

COURT CHIVALRY AND POLITICS:  
NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS TO THE ORDER OF THE GARTER:  
1461-83

A Ph.D. Dissertation

By

T. Tolga GUMUS

THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY  
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

APRIL 2007

*To Ekrem, Taskin, Ovgu and Orkun*

COURT CHIVALRY AND POLITICS:  
NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS TO THE ORDER OF THE GARTER:  
1461-83

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences  
of  
Bilkent University

By  
T. Tolga GUMUS

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in  
THE DEPARTMENT OF  
HISTORY  
BILKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

APRIL 2007

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

-----  
Assist. Prof. David E. Thornton  
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

-----  
Assist. Prof. Paul Latimer  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

-----  
Assist. Prof. Edward Kohn  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

-----  
Assist. Prof. Julian Bennett  
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

-----  
Assoc. Prof. Gümeç Karamuk  
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

-----  
Prof. Erdal Erel  
Director

## ABSTRACT

### **Court, Chivalry and Politics: Nominations and Elections to the Order of the**

### **Garter: 1461-83**

Gümüş, Tarık Tolga

Department of History

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. David E. Thornton

April 2007

This thesis discusses the probable causes behind the nominations and elections of the knights to the Order of the Garter during the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III. The Study argues that various considerations played role in the nominations of particular knights by different companions. The main concern of the Kings and the knights of the Order was the politics of the time in nominating a knight to the Order. Parental closeness and previous military success of the knight-candidates were also important in their decisions. This thesis also suggests that while Anstis's edition of *Liber Niger* is constantly used by the historians as the main primary source for the Order, another important register, the so-called French Register must be also taken into account when constructing Order's history. Chapter 1 is a general introduction to the history of the order, Chapter 2 discusses the main problems of the primary sources of the Order, Chapter 3 discusses the causes of the nominations and elections of the knights in Henry VI's time, Chapter IV discusses the causes of the nominations and elections of the knights during Edward IV and Richard III's time. Chapter V is conclusion.

**Keywords:** Chivalry, England, Order of the Garter.

## ÖZET

### Dizbağı Şovalyeliğine Adaylık ve Seçilme 1461-83

Gümüş, Tarık Tolga  
Department of History  
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. David E. Thornton  
April 2007

Bu çalışma VI. Henry IV. Edward ve III. Richard döneminde Dizbağı Şovalyeliğine aday gösterilen ve/veya seçilen şovalyelerin diğer üyeler tarafından aday gösterilmelerinin ve krallar tarafından seçilmelerinin ardında yatan nedenleri incelemektedir. Dönemin özel politik durumu, şovalyelerin birbirleriyle olan özel ve ailesel yakınlıkları, şovalyelerin geçmiş savaş kariyerlerindeki başarıları seçilmeleri ve aday gösterilmeleri için en önemli nedenlerdir. Bu tez ayrıca bu zamana kadar tarihçiler için temel kaynak olarak kabul edilen Anstis in edisyonu *Liber Niger* in sağladığı bilginlerin zaman zaman yanlış olabileceği ve *French Register* isimli alternatif kaynağında da bundan sonraki Dizbağı şovalyeliği çalışmalarında dikkate alınması gerektiğini iddia etmektedir. Birinci ünite Dizbağı şovalyeliği tarihine kısa bir bakıştır. İkinci ünite tarihsel kaynak sorununu işlemektedir. Üçüncü ünite VI. Henry dönemindeki aday gösterilme ve seçilme nedenlerini işlemektedir. Dördüncü ünite IV. Edward ve III. Richard dönemindeki aday gösterilme ve seçilme nedenlerini işlemektedir son ünite sonuçtur.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Şovalyelik İngiltere Dizbağı Şovalyeliği.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge David E. Thornton, Paul Latimer and Lisa Jefferson for their precious comments and suggestions for this study. I also owe special thanks to Catherine Keats-Rohan from Oxford University, Linacre College, unit for Prosopographical Research, and Eleanor Crancknell, Asistant Archivist in St. George Chapel and Chapter Library in Windsor. I would also like to thank to Nimet Kaya. All errors are mine.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ÖZET .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
CHAPTER I: GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....	1
I.1 Historical Background: .....	5
I.2 A Brief Outline of The Order of the Garter and its History: .....	12
I.3 Nomination Process: .....	18
I.4 Previous Studies of the Order of the Garter .....	23
CHAPTER II: EVALUATION OF THE PRIMARY SOURCES.....	34
II.1 The Registers of The Order of the Garter, 1422-85 .....	38
II.2 The Types of Differences: .....	42
II.2.1 Ashmole 1128 and <i>Liber Niger</i> Compared: .....	42
II.3 Edward IV .....	60
II.3.1 Differences of Names in the Scrutinies: .....	60
CHAPTER III: NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS TO THE ORDER OF THE GARTER DURING THE REIGN OF HENRY VI .....	68
III.1 Introduction .....	68
CHAPTER IV: THE ELECTIONS AND NOMINATIONS DURING THE REIGN OF EDWARD IV .....	127
IV.1 Introduction.....	127
IV.2 The First Reign of Edward IV .....	128



