteenth century. These sources from a variety of areas represent different perspectives on the use of guns during this battle.

*'Bothe parties had goons, and ordinaunce, but th'Erle of Warwike had many moo then the Kynge, and therefore, on the nyght, weninge gretly to have anoyed the Kinge, and his hooste, with shot of gannes, th'Erls fielde shotte gunes al moste all the nyght. But, thanked be God ! it so fortunod that they always ovarshote the Kyngs hoste, and hurtyd them nothinge, and the cawse was the Kyngs hoste lay muche nerrar them than they demyd.'*¹⁹²

The *Arrivall of Edward IV* states that the Earl of Warwick fired his guns at the king's army all through the night before the Battle of Barnet. The *Arrivall of Edward IV* was written by a servant of Edward IV, who was with Edward IV throughout the Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury and so this source is one of the few sources that was written by an eyewitness.¹⁹³ Therefore this source has credibility when it suggests that Warwick fired his artillery through the night, which was an important event that preceded the Battle of Barnet. This is the first example of the guns being used to disrupt the opposing army before the battle began. This is an interesting way to use the weapon, but it is also very important to note that this was seen to be important enough to be mentioned by the author of the *Arrivall of Edward IV*.

*'Edward left Flanders with Lord Hastings and the Lord Say, 900 Englishmen and 300 Fleming handgunners.'*¹⁹⁴

*'Both sides loosed gannes at each othere all nyght.'*¹⁹⁵

Warkworth's Chronicle makes two accounts of guns being used during the Battle of Barnet. Warkworth begins his account of the road to Barnet, stating that Edward was returning to England from Burgundy brought with him three hundred Fleming handgunners. This is an interesting observation from Warkworth as again handguns being used by a foreign mercenaries. However, Edward must have seen these three hundred Flemish handgunners as an important part of his army

¹⁹² *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* ed. J. Bruce (London, 1838) p. 18

¹⁹³ Given- Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England* p.206

¹⁹⁴ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*. p. 13

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14

because these were over a quarter of the number of soldiers that he brought with him when returning from Burgundy. Warkworth does not specifically mention the handgunners during the Battle of Barnet, but the addition of Edward bringing them from Burgundy is very important. This shows the increasing importance that can be placed on guns compared to the earlier sections. Strickland notes that Edward was given the handgunners because they were a very important part of the Duke of Burgundy's army; that it may not have been Edward's decision to bring so many handgunners with him to England in 1471.¹⁹⁶ This would limit the importance of Edward using the handgunners at Barnet.

The second reference from Warkworth agrees with the *Arrivall of Edward IV* that Warwick fired his guns at his enemy all through the night.¹⁹⁷ However, the difference between the two details is that Warkworth states that both sides fired upon each other, rather than it solely being Warwick. This may lead to the suggestion that it was expected that armies would use their artillery to disrupt their enemy the night before the battle. There could also be more of a functional reason for firing the artillery through the night; this may be to attract the attention of late contingents to the battlefield site. Warwick and Edward had to rely on the soldiers from different nobles and these nobles would often be late to battles or not arrive at all. This would explain why both Edward and Warwick were firing their guns the night before the battle, in order to alert the new soldiers of their whereabouts.¹⁹⁸ Both of the reasons why the armies were firing through the night are compelling and they both could be right, Warwick could be aiming to alert new soldiers to his position and trying to disrupt his opponents.

Warkworth's Chronicle is the most detailed contemporary account of how the guns were being used during the Battle of Barnet, and Warkworth states that both handguns and artillery was at Barnet, and it would be logical to assume that they were being used during the battle. Warkworth not only places emphasis on both types of guns, but also shows how the guns were being used in a variety of ways at different parts of the battle. From night firing, which could have been used for a variety of reasons, to being used during the battle, guns were becoming a much more versatile part of the army during this period.

*'Edward with 900 Englishmen and 300 Flemings handgunners travelled to England.'*¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁶ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

¹⁹⁷ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* ed. J. Bruce p. 18

¹⁹⁸ Hammond, *The Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury* (Gloucester 1990) p. 73

¹⁹⁹ J. Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England by John Stow* (ed.) E. Howes p.412

*'Warwick and Edward on the plains were shooting gunnes at each other all night.'*²⁰⁰

John Stow makes two separate references to guns being used at Barnet. First that Edward returns from his exile in Burgundy with three hundred Flemish handgunners. Stow writing in the late sixteenth century has used *Warkworth's Chronicle* as his source for this battle. This can be seen by the similar information that appears in Stow's later source. Stow's use of *Warkworth's Chronicle* does not make Stow's histories unimportant because it shows that Warkworth's earlier chronicle has been seen as an important text when researching the Battle of Barnet. Stow's secondly states that Warwick and Edward shot their guns at each other on a plain all night. This would show how important *Warkworth's Chronicle* was for Stow, because he is using it for his chronicle. Stow is stating that both sides were firing their guns at each other through the night; this could be in order to attract new soldiers or to disrupt the preparations of the opposing army. Stow used *Warkworth's Chronicle* as his source rather than the *Arrivall of Edward IV* in England, this could show how important each of these sources were perceived to be in the late sixteenth century.

*'They had great artillery on both parts, but the earle was better furnished with than the king, and therefore they shot off in a manner continually; but doing little hurt to the kings people, still overshooting them, as the kings men lay much closer than the earle and his army knew. And such silence was kept on the kings campe, that no noise from them to their enemies. For it should not be known to the enemies, how near the kings with his army was lodged unto the, and the king would not suffer any hid gunners in all that night to be shot off, .east they might have guessed the ground and levelled their artillery, to the kings annoyance.'*²⁰¹

Raphael Holinshed, whose chronicle was published in 1587, details guns from Barnet on two occasions.²⁰² Holinshed's firstly states that both Edward IV and the Earl of Warwick had great artillery, but that Warwick had was better furnished. This is an interesting note about the amount of artillery each side had on the battlefield, Warwick is said to have had more guns probably because he was in control of England and the Tower of London at the time.²⁰³ This reference also states how both sides knew that they had to have a good amount of artillery within their army. Holinshed, in his second gun reference has clearly been influenced by the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, by stating that Warwick used his artillery to fire upon Edward's army all throughout the night. Holinshed then adds that due to Edward's position, which was closer to Warwick than Warwick estimated, all of the shots fired over Edward's army and thus only gave away Warwick's position. This suggests that Warwick's

²⁰⁰ Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England* by John Stow p.412

²⁰¹ Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland In Six Volumes*, 3, p. 312

²⁰² Clegg, *Raphael Holinshed Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

²⁰³ Haigh, *The Military Campaigns of the Wars of the Roses* p. 118

use of his artillery was a mistake as it gave away his battle position. However, if Warwick was using the night firing to alert new soldiers of his position, then this would have been seen as a sensible decision by Warwick and not a mistake. Eventhough this is a popular opinion of the ineffectiveness of Warwick's artillery the night before Barnet, Holinshed is writing in the late sixteenth century and this must be taken into account when using this source. Holinshed's portrayal of Edward's reluctance to give his position away during Warwick's night firing could be a sixteenth century perception of night firing. Holinshed and Stow represent an interesting division in later 16th century writers, as Holinshed has been influenced by the *Arrivall of Edward IV in England* and Stow has been influenced by the *Warkworth's Chronicle*, this suggest that both contemporary sources were seen to be important and possibly availability of these sources is the most important influence on which source the later 16th century writers used.

In order to understand the gun references, they have to be placed within the context of the battle. Warwick chose the battlefield and waited for Edward to arrive. It is clear that Warwick fired his artillery all through the night at Edward's camp; however there is a disagreement whether Edward returned the fire. *Warkworth's Chronicles* states that both sides fired at each other, while the *Arrivall of Edward IV* notes that Warwick fired at Edward to disrupt him, but overshot.²⁰⁴ Strickland argues that Warwick used his artillery early in the morning to provoke Edward into attacking his defensive position, but there is no contemporary evidence to support this.²⁰⁵ The battle began in the early hours of the morning and a great mist had covered the field and Edward attacked Warwick.²⁰⁶ Due to the mist, each side's right flank overlapped the opposing left flank; this led to the earl of Oxford quickly defeating the Yorkist left flank, and the duke of Gloucester eventually defeating the Lancastrian left.²⁰⁷ Due to the mist, the rest of Edward's army did not realise that Oxford had overrun the left flank and so the Yorkist army did not become demoralised.²⁰⁸ Oxford returned to the battlefield with eight hundred men, however Oxford's livery badge was similar to Edward's and so due to the mist Warwick's men mistook them and shot and attacked them, causing

²⁰⁴ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 18 Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* p. 14

²⁰⁵ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.377

²⁰⁶ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 18

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18

²⁰⁸ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 18

Oxford's men to flee.²⁰⁹ After Warwick's centre collapsed, Edward was victorious and both the earl of Warwick and the Marquis Montagu were slain during the battle.²¹⁰

Barnet is a well documented battle, with five different sources referencing the use of guns. The Battle of Barnet represents the first time that the contemporary sources offer a variety of uses for guns during the battle. *The Arrivall of Edward IV* notes that Warwick used his guns to fire upon Edward all through the night; this was probably to cause a disruption or to provoke Edward into attacking.²¹¹ *Warkworth's Chronicle* states that not only did Warwick fire on Edward through the night, but also that Edward brought with him three hundred Fleming handgunners. Barnet represents the first battle where guns are being used in a variety of ways and at different times of the battle. Using gun in a multiple of ways shows the development of guns from the second section to the fourth section of battles. There is also a change in the representation of the guns at Barnet, as guns have not been shown within a defensive structure, but rather on a plain. However, the contemporary sources for Barnet do not reference the guns being used during the battle itself, but rather before the battle, it is logical to assume that the guns would have been used during the battle but there is still no clear evidence for this. The later sources clearly use these contemporary sources when they are chronicling the events of the battle; it is important to know which fifteenth century sources influenced the later sixteenth century chroniclers.

5.6 The Battle of Tewkesbury, 4th May 1471

The Battle of Tewkesbury was the fourth and final battle of the fourth section, and the thirteenth battle of the Wars of the Roses. After defeating Warwick at Barnet, Edward had to turn his attention to the arrival of Margaret of Anjou and Henry VI's heir Prince Edward. Edward forced the Lancastrians from their defensive position and defeated the Lancastrians. Prince Edward was slain during the battle and Henry VI was murdered in the Tower of London. The battle represents the end for Henry VI's dynasty and secures the throne for Edward IV, Barnet and Tewkesbury also introduces Richard, Duke of Gloucester, as a powerful Yorkist military leader. Tewkesbury is one of the better represented battles of the Wars of the Roses. Only two of seventeen sources reference the use of guns during the Battle of Tewkesbury, these sources are the *Arrivall of Edward IV* and *Holinshed's Chronicle*, Holinshed had clearly used the *Arrivall of Edward IV* for his later chronicle.

²⁰⁹ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*. p. 14

²¹⁰ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 18

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18

*'Netheles the Kyngs ordinance was so conveniently layde afore them, and his vawarde so sore oppressyd them, with shott of arrows, that they gave them right-a-sharpe shwre.'*²¹²

*'Also they dyd agayne-ward to them, bothe with shot of arrows and gones, whereof netheles they ne had not so great plenty as had the Kynge.'*²¹³

'but Edmond, called Duke of Somarset, having that day the vawarde, whithar it were for that he and his fellowshipe were sore annoyed in the place where they were, as well with gones-shott, as with shot of arrows, whiche they ne wOULD nor durst abyde, or els, of great harte and corage, knyghtly and manly avaun syd hymselfe, c with his fellowshipe, somewhat asyde-hand the Kyngs vawarde, and, by certayne pathes and wayes therefore afore purveyed, and to the Kyngs party unknowne, he departyd out of the field, passyd alane, and came into a fayre place, or cloos, even afore the Kynge where he was enbattled, and, from the hill that was in that one of the closes, he set right fiercely upon th'end of the Kyngs battayle.

The *Arrivall of Edward IV* shows how Edward positioned his army, into three battles, and states that in front of his battles he placed his artillery. The artillery would normally have been placed at the front of the army, to be most effective. This could suggest that the artillery was manoeuvrable enough that they could be placed at the front of the army, used at the beginning of the battle and then either placed out of the way or moved past by the attacking army. The second and third reference from the *Arrivall of Edward* notes that the use of the artillery and of the archers allowed the vanguard of Edward IV to engage the enemy. This second reference states that the king had more archers and guns than the Lancastrians. This would be expected as Edward had just left London and would have been able to use the guns kept in the Tower, it is important that the Lancastrians, recently returned from France, still had a good amount of guns. As this shows that even a returning army would have brought with them a certain number of guns.

It is the third reference to guns that is the most important for this battle, the *Arrivall of Edward IV* states that the Duke of Somerset and his Lancastrian vanguard was in a good defensive position, but left this position after becoming disrupted by Edward's archers and guns. The importance of the guns in this source cannot be understated, as they were a decisive factor, forcing the Lancastrians to leave their strong defensive position and attack the Yorkist army. This arguably led to the Yorkist victory, which would have been much harder if the Yorkists had been attacking a strong defensive position. Just like at Barnet, there are no references that state the guns were being

²¹² *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 29

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 29

used during the battle, only at the beginning of the battle. However the guns at Tewkesbury were a decisive factor in luring the Lancastrians out of their strong defensive position, leading to their defeat. This source shows that the guns were becoming a decisive part of the army during this period, and at Tewkesbury had a crucial role.