IV.3 Edward's Second Reign.....	138
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	217
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	225
APPENDIX: NOMINATIONS TO THE ORDER.....	240

# CHAPTER I

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The history of the Order of the Garter as well as its institutional structure has long been a topic of concern for historians. Nevertheless, recent scholarship especially in the medieval history of the fraternity has remained largely focused on explaining the politics behind the Order such as the sovereign's motives for electing individual knight-companions, and the changing nature of the Order due to the character of the kings and their attitudes to the English nobility. However individual knight-companion's regard of the nobility has been neglected; a detailed analysis of the process of nomination is thus still missing. This study aims to reverse this neglect: thus instead of the king's purpose in choosing particular knights, it focuses on an analysis of the companions' motives for nominating individual knights. By doing so, a fuller understanding of the inner dynamics of the Order and of the English peerage may be acquired. Probable repeating nomination patterns are classified during the reigns of Henry VI and Edward IV and change of attitudes between members in nominating new nominees are compared. Hence my focus will be on the possible changes originating from the differing attitudes of individual knights instead of the character of kings.

After giving a brief account of the Order and a survey of the former historiography in the Garter studies in the first chapter, the second chapter will analyze the problem(s) of Order's own sources, which is to-date a neglected topic. Sometimes the differences between the Order's registers are significant thus necessitating an elaborate analysis of two extant registers, especially in determining which nominee a particular knight companion had nominated to the king's attention. Accordingly the differences between Ashmole's copy of the Old *French Register* (hereafter FR) and Anstis's copy of *Liber Niger* (Hereafter LN) are elaborated. Although there are substantial differences in any part between these two registers, the focus will be in the discrepancies between the nomination lists of the individual knights. However, sometimes the registers especially Ashmole's copy of the Old *French Register* give some further information which may substantially increase our knowledge of the Garter's medieval history. Those extra information provided by any registers will also be discussed.

The third chapter will examine the nominations to the Order of the Garter during the reign of Henry VI. The regular and consistent nomination of political 'new comers' will be discussed in accordance with the politics of the time. The first topic is to analyze how and to what extent the political dominance of the Duke of Somerset between 1443-7 affected the nomination lists in general and elections of the Order. We shall see his political allies were regularly nominated to the Order those who were already members of the fraternity. Next, I will examine the influence of the political dispute between the Duke of York, and the Duke of Suffolk in the nomination lists. The nominations of the so-called 'Warrior' councilor's and war leaders such as Sir John Wenlock and Tomas Kiriell will also be discussed.

Warwick's control in the nomination lists for which only one scrutiny is available, will be analyzed briefly.

The fourth chapter will focus on the nominations during the reign of Edward IV. Since most of the surviving scrutiny lists (i.e. votes of individual knight companions to the king's attention whenever a new knight had to be elected to the membership of the Order) belong to Edward's second reign, the dominance of the so-called Court Party, the Woodvilles, Herberts, and Staffords, in Garter nomination lists will be discussed. It is again suggested that the Woodvilles dominated the Garter nominations, and their admittance and approval by the old nobility will be underlined. The traces of the dispute between Richard the Duke of Gloucester vs. his brother the Duke Clarence will be examined. The change of attitudes from warrior councilors to political councilors will be clarified. The possible causes of the differences of the number of knights participating to the sessions will be explained. In Edward's second reign the participation is substantially high. This chapter will also look at to individual minor names but whose value in their service to the English crown was undisputable, such as Sir Thomas Burgh, an influential gentlemen, Sir John Huddleston, a local notable, Sir John Donne, an important soldier.

A full list of companions' votes is given in the Appendix. All the scrutinies and all the companions are included in the list. The first column gives the date a particular scrutiny was submitted to the king's attention; and the second column records the relevant page(s) in Anstis's edition of the *Liber Niger*. The third column is the name or title of the knight companion who was present at that particular voting session. The fourth column shows the rank of a particular knight nominated in a particular position. The scrutinies are divided into three main parts and in each part three ranks were also available. The first rank means the nominee belonged to the

highest class in the society. Each companion had to nominate three people in the noble rank. These were the kings of various countries, the dukes, marquesses, earls or viscounts. All these names were nominated by the members in the first rank. The second rank was composed of the lords and the last rank was composed of gentlemen. The following column shows the name of the nominee nominated by the particular knight companion. In this way it is possible to determine who nominated whom in a particular session. The following column shows the social status of a particular nominee in the nomination list of a particular knight in the session meeting in question. If the order of an earl is 'one' in the table then it means this particular earl was the highest person in the nomination list of that particular knight companion in that particular session. The names of each nominee were written down by considering his social status with respect to other nominees of a particular knight companion. If a member was to nominate a king, a duke and a earl at the same time, first, the name of the king was written into his scrutiny, then the name of the duke and lastly the name of the earl. Accordingly the king would be in the first order, the duke in the second order and the earl in the third order. The last column shows whether that particular nominee was elected or not in that particular election meeting.

This study has two main theses. The first is that the Order's own sources are problematic. The official register of the Order survived in two versions and there are a great many differences between these two texts. Although one tends to be superior, both extant registers give valuable information for the history of the fraternity. Accordingly any attempt at reconstructing the Garter's history must take both accounts into consideration and weigh their conflicting testimony carefully. The second thesis is that politics played a major role in both the elections and nominations to the Order. Although other considerations, such as blood relationship

with the royal family and heroic achievements in the wars, were still effective in one's nomination to the companionship, the kings and the real focuses of power, such as William de la Pole, and Richard Neville, considered the politics of the situation more than anything else in the election of the new knights to the Order. Accordingly nominations to the Order by other companions were similarly important because they usually nominated their own political allies.

### **I.1 Historical Background:**

The Wars of the Roses was one of the most turbulent periods of the English history.<sup>1</sup> The Island witnessed a number of major fights between the great magnates for political power. The main question was who was to become the king and which magnate would support which potential candidate to the kingship. The years immediately after Henry VI took the throne in 1422 were quite unstable for the English monarchy. Henry indeed had to face a number of problems. The most important of these problems was an inherent problem of the English monarchy throughout the middle ages. Different factions among the nobility were struggling for power and this time a faction of the nobility became favourite of Henry, Edmund Beaufort, 2nd Duke of Somerset and William de la Pole, 1st Duke of Suffolk, were the new favourites of the King and they were blamed by the other factions of the nobility for administering the government improperly. In addition to that the Hundred Years' War with France was continuing and England was evidently losing

---

<sup>1</sup> For some general accounts see for example: Desmond Seward, *The Wars of the Roses, and the Lives of Five Men and Women in the Fifteenth Century* (London 1995); John Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses: Peace and Conflict in Fifteenth-century England* (London 1990); J R, Lander, *Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth-century England* (London, 1977).

the war. In Henry VI's period, almost all English holdings in France were lost. Both the mismanagement of Henry's councilors and his defeat in the French war decreased the value of Henry in the eyes of his subjects. In addition, he had a severe mental illness which sometimes prevented him from ruling properly. Sometimes his mental illness was so severe that he occasionally completely lost consciousness. Accordingly by the 1450s, the resentments against Henry's regime grew still stronger. Moreover, the important decisions within the kingdom were already taken by his advisors and not, or seldom by the king himself.

The rival faction noble group, the house of York which would take up the throne some ten years later, started to boost up the fragile situation and raised the question of legitimacy of the kingship under this particular situation of Henry VI, and the chief of the House of York Richard, duke of York raised the argument that in fact he must have been the rightful candidate to the throne. This further weakened the situation of Henry, and the political situation was much more fragile than ever before. Moreover the political problem was not only at the top of the society. Different noble families engaged in private feuds with each other and they seldom considered the royal authority.<sup>2</sup> The Percy-Neville feud was the best-known of these private wars, and there were many others in various places of the kingdom. For example, another less important event was the feud between the Courtenays and Bonnevilles in Cornwall. Nominations and elections to the Order of the Garter reflected these tensions within the society.

---

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed analysis of the political picture see for example Joel Thomas Rosenthal, *Patriarchy and Families of Privilege in Fifteenth-century England* (Philadelphia, 1991); Ernest Fraser Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485* (Oxford, New York, 1993).