'Nevertheless, he being well furnished with great artillerie, the same was aptlie lodged to annoy his enemies, that they reciveved great damage: and the duke of Gloucester, galled them greuouslic with the shot of arrows: and they rewarded their adversaries home againe with like payment, both with shot of arrows, and great artillerie, although they had not like the plenty of guns that the king had.

²¹⁴

*'The duke of Somerset perceived either moved therewith, or else because he was too sore annoied with the shot in that place where he and his fore-ward stood, like a knight more courageous than circumspect came out of his strength with his whole battell and advanced himself somewhat.'*²¹⁵

Holinshed has referenced the *Arrivall of Edward IV* and this is shown with his gun references. Holinshed again mentions how the Yorkists fired upon the Lancastrians, and they fired back. Holinshed does add his own detail, stating that the Lancastrians had a smaller number of artillery than the Yorkists did. This does seem plausible because Edward had access to the guns from the Tower and the Lancastrians consisted of an invading force and rebelling nobles, which may not have had access to large amounts of guns.²¹⁶ Holinshed, though writing a century later than the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, does emphasise the importance of this opening exchange of arrows and gunfire, this suggests the importance of this during the battle. Holinshed's second gun reference is also clearly influenced by the contemporary *Arrivall of Edward IV*, because he states that due to Somerset's annoyance of the shot he left his strength, his strong defensive position, to attack the Yorkists. This shows the power the artillery had during the opening exchanges of the battle.

The Battle of Tewkesbury, mainly due to the eyewitness account from the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, is one of the better documented battles of the Wars of the Roses.²¹⁷ The Lancastrian army had been positioned into a strong ground, in good array, making it difficult for Edward to attack them.²¹⁸ Edward wanting to defeat Margaret before any of her reinforcements entered the battle positioned his artillery and archers at the front of his vanguard to attempt to persuade the Lancastrians to leave

²¹⁴ Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland In Six Volumes*, 3, p. 319

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 319

²¹⁶ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.172

²¹⁷ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.377

²¹⁸ Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland In Six Volumes*, Vol 3 p. 319

their defensive position due to the firepower of his army.²¹⁹ This suggests that the positioning of the artillery was decisive in how effective the artillery could be as an offensive weapon. The Lancastrians returned the fire with their own ordinance but they had a limited amount and Edward was successful in provoking Somerset and the Lancastrians to attack them. After a long and fierce battle, Somerset was overwhelmed by Edward's superior force.²²⁰

Tewkesbury represents the importance that strong artillery was beginning to have on a battle. At Tewkesbury the Lancastrians had a good defensive position, but the *Arrivall of Edward IV* states the shots from Edward's ordinance was too much and this caused the Lancastrians to leave the safety of their position and was forced to attack Edward.²²¹ Tewkesbury is one of the few battles from the Wars of the Roses which suggest that Edward had to use his artillery otherwise he would have found it very difficult to defeat the defensive Lancastrians. Due to the eyewitness account of the *Arrivall of Edward IV* the role of the artillery, especially at Tewkesbury, can be shown to have played a large part in the outcome of the battle and this cannot be said for any of the previous battles of the Wars of the Roses.

5.7 The Battle of Bosworth, 22nd August 1485

The Battle of Bosworth was the first battle of the fifth and final section, and the fourteenth battle of the War of the Roses. Bosworth represents the end of Yorkist rule and the beginning of the Tudor dynasty, with Henry Tudor becoming Henry VII. Bosworth is known for the treachery of the Stanley's, as they decided to help Henry Tudor at the end of the battle, and for the courageous last charge of Richard III. The details of this battle remain unclear, mainly because the detailed version of the battle from Polydore Vergil was written twenty years after the battle. Guns are referenced in seven of seventeen sources that chronicle the battle. The source that details the use of guns are *Jean de Molinet*, *Philippe de Commines*, *Act of Attainder*, *Ballad of Bosworth*, *John Stow*, *Pittscottie's Chronicle* and *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*. The problem with these references is that except for Commines, Molinet and the Act of Attainder all of the other references come from late sixteenth century sources.

²¹⁹ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 28

²²⁰ P. Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History: Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III* (ed.) H Ellis (London, 1844)

²²¹ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 28

*'The king had the artillery of his army fire on the earl of Richmond, and so he French, knowing by the king's shot the lie of the land and the order of his battle, resolved, in order to avoid the fire, to mass their troops against the flank rather than the front of the king's battle.'*²²²

Molinet states that the French mercenaries used the fire from Richard's army to change their position to attack the flank of the army instead of the centre. Molinet suggests that the French mercenaries used the fire of Richard's guns in order to gauge the deployment of Richard's army, and then changed their position to attack the flank, to avoid the fire from Richard's army. The French mercenaries do seem to change their position in order to negate the effects of Richard's artillery; however this does not seem to be the primary reason to change position. Molinet suggests that the French mercenaries used the fire of Richard's artillery to understand how Richard had deployed his army, the mercenaries then moved in order to attack the flank rather than the centre of the army. The French mercenaries knew that Henry's army was outnumbered by Richard's; this change in position was intended to negate the greater size of Richard's army, rather than to evade the artillery. This source is proposing that the position of the artillery within Richard's army was very important for the mercenaries to understand the deployment of his army. However, one must question why Edward IV, at Barnet, did not change his battlefield position after learning the position of Warwick's army, due to the night firing. This would lead to the conclusion that the French, at Bosworth, were concerned about being outnumbered, where Edward, at Barnet, was not outnumbered and so had no need to change his position. Adversely, this source could suggest that Richard's artillery was powerful enough that the French mercenaries had to make a tactical decision to counteract the gunfire. This is the first example from the Wars of the Roses of an army changing their tactical position because of the opponent's guns. However, one must question the manoeuvrability of the artillery if a positional change could negate the effects of the fire. Not only is this seen to be a very important part of the battle, but it shows the importance and power that the guns were perceived to have had by the French mercenaries. Molinet also states that due to this move in position, the French gained mastery of the vanguard. This again shows how important this tactical decision was.²²³ This suggests a further development in the effectiveness of the gunpowder weapons.

*'Henry was given artillery by the king of France.'*²²⁴

²²² J. Molinet *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* (1474- 1506) M Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud 2008) p. 139

²²³ J. Molinet *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* (1474- 1506) Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* p. 139

²²⁴ *Phillippe de Commines, The Memoirs of Phillippe de Commines Lord of Argenton Vol 2* (ed.) H. G. Bohn (London, 1856) M. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud, 1985) p. 138

Though *Phillipe de Commines* only notes that the king of France gave Henry Tudor artillery before he left France for England, this does show the importance that was being placed on artillery, as Henry and his small invading contingent was given artillery to take with them. This could show that gunpowder weapons were an expected part of an army.

*'And they kept the same host in being, with banners displayed, strongly armed and equipped with all kinds of weapons, such as guns, bows, arrows, spears, glaives, axes and all other weaponry suitable or necessary for giving and advancing a mighty battle against our said sovereign lord.'*²²⁵

This quotation is from the *Act of Attainder*, within the Parliamentary Records. This reference was written soon after the Battle of Bosworth and details the events of the battle and the actions of Henry VII after the battle. The *Act of Attainder* is one of the few sources that list the different types of weapons that were used during the Battle of Bosworth. Though not detailing the use of the guns during the battle, both this and Commines show how entrenched guns had become when trying to construct a strong army. This reference states that these weapons were vital for a mighty battle. This reference does not just specify the importance of the guns, but of a variety of weapons at Bosworth.

*'The king commanded, with all haffe to set upon them, the terrible shot on both sides passed, the armies joined and came to handstrokes.'*²²⁶

Stow is noting that both sides were initially shooting at each other before coming to hand strokes, this would agree with the accepted version of the battle that suggests that the artillery and archers were used to provoke the other side into an attack. It was thought that Stow was referencing the use of archers here; but comparing this reference with his reference of guns at Barnet shows that they are written in the same manner, suggesting that Stow is detailing the use of guns at Bosworth. Stow was writing in the late sixteenth century, but Stow does seem to have a good understanding of how the battles were fought and it is clear that Stow used many of the contemporary sources from the Wars of the Roses.

*'Richard positioned his vanguard with his great artillery.'*²²⁷

Pittscottie Chronicle stated where the guns were being placed within the battle formations; this is often not included in the other gun references. This chronicle is noting that the guns were

²²⁵ *Act of Attainder 'Henry VII: November 1485: Part 1' Parliament* (ed.) C. Given- Wilson. *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=116563> [accessed: 29 May 2014]

²²⁶ Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England by John Stow* (ed) E. Howes p.469

²²⁷ *Pittscottie's Chronicles*. (ed.)M Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* p. 140

positioned with Richard's vanguard; however this contradicts the placement of the artillery in Molinet, as Molinet implies that the artillery was placed in the centre of Richard's army.²²⁸ This contradiction is important because the French mercenaries flanking manoeuvre moved out of the way of the artillery and allowed only the vanguards to engage with each other. *Pittscottie's Chronicle*, published in the 1570's, seems to have been mistaken about where the vanguard was positioned in Richard's army, due to being written at a later stage.²²⁹

'Archers let the arrows fly and shot guns both fell and far.

Seven score serpentines chained together ' like a blast of thunder'

*Harquebusters' pellets thoroughly did thring'*²³⁰

The *Ballad of Bosworth* represents one of two ballads that detail the use of guns during the Wars of the Roses. The Ballad states that the guns were being fired along with arrows during the battles, which would be expected during the battle. The Ballad continues to explain the type of guns that were being used, the arquebus and the serpentine, even stating that the serpentine sounds like thunder.²³¹ If this was a contemporary source this information would be invaluable, however because the Ballad of Bosworth was written in the late sixteenth century, it remains unclear where this information originates from. The ballads from the late sixteenth century consist from long standing oral traditions, and because of this must be handled with care.²³² However these sources are still useful as they represent the popular portrayals of the battle, which had been passed down through generations.

'And of the ordinance heere shall yee,

that had that day Richard our Kinge.

they had 7 scores Sarpentines without dout,

that locked & Chained vppon a row,

as many bombard that were stout;

like blasts of thunder they did blow.

10000 Morespikes, with all,

& harquebusyers, throwlye can thé thringe

²²⁸ Molinet *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* (1474- 1506) Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* p. 139

²²⁹ Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* p. 140

²³⁰ *The Ballad of Bosworth Field*. (ed.) M Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* p. 155

²³¹ *The Ballad of Bosworth Field*. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth*. 155

²³² Foard, and A. Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.21

*to make many a noble man to ffall
that was on Henry's part. our kinge.*²³³

This ballad comes from *Bishop Percy's Folio* and offers a great amount of information about the types of guns that were being used during the Battle of Bosworth. Similar to the *Ballad of Bosworth* the amount of detail that this ballad has is compelling and would seem realistic that one of these ballads would have used the other as a source. The ballad states that the Tudor army fired guns at Richard, which would certainly have happened, however the amount of detail about the weapons involved has to be taken with suspicion due to the manner of the long standing oral traditions.

To understand the references, one must understand the events from the Battle of Bosworth, as this will place the references into the context of the battle. Richard III arrayed his vanguard in one long line, which made his army look formidable.²³⁴ Richard stayed behind his army with a small contingent. Henry Tudor drew up a smaller army under the control of the earl of Oxford, with Henry staying with a small contingent behind the vanguard. Tudor's army had a contingent of one thousand Frenchman; who would prove to be invaluable.²³⁵ The firepower from Richard's guns concerned the French captains and they decided to change position to attack Richard's flank.²³⁶ This change in position, next to a marsh using it as a defensive structure, helped to defeat Richard's vanguard.²³⁷ Once Henry Tudor's and Oxford's vanguard advanced the battle began and after a hail of shots came the hand to hand combat.²³⁸ Oxford knowing that his army was outnumbered ordered his men to stay within ten feet of their standard bearer. This was an important decision as it positioned the army into a wedge shape, which was difficult for Richard's army to break down.²³⁹ As Tudor's army began to gain control over the field, Henry again decided to try to convince the Stanley's, who with their army stood on the side of the battle, to join his side.²⁴⁰ This prompted Richard to charge at Henry with a small contingent; Richard reached Henry and cut down his

²³³ *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript. Ballads and Romances*, ed. J.W. Hales and F.J. Furnivall, 3, (London, 1868), III, pp. 233-59. http://newr3.dreamhosters.com/?page_id=1928 [Accessed 14 June 2014]

²³⁴ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.384

²³⁵ Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History: Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III* p.223

²³⁶ Molinet, *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* p. 139

²³⁷ Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History: Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III* p.223

²³⁸ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.386

²³⁹ Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History: Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III* p.223

²⁴⁰ *Continuations of the Crowland Chronicle* (1492) (ed.)H. T. Riley (London 1893) p.503

standard bearer and his bodyguard before being cut down by the incoming Stanley force.²⁴¹ The entering Stanley force overwhelmed the remaining Yorkist army and Tudor was victorious. Henry Tudor was helped by the inactivity of Earl of Northumberland and his army, the reason why Northumberland did not enter the battle to help Richard is difficult to know, but this decreased the size of Richard's army during the battle.²⁴²

Bosworth represents a difficult challenge when trying to investigate the gun references for the battle, because the only evidence from a contemporary source that states that guns were being used is from Molinet. Molinet is a foreign source but does make assertions from reliable information. The English sources fail to mention the use of guns during the battle, until the late sixteenth century English sources. The sources that the sixteenth century sources use is often unknown, causing problems when analysing the life for example, the two ballads make wild assertions about the type of guns that were being used, but this information cannot be verified by any contemporary source. The other later sixteenth century source such as Stow and *Pittscottie's Chronicle* both offer simple references to how the guns were being used and this is all that they could do. Whether Stow and Pittscottie are meaningful contributions for Bosworth is contentious; however with the exception of the position of the vanguard in *Pittscottie's Chronicle*, the sources do not add much more than the reliable Molinet source, and so can be seen as a valuable but limited sixteenth century sources. The gun references from the Battle of Bosworth suggest that the use of the artillery is very similar to that of the earlier Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury, being used during the initial stages of the battle; however the gun references for Bosworth could suggest that the effectiveness of the artillery had developed during this time. This would agree with the hypothesis which states that the use of gunpowder weapons would develop and change in use during the Wars of the Roses.