1453 is a key date because at this year Henry's mental disorder appeared. He collapsed mentally, probably because of the difficulties he faced in ruling the difficult situation. The consequence of this event further complicated the political scene. A Council of Regency was set up, and Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York is declared as the Lord Protector. As an evidence demonstrating the rivalry between competing noble factions, Richard imprisoned Somerset, Henry's chief councilor and backed his allies, Salisbury and Warwick, in a series of minor conflicts with powerful supporters of Henry, such as the Dukes of Northumberland. At that time both Richard and Somerset were related to the Order. The political situation became still more complicated when Henry was recovered in 1455. Who was to be the king and whose legitimate right was to be so? Richard and his allies wanted the kingdom, but Henry and queen, Margaret of Anjou's allies were not keen on leaving the throne to Richard. Once Margaret realized that Richard was becoming a serious threat, she decided to take the political control. In a sense her allies welcomed her leadership. Lancastrians and Yorkists were about to start to fight.<sup>3</sup> Thus the First Battle of St Albans broke in 1455. This was a civil war, though by no means the decisive battle between these two conflicting noble factions. The Lancastrians were defeated, and the duke of Somerset died. York and his allies started to rule the kingdom by that time. Furthermore, Henry mentally collapsed again, and York was once more appointed Protector. After 1455 York remained the dominant political figure on the Council even after Henry's recovery. The next question was who would rule England after Henry VI's death. There were unfortunately two candidates: Anjou's son

---

<sup>3</sup> Still of interest *Fifteenth-Century Attitudes: Perceptions of Society in Late Medieval England* ed. by Rosemary Horrox (Cambridge, 1994); *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509: Studies in Politics and Society* ed. by S.B. Chrimes, C.D. Ross and R.A. Griffiths (Stroud, 1997).



Edward, who was in fact the legitimate king, and of worse the duke of York himself. At this period, two other political figures who would affect the future ten years of English throne perhaps more than the Kings Henry VI and Edward IV were coming to the scene: the new Duke of Somerset was emerging as a favourite of the royal court after his father, while on the other hand, York's ally, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick 'The Kingmaker'.<sup>4</sup>

In 1459, Richard Plantagenet returned from the lieutenancy of Ireland to England. This again strengthened the old hostilities between the rival factions and Lancastrians and Yorkists fought again.<sup>5</sup> At the same year therefore, the Battle of Blore Heath in Staffordshire occurred when Lord Salisbury the chief of the Neville family, and the relative of the kingmaker, was the chief commander of the Lancastrian army. He was unable to stop the Yorkist forces. Later at the same year the Battle of Ludford Bridge, broke and this time Lancastrians won the battle. Since Richard Neville the kingmaker was a Yorkist supporter, he had to flee to France.<sup>6</sup>

There he collected further military forces and one year later in 1460, the earl of Warwick went back to England to fight at the Battle of Northampton, on July 10, 1460. This battle was a clear victory for the Yorkists. The Kingmaker then captured Henry and took him prisoner. The Yorkists were now much more stronger than ever.<sup>7</sup> York now moved to press his claim to the throne based on the illegitimacy of the Lancastrian line. Landing in north Wales, he and his wife Cecily entered London, and Parliament was assembled. Richard announced his claim to the

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example, Paul Murray Kendall, *Warwick the Kingmaker* (London, 1985); A. M. Hicks, *Warwick, the Kingmaker* (Malden, 1998).

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed analysis of the politics of the situation see Ralph Alan, Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1991).

<sup>6</sup> Hicks, *Warwick, the Kingmaker*, p. 99.

<sup>7</sup> *Crown, Government and People in the Fifteenth Century* ed. by Rowena E. Archer (York, 1995).

throne, but the Lords, even Warwick and Salisbury, did not like the idea. However, in October 1460 the Act of Accord was passed by the Parliament which recognised Richard as Henry's successor, disinheriting the later Edward IV. York accepted this offer. But the Act of Accord proved unacceptable to the Lancastrians. Margaret thus formed a large army in the north. Richard was defeated at the Battle of Wakefield. He was slain in the battle, and Salisbury and Richard's son, Edmund, Earl of Rutland, were captured and beheaded. Thus Edward, Earl of March, York's eldest son, as Duke of York became heir to the throne. Salisbury's death left Warwick, his heir, the biggest landowner in England. At the Second Battle of St Albans, the Queen won the Lancastrians' most decisive victory yet, and as the Yorkist forces fled they left behind King Henry.

Edward was crowned king of England. However, this coronation was not a genuine one because unless Henry and Margaret were executed or exiled he would not be accounted for a legitimate king in every sense of the word. The problems of English monarchy did not come to an end easily therefore. Edward and Warwick made an alliance and started to prepare a military campaign towards the north of England.<sup>8</sup> As we shall see throughout the thesis, the northern problem persisted even until the end of Edward IV's reign. Therefore the Yorkist and Lancastrian armies met at Towton, which was the biggest battle of the Wars of the Roses.<sup>9</sup> The Yorkists, that is to say Edward and his major ally earl of Warwick, won a decisive victory. Since the Lancastrians were defeated Henry and Margaret had to flee further north. It is also surprising to see that many of the surviving Lancastrian nobles switched

---

<sup>8</sup> Hicks, *Warwick, the Kingmaker*, p. 109.

<sup>9</sup> Seward, *The Wars of the Roses, and the Lives of Five Men and Women in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 81.

allegiance to King Edward, as we shall also see some of them were at least nominated to the Order of the Garter.

Therefore Edward IV was crowned again this time officially in June 1461 in London. Since there were no serious threat within the realm He was able to rule in *relative* peace for ten years. That does not necessarily mean that Edward was in total control of every political situation and nothing went wrong. First of all as we shall see the alliance between Edward and Warwick was quite fragile and anything which would cause the resentment of Warwick would bring the end of the alliance. And the alliance came to an end expectedly. The political situation in North was now even much more complicated and fragile. A number of castles such as Dunstanburgh, Alnwick, Bamburgh, and Harlech in Wales, were surrendered as late as 1468. The King Henry was captured by his in 1465 and held prisoner at the Tower of London. Even if the Lancasterians were seriously defeated, their revolt did not come to an end easily. In 1464, we see the first was the Battle of Hedgeley Moor and the second at the Battle of Hexham. Both revolts were put down by Warwick's brother, John Neville, 1st Marquess of Montagu who was later elected to the Order of the Garter.

Immediately after the Lancastrian revolts were suppressed, another problem emerged. The political relationship between Edward and Warwick was in decline especially during the years 1467-70.<sup>10</sup> There may be many reasons for this decline, but as far as the historians believe the most important one was Edward's decision to marry Elizabeth Woodville in a secret ceremony in 1464. This marriage spoiled Warwick's plans completely. He in fact had been planning a political marriage between the king Edward IV and a French bride, since Neville thought that

---

<sup>10</sup> Hicks, *Warwick, the Kingmaker*, p. 101.

England was in need of an alliance with France. This marriage brought about something worse for the whole Neville household. They were without question the most influential noble family within England after the royal household. But things started to change in a negative way for the Neville household. A new household the Woodvilles, came to be favoured over the Nevilles at court. As we shall see, throughout a time period of twenty or so years the Woodvilles would be the most dominant household in England. On the other hand, although the reasons is not known by me, Edward preferred an alliance with Burgundy over France, and Edward did not like the idea of his brothers George, Duke of Clarence, and Richard, Duke of Gloucester, marrying Warwick's daughters, Isabel and Anne Neville.<sup>11</sup> Perhaps Edward did not like Nevilles and his relationship with them was only political. Another option is of course the probability that Edward resented the power the Nevilles acquired by their political rise.

Richard Neville must have been aware of these threats and was prepared to fight for securing his formal strong position. Accordingly by 1469 Warwick had formed an alliance with Edward's brother George against Edward IV. They raised an army which defeated the King at the Battle of Edgecote Moor, and held Edward at Middleham Castle in Yorkshire. Warwick executed the queen's father, Richard Woodville, 1st Earl Rivers, who was once nominated to the ranks of the Order. The aim of Warwick was to make George, Duke of Clarence the new king of England and in order to do so he was trying to convince Edward IV. However, Edward had also his own supporters the most important of them was his other brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester, the future king of England as Richard III. By means of

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 111.

Richard's help. Edward secured himself. Expectedly Richard Neville and the duke of Clarence were declared traitors and they went to France in 1470. Five years later England and France would start to another war partly because of the inner disputes of English monarchy.