²⁴¹ Foard, and Curry, *Bosworth 1485, A Battlefield Rediscovered* p.192

²⁴² Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.387

6. Did the use of gunpowder weapons develop during the Wars of the Roses?

The hypothesis states that the use of gunpowder weapons would develop and change in use during the course of the Wars of the Roses, this investigation has analysed the primary source evidence of gun use to test this hypothesis. Having analysed all of the primary source gun references individually, this investigation will now compare these references from the entire period to see if there is a development in the use of gunpowder weaponry. This section will examine whether a development did occur in the use of guns and question why this change may have happened. The investigation has shown that it is important to separate artillery from handguns when analysing the gun references, because these weapons were being used and developed in different ways during this period and will continue to separate these references in this section. Through the analysis of each artillery and handgun reference this section will determine the validity of the hypothesis and decide whether there is a development in the use of gunpowder weaponry during the Wars of the Roses.

6.1 Artillery

The references that detail how artillery was being used do change as the wars progress. The Rout of Ludford Bridge and the Battle of Northampton and the Second Battle of St Albans are all referenced to have used the artillery within defensive positions and structures. For example, at Northampton the Lancastrians placed their artillery at the front of a defensive formation.²⁴³ This need for a strong defensive position is a consistent at all of these events, and the references show that each of these armies had artillery within this position. This tactic is used by both the Lancastrians and the Yorkists, because at Ludford Bridge and Northampton, the Yorkists used the

²⁴³ Haigh, *The Military Campaigns of the Wars of the Roses* p. 24

defensive position and at the Second St Albans, the Yorkists, under the leadership of the Earl of Warwick, created the defensive position with artillery.²⁴⁴ These references suggest that the favoured use of artillery during the initial stages of the wars was within a strong defensive position. The need for a strong defensive position may have been because the artillery at this time was difficult to manoeuvre.²⁴⁵ This difficulty was stated by Gregory at the Second Battle of St Albans, because as the Lancastrians attacked from a different direction, the Yorkists found both their artillery and handguns difficult to redeploy quickly enough to stop the Lancastrian attack. This resulted in the Yorkists throwing down their guns and fighting with handstrokes.²⁴⁶ This perceived difficulty to manoeuvre the artillery was likely to have resulted in the way that the artillery was being used during the second section of the Wars of the Roses. However, this does not mean that the artillery was only being used within a defensive structure. Gregory's statement that the noise from the guns at Northampton brought Sir William Lucy to the battlefield could support the argument that it was the attacking Yorkists that was firing the guns and not the Lancastrians. This claim would suggest that the chronicles had just failed to mention the Yorkist guns, but would support the chronicle references that the Lancastrian guns were ineffectual.

The use of artillery does change from the second section to the fourth section, and this change represents a difference in approach towards the use of artillery. The Battles of Empingham, Barnet and Tewkesbury all use artillery differently to the battles from the section before, but also use the artillery differently from each other. At the Battle of Barnet, Warwick fires his artillery before the battle started in order to unsettle his opponents, or to provoke an attack.²⁴⁷ This shows the change in Warwick's approach to using his artillery, as he used the artillery within his defensive structure at the Second Battle of St Albans but then a decade later uses his artillery as an attacking, or provoking weapon. This change could be because of technological advancements that occurred in those ten years, or could have been because the Earl of Warwick at Barnet had access to a large amount of artillery which could have changed his battle strategy.²⁴⁸ This change in approach towards the use of guns can be seen by how Edward IV used his artillery during the Battles of Empingham and Tewkesbury. At Empingham and Tewkesbury, Edward used his artillery as an offensive weapon against a defensively positioned army. Edward tried to provoke these defensive armies into leaving

²⁴⁴ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.373

²⁴⁵ Hammond, *Richard III and the Bosworth Campaign* p. 84

²⁴⁶ *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

²⁴⁷ Warkworth, *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth.* p. 14 - 16

²⁴⁸ Strickland and Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.377

their protected position and attacking.²⁴⁹ Both the *Arrivall of Edward IV* and *Warkworth's Chronicle* state that Edward used his artillery in this way at these battles. These sources were both written close to the time of these battles, and the *Arrivall of Edward IV* was written by an eyewitness of the battle, which makes these sources to be considered reliable.²⁵⁰ This is the first documented account of how Edward used his artillery during the Wars of the Roses, and states that Edward used his artillery as an offensive weapon. The way that Edward used his artillery changes the perceptions of how manoeuvrable artillery was during this period. Edward, at both Empingham and Tewksbury, was trying to reach his opponents quickly in order to defeat them before the Lancastrians could gain reinforcements.²⁵¹ This completely contradicts Gravett's opinion of artillery during this period, for being too slow for Edward's quick offensive attacks.²⁵² Edward, stated in the *Arrivall of Edward IV*, arrives at Tewkesbury with a good array of artillery, even after moving quickly.²⁵³ This shows that Edward was able to quickly move to the battle and his large amount of artillery proved to be no hindrance in this. This could also be because of the change of commanders during the course of the Wars of the Roses. Edward IV was known as a brave military leader and the offensive use of his artillery supports this opinion of him.²⁵⁴ The source evidence of an offensive use of artillery could be because of how Edward used the weapons, rather than technological advancements.

The change in how artillery was being used from the second section to the fourth section of the battles is a very important change, because through the fourth section artillery had been used in a variety of ways. Artillery was being used before the battles to unsettle the opponents and at the beginning of the battle to provoke a defensive opponent into an attack.²⁵⁵ This change is significant because artillery was becoming a multi-functional part of an army's weaponry rather than being limited to being used within a defensive formation, which was being stated from the battles of section two. The largest change from the second section of battles to this fourth section is how Edward had his artillery within his army even when he is trying to quickly attack his opponents. This change in speed is a very important development from the second to the fourth section of the wars.

²⁴⁹ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*.p. 14
Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI p. 28

²⁵⁰ Given- Wilson, *Chronicles The Writing of History in Medieval England* p.206

²⁵¹ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society 1452 - 97* p.82

²⁵² Gravett. *Tewkesbury 1471, The Last Yorkist Victory* p.28

²⁵³ *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* p. 28

²⁵⁴ C. Ross, *Edward IV* (Berkeley 1974) p.37

²⁵⁵ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*.p. 14 – 16
Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI p. 28

The final battle to reference the use of artillery was the Battle of Bosworth; this battle not only had the most references of artillery being used, but also has an important account of how the artillery was used during the battle. Stow, writing in the late sixteenth century, states that both sides fired their guns at each other at the start of the battle, and this is what would be expected at the start of the battle, as occurred at Barnet.²⁵⁶ However, the most important reference comes from Molinet, who states that the French mercenaries within Henry Tudor's army changed their position on the battlefield in order to nullify the power of Richard III's artillery.²⁵⁷ This is a very important statement from Molinet, as it is the first time that an army had been shown to have changed position in order to counteract the opponent's artillery. Molinet could have specified that the French mercenaries were the ones to instigate this approach, because the French were technologically advanced and placed more emphasis on the importance of artillery during this period and so this change of position because of Richard's artillery may have been an accepted part of French warfare.²⁵⁸ This shows that the artillery was becoming a more important weapon during this period, even needing to be prepared for. However, it is the next statement that Molinet makes that is most important,

*After changing position, thus they obtained mastery of the field.*²⁵⁹

This states that by nullifying the opponent's artillery fire, Henry Tudor's vanguard obtained mastery of the field. This is the first time that an opponent changed position, because of the opponent's artillery, but also that this move was decisive for that battle. The decision from the French to change position may not have been because of the fear of Richard's artillery; the French may have used the position of Richard's artillery to gauge the position of the Yorkist army on the battlefield and changed position to attack a different, possibly weaker section of his army. The way that the artillery was being used does not change from the fourth section to the fifth section of the Wars of the Roses, as they were both using the artillery before the battle and during the battle. However, the change between the two sections is that the artillery was becoming more important within the English armies that new tactical approaches had to be created in order to contend with this new important weapon.

The problem that this investigation has found is that many of the battles have no information about artillery being used, even though archaeological evidence at the Battle of Towton

²⁵⁶ Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England* by John Stow p.786

²⁵⁷ Molinet *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* 138

²⁵⁸ Strickland and R. Hardy, *From Hastings to the Mary Rose The Great Warbow* p.361

²⁵⁹ Molinet *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* p. 138

suggests otherwise.²⁶⁰ Historians, such as Twemlow, state that artillery would have been used at Blore Heath, even though no primary source evidence has been found to agree with this.²⁶¹ Appendix 1 shows that nine of the battles of the Wars of the Roses do not have any evidence of artillery being used; however this research is not suggesting that artillery was not used at these battles, but just that they are not documented to have used artillery. The last battle of the Wars of the Roses, the battle of Stoke in 1487, does not have any documented evidence for the use of artillery. This is very strange as the evidence shows how the use of guns was commonplace at the time. This could be because of the arguments of writers only mentioned the use of guns when they were an important part of a battle, which suggests that at Stoke they were not. This study is not focusing on whether artillery was being used at every battle of the Wars of the Roses; this investigation is focusing on whether the source evidence shows a developing importance of how the artillery was used during this period. Analysis into the references show that the role of artillery changes, and that a greater emphasis can be placed on artillery culminating in the tactical change undertaken by the French mercenaries at Bosworth. This section would agree with the hypothesis that the use of artillery did develop and change in use during the Wars of the Roses.

6.2 Handguns

Handguns are only referenced to have been used at two battles during the Wars of the Roses, the Second Battle of St Albans and at Barnet. At St Albans, *Gregory's Chronicle* states that the Burgundian handgunners fought in the battle, at Barnet Edward IV has three hundred Flemish handgunners within his army. The primary references of handguns being used during these battles state that the handguns were used by foreign mercenaries. At the Second Battle of St Albans Warwick allows the handgunners to be placed within his defensive position, Gregory even specifies that the handgunners stood behind defensive pavises.²⁶² This reference shows how handguns were being used in the same way as artillery during this stage, within a defensive position.²⁶³ Gregory notes that the handguns became useless when they had to be redeployed due to the Lancastrian attack coming from a different position. Gregory's disdain for the handguns at St Albans agrees with the traditional opinion of guns at this time, which was that they were useful but slow moving weapons.²⁶⁴ This changes ten years later in 1471, as Edward IV returns from exile with a small contingent of just over a thousand men and three hundred of them are Flemish handgunners.²⁶⁵ This

²⁶⁰ Hardy, *Towton Battlefield Society Archaeology*

²⁶¹ Twemlow, *The Battle of Blore Heath, The First Major Battle of the Wars of the Roses* p.51

²⁶² *Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

²⁶³ Mclachlan, *Medieval Handgonnes, The First Black Powder Infantry Weapon* p. 45

²⁶⁴ Gravett. *Tewkesbury 1471, The Last Yorkist Victory* p.28

²⁶⁵ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* p. 12

shows how much importance Edward placed on these mercenaries with handguns because over a quarter of his force returning from Burgundy was of the handgun specialists. Edward would later again use these Flemish handgunners at the Battle of Barnet.

There is no evidence of English soldiers using handguns during the Wars of the Roses. It has been assumed that the English had a mistrust of the handguns, possibly due to the national appeal of the longbow²⁶⁶ or due to the high cost to manufacture handguns in the later fifteenth century.²⁶⁷ Even though handguns was not stated within the primary sources as being used by the English soldiers, Grummitt states that handguns was used by the English soldiers, but are not mentioned, like the probable use of artillery at other battles, such as Towton and Stoke, that has not been mentioned.²⁶⁸ Grummitt argues that because the English Calais Garrison used handguns then it would be sensible to assume that the English would be using them as well.²⁶⁹ This argument has been difficult to disprove, due to the lack of primary evidence which states the use of handguns on the battlefield. However, this investigation has analysed the *Coventry Leet Book*, this source is from Edward IV's preparation for the Battle of Edgecote in 1469.

*'Letter from the king, for suppressing these rotten rebels send unto 100 archers well and defensible arrayed.'*²⁷⁰

'Arms delivered to the captains. Rob Onley, A Serpentine with the chamber for the new- yate & a honed gun with a pike in the end and a fowler. Item delivered to Jon Handley 1 staff gun.

Will Saunders 2 staff guns and a great gun with 3 chambers. 3 jacks and 24 arrows.