Margaret of Anjou was already in France and negotiating with Louis XI of France about their possible plans to invade England. Margaret's aim was to free her captive husband Henry VI from prison and declare him the King of England. Since Warwick was also resenting Edward, a war with France. Warwick had already invaded from France, and his plan was to liberate and restore Henry VI to the throne. Henry VI was restored king in October and Edward and Richard were proclaimed traitors. This time Edward and Gloucester had to flee to Holland and exile in Burgundy. Edward's Burgundian alliance was established because at this time Charles the Bold of Burgundy assisted Edward in 1471. Another war was inevitable. Edward defeated Warwick at the Battle of Barnet in 1471. Lancastrian forces were destroyed at the Battle of Tewkesbury, and Prince Edward of Westminster, the Lancastrian heir to the throne, was killed. Henry VI was murdered in May 14, 1471. After that period Edward ruled quite a stable kingdom. The only political consideration was the Northern problem. Elections and nominations to the Order of the Garter were affected by this stability.

## **I.2 A Brief Outline of The Order of the Garter and its History:**

Their triumph eek and martial glory;  
Which unto him is more parfyt richesse,

Than any might imagine or can gesse.<sup>12</sup>

The Most Noble Order of St. George of the Garter, the most distinguished and exclusive of the British chivalric Orders still active today was created somewhere in the years 1346-51 by Edward III possibly in order to praise the deeds of his close companions in the wars against France though the exact reason of its foundation by Edward III is still a matter of debate.<sup>13</sup> The Order was initially composed of and limited to twenty-six companions (including the King as the patron of the Order, and the Prince of Wales) who were by no means exclusively the members of the highest peerage, being at the top of the social hierarchy, but Edward III's and Edward the Black Prince's companions-at-arms in the battle of Crécy.<sup>14</sup> This limitation of the membership to the companionship to the Order remained unchanged throughout the Middle Ages. Accordingly, since its nature was highly exclusive, the fraternity soon asserted itself as the most eminent symbol of the traditional ideal of knightly vocation and a sophisticated means of patronage within the network of complex noble alliance of late Middle Ages. Membership to the Order was a matter of great honor for its members. The Order's formal celebration day is 23 April, the holy day

---

<sup>12</sup> *The Flower and the Leaf*, in *Chaucerian and Other Pieces*, (ed.) Skeat, 377, II. 523-5, cited in H. E. L. Collins, *The Order of the Garter 1348-1461, Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2000), p. 285.

<sup>13</sup> The foundation date and the Edward III's probable aim of creating such an Order is still a matter of debate, for a recent discussion see for example, Scott L. Waugh, *England in the reign of Edward III* (Cambridge; New York, 1991), and W. M. Ormrod, *Political life in medieval England, 1300-1450* (New York, 1995) and Richard W., Barber, *Edward, Prince of Wales and Aquitaine : a biography of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1996) and *The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince: From Contemporary Letters, Diaries and Chronicles, Including Chandos Herald's Life of the Black Prince*, ed. Richard W. Barber, (Rochester, 1997) or for an early account of Garter 'legend' i.e. the possible underlying motives for Edward III to create the Order of the Garter with reference to 'Round Table Legend' see *Thomas Bulfinch, Mythology: The age of fable, The age of chivalry, Legends of Charlemagne* (New York, 1970), and for a general account of the Order with respect to the secular chivalric Orders see Maurice Hugh Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven, 1984).

<sup>14</sup> W. M., Ormrod, *The Reign of Edward III: Crown and Political Society in England, 1327-1377* (New Haven, 1990).

of its patron saint St. George.<sup>15</sup> The institution of the Order as a whole is a much more complex structure with its prelates, Chancellor, Garter-king of Arms, and other officers. Their particular duties and ceremonial requirements became neatly organized by the end of the Middle Ages.<sup>16</sup> The motto of the Order is as enigmatic as its foundation date and reason: “Honi soit qui mal y pense”.<sup>17</sup> One explanation for the selection of this motto by Edward III is that he might have probably intended to send an implicit message to the King of France reminding him of his *admitted* wish to the French throne. The other possibility is coming from a narrative account which states that when a garter of a noble lady (probably Joan, Countess of Salisbury, who was thought to be the king’s mistress, or Queen Philippa or Joan, later the wife of the king’s eldest son, Edward the Black Prince) fell down from her leg to the ground in a royal ceremony probably at Calais, the young King Edward took it from the floor and tied it to his own leg. This in turn, created a rumorous reaction from the public. In response to this, Edward replied back to the public with this famous motto meaning he is not particularly interested to this lady.

Although the Order was initially established to praise the martial deeds of a selective group of aristocrats, its attributed honorific distinction far more exceeded its initial ethos setting a firm bridge between landed aristocracy and warfare-spirited figures of chivalry though in some politically unstable years of the English medieval

---

<sup>15</sup> For a detailed discussion in the particular ceremonies to be held at this formal celebration day, see: Elias Ashmole, *Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most noble Order of the Garter* (London 1971). last section in Chapter 7.

<sup>16</sup>For a detailed account of the functions of the officers appointed to the service of the Order, the prelate of the Order: his oath, Robe and privileges, the duties of the Chancellors, his institution, his oath, Robe, Badge and pension, the registers’ oath, mantle, badge and privileges, Garter’s institution , his oath, Mantle, badge and privileges and the institution of the Black Rod’s office and the payment of the officer’s pensions upon the new establishment and the execution of the offices by the deputies see: Ashmole, *Institution*, chapter 8.

<sup>17</sup> ‘Honi soit qui mal y pense’: ‘Evil to him who thinks evil’.

history, the character of the Order was more bifurcated as rival political factions also became enrolled within the membership of the Order. Parallel with the patronal policy of the English crown, the Order served the kingdom to create necessary noble alliances both domestically and internationally as well as helping to set diplomatic ties with other foreign rulers such as Emperor Sigismund, Eric VII, king of Denmark, Alphonso V, king of Portugal, and Francesco Sforza, duke of Milan.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, the usefulness of this mechanism is disputable as to whether Garter companionship helped to solve international problems in actual political practice at all.

As a curial form of alliance, the character of the Order was shaped largely (but not completely) by the peculiar personalities of the monarchs and the particular political circumstances of the time. Under relatively more bellicose kings such as Edward III, Henry V or Edward IV, the membership of the institution was determined more with regard to their success in their expeditions to France than formal necessities of diligence-in-arms, loyalty and gentility of birth.<sup>19</sup> In Richard II and Henry IV's time, in accordance with the domestic political troubles, as it was the case for Richard II's need to enforce his personal government and free himself from parliament, and Henry IV's desire for dynastic loyalty especially in the period of Bolingbroke's exile in France, the election to the Order went much more in accordance with the nominees' allegiance to the monarchs instead of rebelling nobles in solving internal disputes. Then in Henry VI's period, the Order saw perhaps one of its worst crises of its history. Political fragmentation severely damaged the inner

---

<sup>18</sup> I am not aware of any particular study dealing with the diplomatic role of the Order, except Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, last chapter.

<sup>19</sup> C. T. Allmand, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War, c. 1300-1450* (Cambridge; New York, 1991).



solidarity of the fraternity and after Edward IV took the throne, Garter companionship became much more stable especially throughout Edward's second reign. In both Henry VI and Edward VI's time, political and curial considerations rather than heroic achievements in the war were the key factors for both elections of the companions by the kings (or the real focuses of power such as Suffolk and York) and nominations of new knights by the current members to the Order. However, another shift of emphasis may have happened in the nature of the Order when Richard III, himself a chivalric figure in the eyes of many of his contemporaries, may have intended<sup>20</sup> a revival of martial prowess in Garter elections in a time when previous nominees were tending to be more curial in character.<sup>21</sup>

Influenced by the romantic considerations of the Arthurian legends,<sup>22</sup> the Order of the Garter reflected throughout the Middle Ages, the ultimate ideal of the chivalric aspirations of the English nobility with its ornate ceremonial activities<sup>23</sup> in Westminster Abbey and sophisticated habits of its rituals, in an age when landed aristocracy was in decline due to the gradual decrease of the seigniorial incomes from land and the growing confidence of the gentry mercantile class were beginning to challenge the inherent pre-eminence of the martial aristocracy. Noblest honour, and its pompous recognition thus, was the only distinguishing principle of the elites

---

<sup>20</sup> There is only one scrutiny list surviving from his short reign, and that list is only available in one of the Order's official registers, the *Liber Niger*, but not available in the so-called 'French Register'. (Detailed information about these registers will be given in the following chapter.) Thus a firm conclusion about the exact character of the Order in Richard III's time is difficult.

<sup>21</sup> For a discussion of the 'warrior' character of Richard III and his possible understanding of chivalry, see Keith Dockray, *Richard III: A Source Book* (Gloucestershire, 1997).

<sup>22</sup> For a detailed discussion see Ashmole, *Institution*, chapter 1.