*John Wylgrys 1 gun with 3 chambers.*²⁷¹

The *Coventry Leet Book* is stating that Edward IV asked the city of Coventry for one hundred archers to fight with him at the Battle of Edgecote.²⁷² The account then states that the city of Coventry used its own supply of handguns and gave them to members of the city, in defence of the city. The information from the *Coventry Leet Book* suggests that Edward could have asked for the

²⁶⁶ Gunn, *Archery Practice in Early Tudor England, Past and Present*, 209, p. 53- 81

²⁶⁷ D. Nicolle, *European Medieval Tactics, New Infantry, New Weapons 1260 – 1500* (Oxford 2012) p.45

²⁶⁸ D. Grummitt, *The Defence of Calais and the Development of Gunpowder Weaponry in the Late Fifteenth Century, War in History*, 7, (2000) p. 253- 272

²⁶⁹ Grummitt, *The Defence of Calais and the Development of Gunpowder Weaponry in the Late Fifteenth Century, War in History*, 7, p. 253- 272

²⁷⁰ *Coventry Leet Book or Mayor's Register Part 1* (ed) M D Harris (London, 1907) p. 341

²⁷¹ *Coventry Leet Book or Mayor's Register Part 1* Harris p. 345

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 345

handguns at Coventry, but only asks for the archers. This source suggests that the English had the facilities and had the handguns available to be used on the battlefield, but Edward chose not to use them in favour of archers. This is the only evidence of English handguns being available around the time of a battle of the Wars of the Roses and this source is stating that they were not used. The evidence from the *Coventry Leet Book* agrees with Grummitt because the English did have the ability to use handguns on the battlefield. However, Grummitt argues that English handguns were used but not mentioned, where the *Coventry Leet Book* states that handguns were available but not wanted in favour of archers by Edward IV. Edward's favourable use of artillery suggests that he was an advocate of guns; this makes his favour of archers over handguns even more important.²⁷³ Therefore the only reference to English handguns is that they were used in protection of the city instead of being used on the battlefield. From this evidence, one can suggest that handguns were available in England, but were used in defence of towns and cities rather than on the battlefield.

6.3 Conclusion

This investigation has shown that it was important to analyse artillery and handguns separately, because the results have been different. The use of artillery developed during the Wars of the Roses from being used within a defensive structure during the early battles such as Northampton, 1460, to being used in an offensive way at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485. The developing importance of artillery does seem to occur with technological advancements of the late fifteenth century.²⁷⁴ These advancements led to artillery, which was already in fifteenth century armies, being used in a more prevalent role. The decision from the commanders to use the artillery as a more offensive weapon shows the greater importance being placed on the use of artillery during the later battles. The development of artillery during the Wars of the Roses would agree with the hypothesis, which states that the role of gunpowder weapons developed during this period.

Handguns do not seem to be as important within these armies as artillery. Handguns are only referenced as being used by foreign mercenaries during the Wars of the Roses. At the Second Battle of St Albans and Barnet, these skilled handgunners were an anomaly and focus seems to be on the use of artillery. The evidence from the *Coventry Leet Book* shows that Edward, before the Battle of Edgecote in 1469, asked for archers from Coventry, even though handguns were available. However, the amount of foreign handgunners that Edward brought back with him from Burgundy in 1471, a quarter of his force, shows the importance that Edward placed on the weapon. I would suggest that the experienced and trained Flemish mercenaries were seen as a reliable regiment for

²⁷³ Grummitt, *The Calais Garrison, War and Military Service in England 1436 – 1558* p. 124

²⁷⁴ Keen, *Medieval Warfare A History* p.277

Edward, where a possible untrained and inexperienced English handgunner from Coventry may have been a risk for Edward at Edgecote.

This investigation has tested the hypothesis that the use of gunpowder weapons would develop and change in use during the Wars of the Roses. This investigation was testing whether there was a development and that a greater importance can be placed on the use of artillery and handguns as the Wars of the Roses progressed. This study has shown how the use of artillery changed, from being represented as defensive weapons, in the battles from section two, to an offensive weapon, in the later battles from sections four and five. The problem that this investigation has found is that early evidence of artillery detail the use within a defensive position; but Gregory's reference from the Battle of Northampton in 1460 suggests that the artillery could have been used by the attacking Yorkists. There will always be a problem with how the primary sources represented the use of guns during this period, often omitting important details; however this investigation has attempted to use all of the primary sources to place a greater importance on the use of artillery during the Wars of the Roses, which has been successful.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to re-examine the development of gunpowder weaponry during the Wars of the Roses. This investigation has analysed the traditional historiography of the development and importance of gunpowder weapons and compared it to the evidence from the primary sources. The importance of this study is that it is the first to examine the primary sources for every battle from this period in relation to each other, not just in relation to individual battles. Comparing each battle's gun references has allowed this investigation to determine whether there is a development in the use of guns during the course of the battles. . The hypothesis tested during this investigation was that the gun references would become more concentrated towards the later battles of the Wars of the Roses, placing a greater emphasis on their use and if this occurred then this would correlate with the archaeological finds at Bosworth. The first problem was that the table in Appendix 1 maintained a consistent number of gun references through the chronology of the battles of this period. This disagreed with the hypothesis which stated that the gun references would become more concentrated towards the later stages of the war. However, the examination did suggest that

'The role of the gunpowder weapons developed and changed through the battles of the Wars of the Roses indicating changes in the usage of guns over time.'

this investigation would then test this new hypothesis which placed a greater importance on the detail from each gun references from the primary sources.

Between the Rout of Ludford Bridge, 1459, and the Battle of Bosworth, 1485, there were changes in how guns were used during the rout and battles. The early engagements of Ludford Bridge, Northampton and Second St Albans suggest that the artillery was being used within a

defensive position by both the Lancastrians and the Yorkists. The representation of guns at these early battles is of a problematic weapon, with both Northampton and second St Albans referencing the difficulties of using guns. The effectiveness of the weapons cannot be estimated from these battles, but what is evident is that their portrayal in these early battles is often negative; especially Gregory's detailed account of the Yorkist problems with both their artillery and handguns at the Second Battle of St Albans, 1461.²⁷⁵ The portrayal of the defensive and problematic gunpowder weapon changes with the Battle of Empingham, 1470, Barnet and Tewkesbury, both in 1471. These battles, though referencing the use of artillery and handguns differently, do not have the negativity of the previous battles. The most important references are from the *Warkworth's Chronicle* and *Arrivall of Edward IV* from the Battles of Empingham and Tewkesbury respectively, these references state that Edward IV used his guns in order to coax the Lancastrians out of their defensive position.²⁷⁶ This suggests that Edward was using his artillery as an offensive weapon to force his opponents from their defensive positions; these sources suggest that Edward's artillery was powerful enough to encourage his opponents to change their tactical position. The change in perception of gunpowder weaponry is found at the last battle to detail the use of guns, Bosworth in 1485. The Bosworth gun references state that the foreign mercenaries within Henry Tudor's army changed their position after learning the placement of Richard III's artillery, and this allowed them to gain mastery of the vanguard.²⁷⁷ This suggests that the position of Richard's artillery allowed Henry's foreign mercenaries to decide to attack a different section of the Yorkist army, allowing Tudor to gain victory. The hypothesis states that the role of the gunpowder weapons would change and develop over the period. These primary source references suggest that the role of the artillery did change through the Wars of the Roses; however the same cannot be said for the development of the handguns from this period. The primary sources show that handguns were used during the Second Battle of St Albans, 1461, and Barnet, 1471, but only by foreign mercenaries. The evidence from the *Coventry Leet Book* for the Battle of Edgecote, 1469, suggests that English handguns were available, but were only used for urban defences. The handgun evidence shows that the hypothesis does not hold because they were only referenced as being used by foreign mercenaries during this period.

This study was attempting to understand whether the archaeological finds from the recently discovered battle of Bosworth site were just an anomaly, or if they represented the culmination of the developing role of gunpowder weapons during the Wars of the Roses. The hypothesis was

²⁷⁵ Gregory's *Chronicle: 1451- 1460'*, *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* pp. 196- 210,

²⁷⁶ Warkworth. *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth*. p. 8 *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recoverye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* ed. J. Bruce p. 18

²⁷⁷ Molinet, *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* p. 139

created to test this theory, using the primary sources comparatively for the entire period. The study has shown that the portrayal of artillery becomes more positive, this may be the result of the guns becoming more reliable and manoeuvrable, which allowed the military leaders to use them in an offensive way. This could also be symbolic of the change of importance that was being placed on these weapons. This study's analysis of the primary sources has shown how the use of gunpowder weapons was changing during the later stages of the Wars of the Roses; however this investigation could not conclusively say that more guns were being used in the later battles. To further this research of the primary sources new archaeological excavations must be undertaken at the battlesites of Empingham, Barnet and Tewkesbury. These archaeological excavations could offer more information about the amount of gunpowder weaponry being used during these later battles not found in the primary sources.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Refer to the A3 document called, Gun references within the primary sources and Appendix 1.

Appendix 2

Timeline of events from the Wars of the Roses

1422- 31st August, Henry VI becomes King of England

1453- August, Henry VI's mental breakdown

1454 – April, Duke of Yorks becomes Protector

1455- February, Duke of York's Protectorate ends

22nd May, Yorkist Victory at the First Battle of St Albans

1459- 23rd September- Yorkist victory at the Battle of Blore Heath

12th October- Lancastrians rout at the Rout of Ludford Bridge

1460- 10th July- Yorkist victory at the Battle of Northampton

30th December- Lancastrian victory at the Battle of Wakefield, The Duke of York is slain.

1461- 2nd February- The Yorkist victory at the Battle of Mortimer's Cross

17th February- Lancastrian victory at the Second Battle of St Albans

20th March- The Battle of Towton- Edward VI named as King of England

1464- 25th April- Yorkist victory at The Battle of Hedgeley Moor

15th May- The Yorkist victory at the Battle of Hexham

1469- 26th July- The Yorkist victory at the Battle of Edgecote

1470 – 12th March The Battle of Empingham. Edward IV flees to Burgundy.

Henry VI crowned King, with the help of the Earl of Warwick and Duke of Clarence.

1471- Edward IV returns from exile.

14th April – The Battle of Barnet- the Earl of Warwick is slain as the Lancastrians are defeated.

4th May- The Battle of Tewkesbury- Yorkist victory as Prince Edward is slain.

Edward IV return as the King and Henry VI is murdered.

1483- Edward IV dies and Edward V named as king

Richard, Duke of Gloucester, named as king and Edward V locked in the Tower of London

1485- Henry Tudor returns from exile in France.

22nd August- Lancastrian victory at the Battle of Bosworth, Richard III is slain.

Henry Tudor becomes Henry VII

1486- Henry VII married Elizabeth of York.

1487- 16th June- The Lancastrian victory at the Battle of Stoke

Appendix 3

This section will have the full battle reference from each primary source that includes the use of gunpowder weapons.

2.1 Ludford Bridge, 12th October 1459

Gregory Chronicle '*Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460*', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (1876) (ed.) J. Gairdner Camden Society pp. 196- 210, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45559> [Date accessed 01 June 2014]

Ande thys same yere there was a grete afray at Lodlowe by twyne the kynge and the Duke of Yorke, the Erle of Salusbury, the Erle of Warwyke, the Erle of Marche. The Duke of Yorke lete make a grete depe dyche and fortifyde it with gonnys, cartys, and stakys, but hys party was ovyr weke, for the kyng was mo thenn xxx M'of harneysyd men, by-syde nakyd men that were compellyd for to come with the kynge. And thenne the duke fledde fro place to place in Walys, and breke downe the bryggys aftyr hym that the kyngys mayny schulde not come aftyr hym. And he wente unto Irlonde.

2.2 Northampton, 10th July 1460

1. Gregory Chronicle '*Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460*', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (1876) (ed.) J. Gairdner Camden Society pp. 196- 210, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45559> [Date accessed 01 June 2014]

The Duchyes of Yorke was take to the Duke Bokyngham and to hys lady, for they two ben susters, and there she was tulle the fylde was done at Northehampton, and she was kept fulle strayte and many a grete rebuke. Alle soo thes for sayde lordys come agayne unto Sondewyche the xxj day of June nexte folowyng. And the comyns of Kente and there welle-wyllers brought hem to Lundon, and so forthe to Northehampton. And there they mete with the kynge and foughte manly with the kyngys lordys and mayny, but there was moche favyr in that fylde unto the Erle of Warwycke. And there they toke the kynge, and made newe offycers of the londe, as the chaunceler and tresyrrar and

othyr, but they occupyde not fo[r]the-with, but a-bode a seson of the comyng of Duke of York owte of Irlonde. And in that fylde was slayne the Duke of Bokyngham, stondyng styлле at hys tente, the Erle of Schrovysbury, the Lord Bemond, and the Lord Egremond, with many othyr men. Ande many men were drownyd by syde the fylde in the revyr at a mylle. And that goode knyght Syr Wylliam Lucy that dwellyd be-syde Northehampton hyrde the gone schotte, and come unto the fylde to have holpyn [t]e kynge, but the fylde was done or that he come; an one of the Staffordys was ware of hys comyng, and lovyd that knyght ys wyffe and hatyd hym, and a-non causyd hys dethe.

2. An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V and Henry VI written before the year 1471 (ed.) J. Silvestre Davies (London, 1855) p. 97

The erles with the nombre of ix. M 1 ., as it was sayd, came to Northampton, and sent certayne bysshops to the kyng besechyng hym that in eschewyng of effusyone of Crysten blood he wolde admytte and suffre the erles for to come to his presence to declare thaym self as thay were. The duk of Bukynghame that stode besyde the kyng, sayde vn to thaym, " Ye come nat as bysshoppes for to trete for pease, but as men of armes ;" because they broughte with thaym a notable company of men of armes. They answered and sayde, " We come thus for suerte of oure persones, for they that bethe aboute the kyng by the nat oure frendes." " Forsothe," sayde the duk, "the erle of Warrewyk shalle nat come to the kynges presence, and yef he come he shalle dye." The messyngers returned agayne, and tolde thys to the erles.

Thanne the erle of Warrewyk sent an herowde of armes to the kyngj besechyng that he myghte haue ostages of saaf goyng and commyng, and he wolde come naked to his presence, but he myghte nat be herde. And the iij de tyme he sente to the kyng arid sayde Thanne on the Thursday the x th day of Juylle, the yere of oure The batayie of Lorde IVP.cccc.lx, at ij howres after none, the sayde erles of Marche and Warrewyk lete crye thorough the felde, that no man shuld laye hand vppone the kyng ne on the commune peple, but onely on the lordes, knyghtes and squyers: thenne the trumpettes blew vp, and bothe hostes countred and faughte togedre half an oure. The lorde Gray, that was the kynges vawewarde, brake the feelde and came to the erles party, whyche caused sauacione of many a mannys lyfe : many were slayne, and many were fled, and were drowned in the ryuer. The duk of Bukyngham, the erle of Shrouesbury, the lorde Beaumont, the lorde Egremount were slayne by the Kentyssshmen besyde the kynges tent, and meny other knyghtes and squyers. The ordenaunce of the kynges gones avayled nat, for that day was so grete rayne, that the gones lay

depe in the water, and so were queynt and myghte nat be shott. Whanne the feld was do, and the erles thoronghe mercy and helpe had the vycory, they came to the kyng in his tent, and sayde in thys wyse

3. J. Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England by John Stow* (ed.) E. Howes (London 1631) p. 678

The tenth day of July at two of the clock afternoon, the earles of March and Warwicke let crie through the field, that no man should lay hand upon the king, ne on the common people, but on the Lords, knights and esquires: then both hosts incountered and fought halfe an hour, the Lord Edmond Grey of Ruthen that was the kings vanward brake the field and came to the earles party, and was a great helpe in helping them obtain victory: many on the kings side were slaine, and many that fled were drowned in the river, the Duke of Buckingham, Earl of Shrewsbury, the Lord Beaumont, and the Lord Egremont were slain by the kings tent, with many knights and esquires: the kings ordnance might not be shot, there was greate rain that day.

2.3 Second Battle of St Albans, 17th February 1461

1. Gregory Chronicle '*Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460*', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (1876) (ed.) J. Gairdner Camden Society pp. 196- 210, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45559> [Date accessed 01 June 2014]

Ande the xvij day nexte folowyng Kyng Harry roode to Synt Albons, and the Duke of Northeholke with hym, the Erle of Warwycke, the Erle of Arundelle, the Lorde Bouser, the Lorde Bonvyle, with many grete lordys, knyghtys, and squyers, and commyns of an C M^lmen. And there they hadde a grete batayle whythe the Quene, for she come ever on fro the jornaye of Wackefylde tulle sche come to Synt Albons, with alle the lordys a fore sayde; and hyr mayny and every lorde ys men bare hyr lordys leverey, that every man myghte knowe hys owne feleschippe by hys lyverey. And be-syde alle that, every man and lorde bare the Pryncys levery, that was a bende of crymesyn and blacke with esteryge ys fetherys. The substance that gate that fylde were howseholde men and feyd men. I wene there were not v M^lmen that fought in the Quenys party, for [t]^emoste parte of Northeryn men fledde a-way, and sum were take and spoyld owte of hyr harnysse by the way as they fledde. And sum of them robbyd evyr as they yede, a petyffulle thyng hit ys to hyre hit. But the day before that batayle there was a jornay at Dunstapyl; but the kyngys mayny lackyd good gydyng, for sum were but newe men of warre, for the chevyste captayne was a boucher of the same towne; and there were the kyngys mayny ovyr throughe only by the Northeryn men. And sone aftyr the bocher, for

schame of hys sympylle gydyng and loste of the men, the nombyr of viij C, for very sorowe as hyt ys sayde, hynges hym selfe; and sum men sayde that hyt was for loste of hys goode, but dede he ys— God knowythe the trowth.

And in the myddys of the batayle Kyng Harry wente unto hys Quene and for-soke alle hys lordys, ande truste better to hyr party thenne unto hys owne lordys. And thenn thoroughe grete labur the Duke of Northefolke and the Erle of Warwycke a schapyd a-waye; the Byschoppe of Exceter, that tyme Chaunceler of Ingelond, and brother unto the Erle of Warwycke, the Lorde Bouser, whythe many othyr knyghtys, squyers, and comyns fledde, and many men slayne in bothe partys. And the Lorde Bonevyle was be-heddyd, the comyn sayyngge that hys longage causyd hym to dye. The Prynce was jugge ys owne sylfe. Ande ther was slayne that manly knyght Syr Thomas Keryel. The number of ded men was xxxv C an moo [t]at were slayne. The lordys in Kyng Harrys party pycchyd a fylde and fortifyd hyt fulle stronge, and lyke unwyse men brake hyr raye and fyld and toke a-nothyr, and or that they were alle sette a buskyd to batayle, the Quenys parte was at hond whythe hem in towne of Synt Albony, and then alle [t]yng was to seke and owte of ordyr, for hyr pryckyrs come not home to bryng no tydyng howe ny that the Quene was, save one come and sayd that she was ix myle of. And ar the goners and borgeners couthe levylle hyr gonnys they were besely fyghtyng, and many a gynne of wer was ordaynyd that stode in lytylle a-vayle or nought; for the burgeners hadde suche instrumentys that wolde schute bothe pelletys of ledde and arowys of an elle of lengthe with vj fetherys, iij in myddys and iij at the othyr ende, with a grete myghty hedde of yryn at the othyr ende, and wylde fyre with alle. Alle thes iij thyngys they myght schute welle and esely at onys, but in tyme of nede they couthe not schute not one of thes, but the fyre turnyd backe a-pon them that wold schute thys iij thyngys. Also they hadde nettys made of grete cordys of iiij fethem of lengthe and of iiij fote brode, lyke unto an haye, and at every ij knott there was an nayl stondyng uppe ryght, that there couthe no man passe ovyr hyt by lykely hode but he shulde be hurte. Alle so they hadde pavysse bore as a dore i-made with a staffe foldyngge uppe and downe to sette the pavys where the lykyd, and loupys with schyttyng wyndowys to schute owte at, they stondyng by hynde [t]^e pavys, and the pavys as fulle of iij^dnayle aftyr ordyr as they myght stonde. And whenn hyr schotte was spende and done they caste the pavysse by-fore hem, thenn there myght noo man come unto them ovyr the pavysse for the naylys that stode up-ryghte, but yf he wolde myschyffe hym sylfe. Alle so they hadde a thyngge made lyke unto a latisse fulle of naylys as the net was, but hit wolde be mevyd as a man wolde; a man myght bryse hyt to-gedyr that the lengythe wolde be more then ij yerdys long, and yf he wolde he myght hale hyt a brode, thenn hit wolde be iiij square. And that servyd to lye at gappys there at horsemen wolde entyr yn, and many a caltrappe. And as the substaunce of men of worschyppe that wylle not glose nor cory favyl for no parcyallyte, they cowthe not

undyrstond that alle thys ordenaunce dyd any goode or harme but yf hyt were a mong us in owre parte with Kyng Harry. There fore hyt ys moche lefte, and men take hem to mallys of ledde, bowys, swyrdys, gleyvys, and axys. As for speremen they ben good to ryde be-fore the foote men and ete and drynke uppe hyr vetayle, and many moo suche prety thyngys they doo, holde me excusyd though I say the beste, for in the fote men ys alle the tryste.

2. *A Short English Chronicle* (ed.) J. Gairdner, *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles* (1880) p. 76

And a none after the quene reysed all the northe and all opper pepull by the wey, compelled, dispoyled, rubbed, and distroyed all maner of cattell, vetayll, and riches to Seint Albones, where p^e Duke of Northefolke, the Erle of Warwyke, and many þ er lordis with Kynge Harrye and grete multitude of comynes and ordynaunce mett with hem with batayle, and slewe myche pepull on bothe the parties. And there Kynge Henry brake his othe and gremment made be twene hym and his trewe lordis, and so wyckedly for sworne went to the contrary parte of the northe, and disseyed his trewe lordis that stode in grete jopardy for his sake, Northeffolke, Warwyke, with other moo, whiche were full fayne to scape with her lyves, and the Lorde Bonvyle and Sir Thomas Kyrrell, that bode with the kynge and trusted on him, for he graunted to save them; and they were be hedid evyn a for the quene and prince so called at that tyme.

2.4 The Battle of Empingham, 12th March 1470

1. *John Warkworth, Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* (ed.) J. O. Halliwell (London, 1839) p. 8

And whenne the Kynge was sure of hym, he and alle his oste went towarde Lyncolneschyre, the Lord Welles, and alle the othere peple were gaderd togedcre, and commawndede Lorde Wyllowby to sende a lettere to hys sonne and to alle the peple that he gaderyde, that thei schulde yelde them to hym as to thcr sovereyne Lorde, or ellys he made a woue that the Lorde Willowby schuld lese his hede ; and he wrote and sent his lettere forthe, but therfor they wuldc not ceysse ; wherfor the Kynge comawndyde the Lorde Wyllowhby hede for to be smytene of, notwithstandinge his pardone. And so the Kynge toke his oste and went towarde his enemyes, and losyde his gonnys of his ordynaunce uppone them, and faught with them, and anone the comons ileddc away ; but ther was many mannc slayne of Lyncolneschyre, and the Lorde Wellys, Sere Thomas Delalonde, and Sere Thomas Dymmbke, knyghtys, takene and beheddede.

2.5 The Battle of Barnet, 14th April 1471

1. *John Warkworth, Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* (ed.) J. O. Halliwell (London, 1839) p. 14

But it liappenede that he vnthe his oste were enterede into the tounc of Barnct, before the Erie of Warwyke and his host. And so tlie Erie of Warwyke and his host lay witheoute the towne alle nyght, and eche of them loosedede gonnes at othere, alle the nyght. And on Ester day in the mornynge, the xiiij. Day of Apryl, ryght erly, eche of them came uppone othere ; and ther was suche a grete myste, that nether of them myght see othere perfutely; ther thei faughte, from iij. of clokke in the mornynge unto X. of clokke the fore-none. And dy\`erse tymes the Erie of Warwyke party hade the victory, and supposede that tliei hade wonne the felde. But it hapenede so, that the Erie of Oxenfordes men hade uppone them ther lordes ly\`ery, l)othe l)efore and behynde, which was a sterre withe stremys, wicj\`e [was] myche lyke Kynge Edwardes lyvery, the sunne with stremys ; and the myste was so thycke, that a manne myghte not profytely juge one thyng from anothere ; so the Erie of Warwikes menne schott and faughte ayens the Erie of Oxenfordes menne, wetyng and supposynge that thei hade bene Kynge Edwardes menne ; and anone the Erie of Oxenforde and his menne cryed " treasoune ! treasoune !" and fledde away from the felde withe viij. c. menne. The Lorde Markes Montagu was agreyde and apoyntede with Kynge Edwarde, and put uppone hym Kynge Edwardes lyvery ; and a manne of the Erles of Warwyke sawe that, and felle uppone hyme, and kyledde hym. And whenne the Erie of Warwyke sawe his brothere dede, and the Erie of Oxenforde fledde, he lepte one horse-backe, and fiede to a wode by the felde of Barnett, where was no waye for the ; and one of Kynge Edwardes menne hade espyede hyme, and one came uppone hym and kyledde hym, and dispoledde hyme nakede. And so Kynge Edwarde gate that felde. And ther was slayne of the Erie of Warwykes party, the Erie hym self, Markes Montagu, Sere William Tyrre, knyghte, and many other. The Duke of Excetre faughth manly ther that day, and was gretely despoledde and woundedde, and leftte nakede for dede in the felde, and so lay ther from vij. of clokke tille iij. after none ; whiche was take up and brought to a house by a manne of his owne ; and a leche brought to hym, and so afterwarde brought in to sancuarij at Westmynster. And one Kynge Edwardes party was slayne the Lorde Cromwelle, sonne and heyre to the Erie of Essex, Lord Barnes sonne and heyre, Lorde Say, and dyverse other, to the nombre (of bothe partys) iij. m. l. menne.

2. *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV, in England and the Finall Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* (ed.) J. Bruce (London, 1838) p.18- 22

And so he toke in his companye to the felde, Kynge Henrye ; and soo, that aftar none, he roode to Barnete, x myles owte of London, where his aforne-riders had founden the afore-riders of th'Erls of Warwikes hooste, and bet them, and chaced them out of the towne, more some what than an halfe myle ; when, undre an hedge-syde, were redy assembled a great people, in array, of th'Erls of Warwike. The Kynge, comynge aftar to the sayde towne, and undarstanding all this_, wolde [ne] suffre one man to abyde in the same towne, but had them all to the field with hym, and drewe towards his enemies, without the towne. And, for it was right derke, and he myght not well se where his enemyes were enbataylled afore hym, he lodged hym, and all his hoste, afore them, mochenere then he had supposed, but he toke nat his ground so even in the front afore them as he wold have don yf he might bettar have sene them, butt somewhate a-syden-hande, where he disposed all his people, in good arraye, all that nyght ; and so they kept them still, withowt any mannar language, or noyse, but as lytle as they well myght. Bothe parties had goomoste all the nyght. But, thanked be God ! it so fortunated that they always ovarshote the Kyngs hoste, and hurtyd them nothings, and the cawse was the Kyngs hoste lay muche nerrar them than they demyd. And, with that also, the Kyng, and his hoste, kept passinge greate silence alnyght, and made, as who saythe, no noyse, whereby they might nat know the very place where they lay. And, for that they shulde not know it, the Kynge suffred no gonns to be shote on his syd, all that nyght, or els right fewe, whiche was to hym great advauntage, for, therby, they myght have estemns, and ordinaunce, but th'Erle of Warwike had many moo then the Kynge, and therefore, on the nyght, weninge gretly to have anoyed the Kynge, and his hooste, with shot of gonnes, th'Erls fielde shotte gunes aled the ground that he lay in, and have leveled their gunns. On the roorow, betymes, The Kynge, undarstandinge that the day approched nere, betwyxt four and five of the cloke, natwithstandynge there was a greate myste and letted the syght of either othar, yet he committed his cawse and qwarell to Allmyghty God, avancyd bannars, dyd blowe up trumpets, and set upon them, firste with shotte, and, than and sone, they joyned and came to hand-strokes, wherein his enemies manly and coragious - ly receyved them, as well in shotte as in hand-stroks whan they ioyned whiche ioynynge of theyr bothe batteyls was nat directly frount to frount, as they so shulde have ioyned ne had be the myste, whiche suffred neythar party to se othar, but for a litle space, and that of lyklyhod cawsed the bataile to be the more crewell and mortall ; for, so it was, that the one ende of theyr batayle ovarrechyd th'end of the Kyngs battayle, and so, at that end, they were myche myghtyar than was the Kyngs bataile at the same [end] that ioyned with them, whiche was the west ende, and, there fore, upon that party of the Kyngs battayle, they had a gretar distres upon the Kyngs party, wherefore many flede towards Barnet, and so forthe to London, or evar they lafte ; and they fell in the chace of them, and dyd moche harme. But the other parties, and the residewe of neithar bataile, might se that distrese, ne

the fleinge, ne the chace, by cause of [the] great myste that was, whiche wolde nat suffre no man to se but a litle from hym ; and so the Kyngs battayle, which saw none of all that, was therby in nothing discouragyd, for, save only a fewe that were nere unto them, no man wiste thereof ; also the othar party by the same distres, flyght, or chace, were therefore nevar the gretlyar coragyd. And, in lyke wise, at the est end, the Kyngs batayle, whan they cam to ioyninge, ovarrechyd theyr batayle, and so distresyd them theyr gretly, and soo drwe nere towards the Kynge, who was about the myddest of the battayle, and susteyned all the myght and weight thereof. Netheles upon the same litle distresse at the west end anon ranne to Westmynstar, and to London, and so forthe furthar to othar contries, that the Kynge was distressed, and his fielde loste, but, the lawde be to Almyghty God ! it was otharwyse ; for the Kynge, trusting verely in God's helpe, ovr blessyd ladyes, and Seynt George, toke to hym great hardies and corage for to suppress the falcehode of all them that so falcely and so traytorowsly had conspired agaynst hym, where thrwge, with the faythefull, welbelovyd, and myghty assystaunce of his felawshipe, that in great nombar deseveryd nat from his parson, and were as well asswred unto hym as to them was possyble, he manly, vigorowsly, and valliantly assayled them, in the mydst and strongest of theyr battaile, where he, with great violence, bett and bare down afore hym all that stode in hys way, and, than, turned to the range, first on that one hand, and than on that othar hand, in lengthe, and so bet and bare them downe, so that nothing myght stande in the syght of hym and the welle asswred felowshipe that attendyd trewly upon hym ; so that, blessed be God ! he wan the hide there, and the perfite victory remayned unto hym, and to his rebells the discomfiture of xxx M men, as they nombrid them selves. In this battayie was slayne the Erie of Warwyke, somewhat fleinge, which was taken and reputed as chefe of the felde, in that he was callyd amongs them lyvetenaunt of England, so constitute by the pretended authoritye of Kynge Henry. Ther was also slayne the Marques Montagwe, in playne battayie, and many othar knyghts, squiers, noble men, and othar. The Duke of Excestar was smytten downe, and sore woundyd, and lafte for dead ; but he was not wellknowne, and so lafte by a lytle out of the fielde, and so, aftar, he escaped. The Erie of Oxenford fled, and toke into the contrie, and, in his flyenge, fell in company with certayne northen men, that also fled from the same hide, and so went he, in theyr company, northwards, and, aftar that, into Scotland.

3. *J. Stow, Annales or General Chronicle of England by John Stow* (ed.) E. Howes (London 1631) p. 703

The Earle of Warwicke, the Duke of Exetter, marques Mountacute, and the Earle of Oxford, with many knights, came with their host towards Barnet: wherefore king Edward tooke king Henry with

him, and preoccupied the towne of Barnet all the night: the Earle of Warwicke and his retinue remained on the plaine without the towne, shooting guns one at the other. And in the morning being Easer Day, and the 14. of Aprill, they fought in the thick of mist from four o' cloke in the morning til ten, and sometimes the Earle of Warwickes men supposed that they had got the victory of the field, but it happened that the earle of Oxford's men had a star with streames both before and behind on their liveries, and King Edwards men had the sun with streames on their liveries: whereupon the Earle of Warwickes men, by reason of the mist not well differning the badges to like, that at the Earle of Oxfords men that were on their owne part and then the Earle of Oxfords and his men cried treason and fled with eight hundred men. The Marques Mountacute was previously agreed with k. Edward and had gotten on his livery, but one of his brothers, the Earle of Warwickes men seeing this, fell upon him and killed him.

The Earle of Warwicke seeing his brother dead, and the Earle of Oxford fled, lept on a horse to fly, and coming to a woode where was no passage, two of king Edwards men came to him, and killed him, and spiled him to the naked skin.

2.6 The Battle of Tewkesbury, 4th May 1471

1. *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV, in England and the Finall Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI* (ed.) J. Bruce (London, 1838) p. 27- 30

So, continuynge that iourney to he came, with all his hooste, to a village callyd Chilterham, but five myles from Tewkesberye, where the Kynge had certayn knolege that, .but litle afore his comynge thethar, his enemyes were comen to Tewkesbury, and there were takynge a field, wherein they purposed to abyde, and delyver him battayle. Whereupon the Kynge made no longar taryenge, but a litle confortyd hymselfe, and his people, with suche meate and drynke as he had done to be caried with hym, for vitalyge of his hooste ; and, incontinent, set forthe towards his enemyes, and toke the Gelde, and lodgyd hym seife, and all his hooste, within three myle of them. Upon the morow followynge, Saterdag, the iiij. day of May, [the Kynge] apparaild hymselfe, and all his boost set in good array ; ordeined three wards ; displayed his bannars ; dyd blowe up the trompets ; commytted his caws and qwarell to Almyghty God, to ovr most blessyd lady his mothar, Vyrbyn Mary, the glorious martyr Seint George, and all the saynts ; and avaunced, directly upon his enemyes ; approching to theyr filde, whiche was strongly in a marvaylows strong grown d pyght, full difficult to be assayled. Netheles the Kyngs ordinance was so conveniently layde afore them, and his vawarde so sore oppressyd them, with shott of arrows, that they gave them right-a-sharpe shwre.

Also they dyd agayne-ward to them, bothe with shot of arrows and gones, whereof netheles they ne had not so great plenty as had the Kyng. In the front of theyr field were so evell lanes, and depe dykes, so many hedges, trees, and bussches, that it was right hard to approche them nere, and come to hands; but Edmond, called Duke of Somarset, having that day the vawarde, whithar it were for that he and his fellowshipe were sore annoyed in the place where they were, as well with gones-shott, as with shot of arrows, whiche they ne wowlde nor durst abyde, or els, of great harte and corage, knyghtly and manly avaunsyd hymselfe, c with his fellowshipe, somewhat asyde-hand the Kyngs vawarde, and, by certayne pathes and wayes therefore afore purveyed, and to the Kyngs party unknowne, he departyd out of the field, passyd a lane, and came into a fayre place, or cloos, even afore the Kyng where he was enbattelid, and, from the hill that was in that one of the closes, he set right fiercely upon th'end of the Kyngs battayle. The Kyng, full manly, set forthe even upon them, enteryd and wann the dyke, and hedge, upon them, into the cloose, and, with great vyolence, put them upe towards the hyll, and, so also, the Kyng's vaward, being in the rule of the Duke of Gloucestar. Here it is to be remembred, how that, whan the Kyng was comyn afore theyr felde, or he set upon them, he consydered that, upon the right hand of theyr field, there was a parke, and therein moche wood, and he, thinkynge to purvey a remedye in caace his sayd enemyes had layed any bushement in that wood, of horsemen, he chose, out of his fellashyppe, ij c speres, and set them in a plomp, togethars, nere a quartar of a myle from the felde, gyvenge them charge to have good eye upon that cornar of the woode, if caas that eny nede were, and to put them in devowre, and, yf they saw none suche, as they thowght most behovfull for tyme and space, to employ themselfe in the best wyse as they cowlde ; which provisyon cam as well to poynt at this tyme of the battayle as cowthe well have been devysed, for the sayd spers of the Kyngs party, seinge no lyklynes of eny busschement in the sayd woode-corner, seinge also goode oportunitie t'employ them selfe well, cam and brake on, all at ones, upon the Duke of Somerset, and his vawarde, asyde-hand, unadvysed, whereof they, seinge the Kyng gave them ynoughe to doo afore them, were gretly dismaied and abasshed, and so toke them to rlyght into the parke, and into the medowe that was nere, and into lanes, and dykes, where they best hopyd to escape the dangar ; of whom, netheles, many were distressed, taken, and slayne; and, even at this point of theyr flyght, the Kyng coragiously set upon that__othar felde, were was chefe jJMward, called Prince^and, in short while, put hym to discomfiture and flyght; and so fell in the chase of them that many of them were slayne, and, namely, at a mylene, in the medowe fast by the towne, were many drownyd ; many ran towards the towne ; many to the churche ; to the abbey ; and els where ; as they best myght.

2.7 The Battle of Bosworth, 22nd August 1485

1. J. Molinet, *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* (1474- 1506) M Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud 1985) p. 138

When the armies came together, King Richard prepared his “battle”, where there was a vanguard and a rearguard; he had around 60,000 combatants and a great number of cannons.²⁷⁸ The leader of the vanguard was Lord John Howard, whom King Richard had made duke of Norfolk, granting him lands and lordships confiscated from the earl of Oxford. Another lord, Brackenbury, captain of the Tower of London, was also in command of the van, which had 11,000 or 12,000 men altogether. The place was chosen and the day assigned for the eighth day of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, to battle power against power. The French also made their preparations marching against the English, being in the field a quarter of a league away. ‘The king had the artillery of his army fire on the earl of Richmond, and so the French, knowing by the king’s shot the lie of the land and the order of his battle, resolved, in order to avoid the fire, to mass their troops against the flank rather than the front of the king’s battle. Thus they obtained the mastery of his vanguard, which after several feats of arms on both sides was dispersed. In this conflict was taken the duke of Norfolk with his son. The former was taken to the earl of Richmond, who sent him on to the earl of Oxford who had him dispatched, ‘The vanguard of King Richard, which was put to flight, was picked off by Lord Stanley 1 A page and a half left blank after these words.who with all of 20,000 combatants came at a good pace to the aid of the earl. The earl of Northumberland, who was on the king’s side with 10,000 men, ought to have charged the French, but did nothing except to flee, both he and his company, and to abandon his King with some others who deserted him in his need. The king bore himself when he saw this discomfiture and found himself alone on the field he thought to run after the others. His horse leapt into a marsh from which it could not retrieve itself. One of the Welshmen then came after him, and struck him dead with a halberd, and another took his body and put it before him on his horse and carried it, hair hanging as one would bear a sheep. ‘And so he who had miserably killed numerous people, ended his days iniquitously and filthily in the dirt and the mire, and he who had despoiled churches was displayed to the people naked and without any clothing, and without royal solemnity was buried at the entrance to a village church. ‘The vanguard [or in one text ‘rearguard’] which the grand chamberlain of England led, seeing King Richard dead, turned in flight; and there were in this battle only 300 slain on either side.’

²⁷⁸ *Rearguard- Part of the force that protects the rear of the army. The conservative part of the army.*

2. *Phillippe de Commines, The Memoirs of Phillippe de Commines Lord of Argenton Vol 2* (ed.) H. G. Bohn (London, 1856) M. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud, 1985) p. 138

Assisted by the king of France, Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond launches an expedition from Normandy and lands in Wales. 'King Richard marched against him, but Lord Stanley, an English knight and husband of the earl's mother, brought against him 26,000 men. They fought a battle, King Richard was slain in the fighting, and the earl of Richmond was crowned king of England on the field with his crown. Was it mere chance? It was truly the judgement of the Almighty God.

3. *Act of Attainder 'Henry VII: November 1485: Part 1' Parliament* (ed.) C. Given-Wilson. *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=116563> [accessed: 29 May 2014]

Therefore, our sovereign lord, calling to his blessed remembrance this high and great charge enjoined on his royal majesty and estate, not oblivious or unmindful of the unnatural, wicked and great perjuries, treasons, homicides and murders, in shedding infants' blood, with many other wrongs, odious offences and abominations against God and man, and in particular against our said sovereign lord, committed and done by Richard, late on 21 August in the first year of the reign of our said sovereign lord [1485], gathered a great host at Leicester in the county of Leicester, traitorously intending, plotting and conspiring the destruction of the royal person of the king, our sovereign liege lord. And they kept the same host in being, with banners displayed, strongly armed and equipped with all kinds of weapons, such as guns, bows, arrows, spears, glaives, axes and all other weaponry suitable or necessary for giving and advancing a mighty battle against our said sovereign lord, from the said 21 August until the following 22 August, when they led them to a field within the said county of Leicester, and there by premeditated intent traitorously levied war against our said sovereign lord and his true subjects present in his service and assistance under the banner of our said sovereign lord, to the overthrow of this realm and its common weal. Wherefore, by the advice and assent of the lords spiritual and temporal and of the commons assembled in this present parliament, and by authority of the same, be it enacted, decreed and ordained, judged and declared that the said Richard, late duke of Gloucester, otherwise called King Richard III, John, late duke of Norfolk,

4. *The Ballad of Bosworth Field* (ed.) M. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud, 1985) p. 155 - 157

Henry of England, our noble Kinge. he lowted low & tooke his hatt in his hand,

<p>& thanked the states and cominaltye :</p> <p>I trust in Iesus that day to see." 111.444</p> <p>& anon the Larke began to singe ;</p> <p>that euer was betweene King and King.</p> <p>of the Lord stanley that was both wise & wittye ;& hee hath granted him in sight,</p> <p>& saith "but small is your companye."</p> <p>their names to you then I shall minge ;</p> <p>& goe to the vaward with our Kinge. 114.456</p> <p>& come of royall anceytree ;</p> <p>Sir Hugh Persall ; there was 3 : 115.460</p> <p>that proued noble in euerye thinge ;</p> <p>& went to the vaward with our kinge. 116.464</p> <p>2 battells that day had hee</p> <p>better were not in christentye. 117.468</p> <p>was hindmust att the outsetinge ;</p> <p>hee came betime vnto our King. 118.472</p> <p>& looked into a dale ffull dread ;</p> <p>ffor armed men & trapped steeds. 119.476</p> <p>in 4 strong battells they cold fforth bring ;</p> <p>as euer came to maintaine [a] King. 120.480</p> <p>soe did the young Erle of Shrewsburye,</p> <p>soe did Oxfford, that Erle, in companye.</p> <p>& they Noble power that they did bring.</p>	<p>"to quitt you all I vnderstand ;</p> <p>many a cry in the host that night did bee ;</p> <p>truth of the battell heere shall yee,</p> <p>King HENERY desired the vaward right</p> <p>4 of the Noble Knights then called hee ;</p> <p>he bade array them with their chialrye,</p> <p>Sir Robert Tunsall, a Noble Knight,</p> <p>Sir Iohn Savage, wise & wight,</p> <p>Sir Humphrey Stanley the 4th did bee,</p> <p>they did assay them with their chialrye,</p> <p>the Lord stanley bothe sterne and stout,</p> <p>of hardye men, withouten doubt</p> <p>Sir william, wise and worthye,</p> <p>men said that day that dyd him see,</p> <p>then he remoued vnto a mountaine full hye,</p> <p>5 miles compasse, no ground they see,</p> <p>theyr armor glittered as any glead ;</p> <p>they seemed noble men att need</p> <p>the duke of Norfolke avanted his banner bright,</p> <p>to the sun & wind right speedylye dight,</p> <p>to tell the array itt were hard ffor me,</p> <p>And of the ordinance heere shall yee,</p>
--	--

that had that day Richard our Kinge. 122.488 they had 7 scores Sarpendines without dout,
 that locked & Chained vppon a row, as many bombards that were stout ;
 like blasts of thunder they did blow. 123.492 10000 Morespikes, with-all,
 & harquebusyers, throwlye can thé thringe to make many a noble man to ffall
 that was on HENERYS part, our kinge. King Richard looked on the mountaines hye,
 & sayd, "I see the banner of the Lord Stanley." he said, "ffeitch hither the Lord Strange to mee,
 ffor doubtlesse hee shall dye this day ; "I make mine avow to Marye, that may,
 that all the gold this Land within shall not saue his liffe this day,
 in England iff I be Kinge !" 126.504 then they brought Lord Strange into his sight ;
 he said, "ffor thy death make thee readye." then answered that noble Knight,
 & said, "I crye god & the world mercye ! "& Iesus, I draw wittnesse to thee
 that all the world ffrom woe did winn, since the time that I borne did bee,
 was I neuer traitor to my Kinge." 128.512 a gentleman then called hee,—
 men said Latham was his name,— "& euer thou come into my countrye,
 greete well my gentlemen eche one; my yeomen Large of blood and bone,
 sometimes we had mirth att our meetinge ; they had a Master, & now they haue none,
 ffor heere I must be martyred with the Kinge !" there he tooke a ring of his ffingar right,
 & to that squier raught itt hee, & said, "beare this to my Lady bright,
 for shee may thinke itt longe or shee may see ; yett att doomes day meete shall wee,
 I trust in lesu that all this world shall winn In the celestyall heauen vpon hye
 in presence of a Noble King. 132.528 "& the ffeild be lost vpon our partye,
 as I trust in god it shall not bee, take my eldest sonne that is my heyre,
 & fflee into some ffar countrye. 133.532 "yett the child a man may bee,—

hee is comen of a Lords kinn,— another day to reuenge mee
 of Richard of England, if he be King.” then to King Richard there came a Knight,
 saith, "I hold noe time about this to be, see yee not the vawards beginning to ffight?
 when yee haue the ffather, the vnkle, all 3, “looke what deathe you will haue them to dye ;
 att your will you may them deeme.” through these ffortunate words eskaped hee
 out of the danger of Richard the Kinge. then the partyes countred together egerlye.
 when the vawards began to ffight, King Henery ffought soe manfullye,
 soe did Oxford, that Erle soe wight ; Sir Iohn Sauage, that hardy Knight,
 deathes dints he delt that day with many a white hood in fight,
 that sad men were att assay. Sir Gilbert Talbott was not away,
 but stoutly stirred him in that ffight ; with noble men att assay
 he caused his enemyes lowe to light. Sir Hugh Persall, with sheild & speare
 ffull doughtylye that day did hee ; he bare him doughtye to this warr,
 as a man of great degree. 140.560 King Richard did in his army stand,
 he was n[u]mbered to 40000 and 3 of hardy men of hart and hand,
 that vnder his banner there did bee. 141.564 Sir William Stanley, wise & worthie
 remembred the brea[k]ffast hee hett to him ; downe att a backe then cometh hee,
 & shortlye sett vpon the Kinge. then they countred together sad & sore ;
 archers they lett sharpe arrowes fflee, they shott guns both ffell & ffarr,
 bowes of vewe bended did bee, springalls spedd them speedlye,
 harquebusiers pellets throughly did thringe ; soe many a banner began to swee
 that was on Richards partye, their King. then our archers lett their shooting bee,
 with ioyned weapons were growden ffull right, brands rang on basenetts hye,

battell-axes ffast on helmes did light.	there dyed many a doughtye Knight,
there vnder ffoot can thé thringe ;	thus they ffought with maine & might
that was on HENERYES part, our King.	then to King Richard there came a Knight,
& said, "I hold itt time ffor to fflee ;	ffor yonder stanleys dints they be soe wight,
against them no man may dree.	"Heere is thy horsse att thy hand readye ;
another day thou may thy worshipp win,	& ffor to raigne with royaltie,
to weare the crowne, and be our King."	he said, "giue me my battell axe to my hand,
sett the crowne of England on my head soe hye ! ffor by him that shope both sea and Land,	
King of England this day I will dye !	"one ffoote will I neuer fflee
whilest the breath is my brest within !"	as he said, soe did it bee ;
if hee lost his liffe, if he were King. 150.600	

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Act of Attainder 'Henry VII: November 1485: Part 1' Parliament (ed.) C. Given- Wilson. *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England* <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=116563> [accessed: 29 May 2014]

An Account of the First Battle of St Albans from a contemporary manuscript From Sir William Stoner's manuscripts steward of the abbot of St Albans (ed.) J. Bayley *Archaeologia*, 20, (London 1824)

An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V and Henry VI written before the year 1471 (ed.) J. Silvestre Davies (London, 1855)

Account of King Edward the Fourth's Second Invasion of England, in 1471, drawn up by one of his Followers(ed.) E. Jenningham (London, 1827)
<http://search.proquest.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/docview/6997577?accountid=11526> [Accessed 5 April 2014]

Bale's Chronicle, (ed.) R. Flenley, *Six Town Chronicles* (Oxford 1911)

The Ballad of Bosworth Field (ed.) M. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud, 1985)

Benet's Chronicle, For the years 1400- 1462 (ed.) M. A. Harriss *Camden Miscellany* (London 1972)

Bernard Andre, *vita Henrici Septimi, Memorials of King Henry VII* (ed.) J. Gairdner, Roll Series (London, 1858) pp. 49 52

Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript. Ballads and Romances (ed.) J.W. Hales and F.J. Furnivall, 3 vols. (London, 1868), III, pp. 233-59. http://newr3.dreamhosters.com/?page_id=1928 [Accessed 14 June 2014]

'A brief Latin Chronicle' (ed.) J. Gairdner, *Three fifteenth-century chronicles* (1880),
<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=58671> [accessed: 28 June 2014]

'Brief notes of occurrences under Henry VI and Edward IV', (ed.) J. Gairdner, *Three fifteenth-century chronicles* (1880), pp. 148-163 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=58670> [Date accessed: 28 June 2014]

The Brut or The Chronicles of England (ed.) F. W. D. Brie (1906)

Calendar of Patent Rolls – Henry VI and Edward IV Preserved in the Public Records Office AD 1467-1477 (1900) https://dcms.lids.org/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE100801 [Accessed 4 April 2014]

Calendar of the patent rolls, Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III A.D 1476- 1485, Public Record Office (London, 1901)

Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London (ed.) J. Gough Nichols (London, 1852)

A Chronicle of London from 1080 to 1483 written in the fifteenth century (ed.) N. H. Nicholas (London, 1827)

Chronicles of London Bridge (London, 1827)

http://archive.org/stream/chronoflondonbri00thomiala/chronoflondonbri00thomiala_djvu.txt [Accessed 24 May 2014]

Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470 (ed.) J. Nichols (London, 1867)

The Chronicles of the White Rose of York, A series of Historical Fragments Proclamation, letter and other contemporary documents relating to King Edward the Fourth (ed.) A. Giles (London, 1845)

Coventry Leet Book or Mayor's Register Part 1 (ed.) M. Dormer Harris (London 1907)

Diego de Valera, *Castilian Report*(1486) M. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud,1985)

Edward Hall, *Halls Chronicle containing the history of England during the reign of Henry the fourth and the succeeding monarchs to the end of the reign of Henry the eighth 1550* (London 1809)

The Great Chronicle of London (ed.) A.H. Thomas, I.D. Thornley (London 1938)

William Gregory, 'Gregory's Chronicle: 1451- 1460', *The Historical Collections of a Citizen in the fifteenth century* (1876) (ed.) J. Gairdner Camden Society pp. 196- 210, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=45559> [Date accessed 01 June 2014]

Herald's Report, 1488- 90 (ed) T. Hearne (Oxford, 1774)

Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries

http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=chadwyck_ep/uvaGenText/tei/chep_1.1974.xml&chunk.id=d3&toc.id=d3&brand=default [Accessed 3 May 2014]

Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV, in England and the Finall Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI (ed.) J. Bruce (London, 1838)

Household Books of the Duke of Norfolk and Thomas, the Earl of Surrey 1481- 1490 (ed.) J. Payne Collier (London, 1844)

Ingulph's Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland with the continuations by Peter of Blois and anonymous writers,(trans) H. T. Riley (London 1908)

Jean de Molinet, *Chroniques of Jean de Molinet* (1474- 1506) M Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud 1985)

Jean De Waurin, *Recueil des Croniques et Anchiennes Istories de la Grant Bretagne, a present nomme Engleterre*,(ed,) E. Hardy Rolls Series vol 5, 1447 – 1471 (1891)

John Hardyng, *The Chronicle of John Hardyng, From the beginning of England unto the reign of Edward IV* (ed.) H. Ellis (London 1819)

John Rous, *Joanis Rossi Antiquaris Warwicensis Historia Regum Angliae*(1716) (ed.)A. Hanham *Richard III and his Early Historians 1483- 1535* (Oxford, 1975)

J. Stow, *Annales or General Chronicle of England by John Stow* (ed.) E. Howes (London 1631)

John Warkworth, *Warkworth's Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward the Fourth* (ed.) J. O. Halliwell (London, 1839)

John Whethamstede, *Register in Registra Quorundam Abbatum Monasteri S. Albani* (ed.) H. T. Riley (Rolls Ser 1872) Internet Archive
<https://archive.org/stream/annaesmonaster00unkngoog#page/n12/mode/2up> Accessed 6 April 2014

Letters from Bruges 1460 Milanese State Records 1385- 1618 , Calendar of State Papers, Milan 1365 – 1618, (ed.) A. B. Hinds, *British History Online* (1912) pp. 16- 17 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=92247> [Accessed 21 May 2014]

Phillippe de Commines, *The Memoirs of Phillippe de Commines Lord of Argenton Vol 2* (ed.) H. G. Bohn (London, 1856) M. Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud, 1985) p. 138

Pittscottie's Chronicles, (ed.) M Bennett, *Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud 1985)

Memoranda of city of York (1487) Clerk of London York House Book 6, (ed.) M. Bennett, *Lambert Simnel and the battle of Stoke* (Gloucester, 1987)

Milan State Papers, Calendar of State Papers, Milan 1365 – 1618, (ed.) A. B. Hinds, *British History Online* (1912)pp. 16- 17

Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History: Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III* (Ed.)H. Ellis (London, 1844)

Raphael Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland In Six Volumes*, vol 3 (London 1808)

Richard Grafton, *A continuation of the Chronicle of England from the beginning of the reign of Edward iv unto the thirty fourth year of our most redoubted sovereign lord King Henry the Eight* (ed.) H. Ellis (London, 1819)

Robert Fabyan, *The New Chronicles of England and France* (ed.)H. Ellis (London, 1811)

A Short English Chronicle (ed.) J. Gairdner, *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles* (1880)

Vitellius A XVI (ed.) C. L. Kingsford *Chronicles of London* (Oxford, 1905)

William Worcester, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum* (ed.) Stephenson (1864)

Secondary Sources

Baldwin, D., *Stoke Field*. (Barnsley, 2006)

Barnard, F., *Edward IV's French expedition of 1475* (Gloucester, 1975)

'Battle of Barnet', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=5> [Accessed 22 March 2014]

'Battle of Blore Heath', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=6> [Accessed 21 March 2014]

'Battle of Bosworth', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=8> [Accessed 22 March 2014]

'Battle of Edgecote', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=13> [Accessed 23 March 2014]

'Battle of Mortimer's Cross', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=25> [Accessed 21 March 2014]

'Battle of Northampton', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=33> [Accessed 21 March 2014]

'Battle of Tewkesbury', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=45> [Accessed 22 March 2014]

'Battle of Towton', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=46> [Accessed 23 March 2014]

'Battle of Stoke Field', *Battlefields Trust*, <http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/warsoftheroses/battleview.asp?BattleFieldId=42> [Accessed 22 March 2014]

- Beer, B. L., 'John Stow, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/26611?docPos=4> [Accessed 22 May 2014]
- Bell, A., Curry, A., King, A. and Simpkin, D., *The soldier in later medieval England*. (Oxford, 2013)
- Bennett, M., *The Battle of Bosworth* (Stroud, 1985)
- Bennett, M., *Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke* (New York, 1987)
- Bennett, M. J., 'Lambert Simnel, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/25569?docPos=1> [Accessed 7 July 2014]
- Bennett, M. J., 'Thomas Stanley', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/26278?docPos=1> [Accessed 17 June 2014]
- Bennett, M. J., 'Thomas Stanley, first earl of Derby', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/26279/26279?back=,26278> [Accessed 7 June 2014]
- Bennett, M. J., 'Sir William Stanley, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/26282/26282?back=,26278> [Accessed 7 June 2014]
- Boardman, A. and Hardy, R., *Towton* (Stroud, 2009)
- Boardman, A., *The Battle of Towton* (Stroud, 1994)
- Burley, P., Elliot, M. and Watson, H., *The Battles of St Albans* (Havertown, 2013)
- Carpenter, C., *The Wars of the Roses* (Cambridge, 1997)
- Carter, J. M., 'The Battle of Bosworth, M. Bennett, Book Review', *Military Affairs*, 51, 1, (1987) pp.42
- Cassidy, B., 'Machiavelli and the Ideology of the Offensive: Gunpowder Weapons in "The Art of War"', *The Journal of Military History*, 67, 2 (2003), pp. 381-404
- Castor, H., *Blood & roses* (London, 2004)
- Cheetham, A., *The life and times of Richard III* (London, 1972)

- Clark, J. G., 'John Whethamstede', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/29197> [Accessed 22 May 2014]
- Clegg, C. S., 'Raphael Holinshed', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/13505?docPos=1> [Accessed 24 May 2014]
- Connell, W. J., 'Polydore Vergil', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/28224?docPos=1> [Accessed 24 May 2014]
- Crawford, A., 'John Howard, first duke of Norfolk', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/13921?docPos=10> [Accessed 5 May 2014]
- Crawford, A., *Yorkist lord, John Howard Duke of Norfolk* (London, 2010)
- Curry, A. and Hughes, M., *Arms, armies, and fortifications in the Hundred Years War* (Woodbridge, 1994)
- Curry, A., *The Hundred Years War* (New York, 1993)
- Dockray, K., *Richard III* (Stroud, 1994)
- Dockray, K., *Edward IV A Source Book* (Stroud, 1999)
- Dockray, K., *Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and the Wars of the Roses* (Stroud, 2000)
- Dunn, D. E. S., 'Margaret of Anjou', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/18049?docPos=1> [Accessed 2 June 2014]
- Ellis, S. G., 'Henry Percy, fourth earl of Northumberland', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2006) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/21935?docPos=8> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Elton, G., *England, 1200-1640 The Sources of History, Studies in the uses of Historical Evidence* (Ithaca, 1969)
- Falkus, G., *The life and times of Edward IV* (London, 1981)

- Ferguson, M. G., 'Richard Grafton', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/11186> [Accessed 22 May 2014]
- Fiorato, V., Boylston, A. and Knusel, C., *Blood red roses* (Oxford, 2000)
- Flenley, R. *Six Town Chronicles* (Oxford 1911)
- Foard, G. and Curry, A., *Bosworth 1485* (Oxford, 2013)
- Foss, P., *The field of Redemore* (Newtown Linford, 1998)
- Gairdner, J., *Three fifteenth-century chronicles* (1880), pp. 148-163 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=58670>
- Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles, The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004)
- Goodman, A., *The Wars of the Roses Military Activity and English Society, 1452-97* (London, 1981)
- Goodman, A., *The Wars of the Roses The Soldiers' Experience* (Stroud, 2005)
- Gransden, A., *Historical writing in England II* (Ithaca, 1982)
- Gravett, C., *Tewkesbury, 1471* (Westport, 2005)
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Edward, Prince of Wales', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/8524/8524?back=,18049> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Griffiths, R. A., 'Henry Percy, third earl of Northumberland', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/21934?docPos=7> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Grummitt, D., *The Calais garrison* (Woodbridge, 2008)
- Grummitt, D., 'The Defence of Calais and the Development of Gunpowder Weaponry in England in the Late Fifteenth Century', *War in History*, 7, 3, (2000) pp. 253- 272
- Grummitt, D., *A short history of the Wars of the Roses* (London, 2013)
- Gunn, S., 'Archery Practice in Early Tudor England' *Past and Present*, 209, (2008) pp.53- 81.

- Gunn, S. J., 'Henry VII, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/12954?docPos=1> [Accessed 2 June 2014]
- Gunn, S. J., 'John de Vere, Earl of Oxford', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/28214?docPos=12> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Haigh, P., '*... Where Both The Hosts Fought...*' *The Rebellions of 1469- 1470 and the Battles of Edgecote and Lose- Cote- Field* (Heckmondwike, 1997)
- Haigh, P., *The military campaigns of the Wars of the Roses* (Stroud, 1997)
- Haigh, P., *From Wakefield to Towton* (Barnsley, 2002)
- Hammond, P., *The battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury* (New York, 1990)
- Hammond, P., *Richard III and the Bosworth campaign* (Barnsley, 2010)
- Hanham, A., *Richard III and his early historians, 1483-1535* (Oxford, 1975)
- Hanna, R., 'The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century. A revolution in English writing', *Book Review*, no. 340 (2003) < <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/340>>, [Accessed 24 June 2014]
- Hardy R., *Towton Battlefield Society Archaeology*, (2014) <http://www.towton.org.uk/archeology/#>
 Accessed 4 June 2014
- Heal, F., 'Holinshed's Nation: Ideals, Memory and Practical Policy in the Chronicles', *English Historical Review* 128, 531, (2013) pp. 426 – 428
- Herman, P. C., 'Edward Hall', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2012)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/11954?docPos=12> [Accessed 22 May 2014]
- Hicks, M., 'Anthony Woodville, second earl Rivers, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2011)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/29937?docPos=2> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Hicks, M., 'Crowland's World: A Westminster View of the Yorkist Age', *The Journal of Historical Association*, 90, 298, (2005) 172 – 190
- Hicks, M., *Edward IV* (London, 2004)

- Hicks, M., 'George duke of Clarence', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/10542?docPos=12> [Accessed 5 May 2014]
- Hicks, M., *Richard III* (Stroud, 2000)
- Hicks, M., 'Richard Welles', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/28998/28999?docPos=5> [Accessed 17 June 2014]
- Hicks, M., 'Richard Woodville, earl Rivers', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2011)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/29939?docPos=3> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Hicks, M., 'The London Chronicles of the Fifteenth Century: A Revolution in English Writing', *English Historical Review*, 118, 479, (2003) pp. 1366-1368
- Hicks, M., 'The Second Anonymous Continuation of the Crowland Abbey Chronicle 1459--86 Revisited', *The English Historical Review*, 122, 496, pp.349--370.
- Hicks, M., *The Wars of the Roses* (New Haven, 2010)
- Horrox, R., 'Edward IV', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2011)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/8520?docPos=2> [Accessed 22 June 2014]
- Horrox, R., 'Richard III', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2013)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/23500?docPos=1> [Accessed 22 June 2014]
- Horrox, R., 'John Neville, Marquess Montagu', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/19946/19946?back=,19955> [Accessed 6 May 2014]
- Jones, M., 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', *English Historical Review*, 114, 410, (1989) pp.285--307.
- Jones, M., *Bosworth, 1485* (Stroud, 2002)

Jones, M. K., 'Edmund Beaufort third duke of Somerset, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2009) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/1856?docPos=2> [Accessed 13 July 2014]

Jones, M. K., 'Henry Beaufort second duke of Somerset, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/1860?docPos=2> [Accessed 13 July 2014]

Keen, M., *Medieval warfare* (Oxford, 1999)

Kendall, P., *Warwick the kingmaker* (New York, 1957)

Kennedy, E. D., 'John Warkworth', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/28747> [Accessed 24 May 2014]

Manucy, A., *Artillery through the ages* (Washington, 1949)

McLachlan, S., *Medieval handgonnes* (Oxford, 2010)

McLaren, M. R., 'Robert Bale', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/1176?docPos=1> [Accessed 7 July 2014]

McLaren, M. R., 'Robert Fabyan', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/9054> [Accessed 6 May 2014]

McLaren, M., *The London chronicles of the fifteenth century* (Woodbridge, 2002)

Nicolle, D. and Hook, A., *European medieval tactics* (Oxford, 2011)

Orme, N., 'John Rous, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/24173?docPos=2> [Accessed 2 May 2014]

Orme, N., 'William Worcester', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2006) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/29967> [Accessed 22 May 2014]

Patterson, A., *Reading Holinshed's "Chronicles"* (Chicago, 1994)

Pollard, A. J., 'Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008) <http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/19954?docPos=4> [Accessed 6 May 2014]

Pollard, A. J., 'Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/19955?docPos=14> [Accessed 6 May 2014]

Pollard, A., *The reign of Henry the VII from contemporary sources* (London, 1913)

Pollard, A., *The Wars of the Roses* (New York, 1988)

Pollard, A., *Warwick the Kingmaker* (London, 2007)

Rees, D., *The son of prophecy* (London, 1985)

Richmond, C., 'Edmund Beaufort duke of Somerset, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/1855?docPos=1> [Accessed 2 July 2014]

Richmond, C., 'John Mowbray, third duke of Norfolk, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2012)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/19454?docPos=16> [Accessed 13 July 2014]

Ross, C., *Edward IV* (Berkeley, 1974)

Ross, C., *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1976)

Royle, T., *The wars of the roses* (London, 2010)

Sadler, J., *The red rose and the white* (Harlow, 2010)

Smith, R. and DeVries, K., *The artillery of the Dukes of Burgundy, 1363-1477* (Rochester, 2005)

Storey, R., 'Lincolnshire and the Wars of the Roses', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 14, 1, (1970)
pp.64--83.

Strickland, M. and Hardy, R., *The great warbow* (Stroud, 2005)

Summerson, H., 'John Hardying', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/12296?docPos=2> [Accessed 22 May 2014]

Summerson, H., 'Robin of Redesdale', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/23822?docPos=6> [Accessed 24 May 2014]

Thomson, J. A. F., 'Warkworth's Chronicle' Revisited', *The English Historical Review*, 116, 467 (2001), pp.657- 664

Tout, T., *Firearms in England in the fourteenth century* (London, 1968)

Twemlow, F., *The battle of Bloreheath* (Wolverhampton, 1912)

Veale, E., 'William Gregory', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2008)

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/11470?docPos=1> [Accessed 22 May 2014]

Visser- Fuchs, L., 'Jean de Waurin', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2004)

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/54420> [Accessed 24 May 2014]

Watts, J., 'Richard of York', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (2011)

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/view/article/23503?docPos=2> [Accessed 2 July 2014]

Williams, N., *The life and times of Henry VII* (London, 1973)

Younger, N., 'The Calais Garrison: War and Military Service in England, 1436—1558' *Book Review History*, 94, 316, pp.530--531.