<sup>23</sup> For a detailed account of the significance of the habits and ensigns of the Order, the ritual significance of for instance, the garter, the mantle, the surcoat, the hood and the cap, the robes which are supposed to be 'anciently assigned to the queen and the great ladies', the collars in general and the collars of the Order in particular and occasions when and in what manner the habit or part of it ought to be worn see: Ashmole, *Institution*, chapter 7.

as grants of annuities, pensions, offices, and other patronal demarcation marks were no more in society's focus.

In 1786, King George III added four extra Garter stalls to the choir of St. George chapel and ordered that all the descendents of the sovereign be accepted to the membership in addition to twenty-four original members. In 1805, lineal descendents of George II were accepted as the member of the Order. By 1832, all direct descendents of George I have been accepted to the Order. From Edward III's time, ladies were accepted to the Order as 'honorary members'. Henry VIII ended this practice,<sup>24</sup> and in Edward VII's time, it was decided that the King's Consort was automatically a 'Lady of the Garter'. The first admission of 'lady companion' to the Order occurred in 1990 with the admission of Lavinia, Duchess of Norfolk. Foreign royal members are appointed as "Extra Knights and Ladies of the Garter" in addition to the original twenty-six knight companions. The Order was exclusively male (except, of course, for the occasional Queens) until 1901, when King Edward VII re-established the old practice and declared his wife Queen Alexandra a 'Lady of the Garter'. Again in King George V's time his consort Queen Mary is chosen as a Lady of the Garter and subsequently King George VI followed this practice and accordingly made his consort Queen Elizabeth also a Lady of the Garter.

Members were *chosen* to the confraternity by the monarch alone until the end of the 18th century. Then by 1806, the government in Parliament suggested members to the monarch. In 1862, Queen Victoria ended the practice of nominations and elections have been since then made by the King or Queen alone without any nomination. Today, the medieval character of the Order is no more a current issue. In

---

<sup>24</sup> R. B. Waddington, 'Elizabeth I and the Order of the Garter' *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XXIV/1 1993, pp. 254-75.

1946, since the Order played no more a political role, the authority to elect new members to the Garter was returned to the sovereign without government interference. The membership in the Order today thus fills its original role as a mark of royal favour in solely honorific basis. Different from the middle ages, in which the main virtue to be elected to the Order was at least in theory highest chivalric quality, the virtues of today's Garter knights are much more civic: meritorious public service, 'contributions to the nation', or simply as reward for personal service to the monarch. Another difference in the basic structure happened in modern times when women were admitted to the full membership of the Order by a statute decreed in 1987. Refrained from all political and functional calculations, its current status is exclusively 'honorific', in modern standards, and, the title 'the knight of the Garter', 'KG' is the most prestigious honorific title of the United Kingdom as the Order itself is an honorific Order similar to other honorific Orders of the most ancient and noble Order of the Thistle, the Order of Merit, the royal Victorian Order, Order of the Bath, Order of St. Michel and St. George, Order of the British Empire, Order of the Companions of Honour, or Imperial Service Order.

### **I.3 Nomination Process:**

The registers of the Order of the Garter contain three broad categories of information: the formal attendance lists of companions for the chapter meetings (sometimes with additional remarks for explaining the particular situation of companions), records of irregular happenings concerning a miscellanea of details and the lists of scrutinies ie. votes of the companions to be submitted to the king when a new member had to be elected. There are separate entries for each routine note of

each session meeting. The information for the records of each annual meeting usually starts with the regnal year of the session month day and year. Then the names of the companions are listed as well as those of the prelates of the order, indicating whether they were present or absent. If they were absent, the reason for absence is briefly explained and sometimes the fines according to the statutes are noted. The registers then describe the decisions taken (if any) during those sessions and quote any new statutes. They also name any newly elected knight(s), and the stalls to which they are installed, as well as empty stalls due to the death of a knight-companion, and special envoys sent to the stranger knights. Sometimes particular messages of the kings are also added. The scrutinies are the lists of the votes of each knight companion to be submitted to the King. Whenever a new knight had to be elected to the fraternity, an election meeting had to take place. The election session could be done anywhere in any date. The only necessary condition was the King's will. After the election session, the registrar of the Order wrote in the register those scrutinies for each individual knight companion who participated in the election session.

In some of the sessions, when it has been decided that a new knight have to be chosen, the scrutinies ie. the votes of each individual knight companion who participated to the election session and gave votes to nine different knights to be elected to the order are given. The election of a knight to the order is made via the election chapter, which may theoretically take place anywhere. At least six companions must be present in order an election to take place. Each present companion has to nominate a total of nine candidates to the king's attention. It was only the king who was to chose the knight to the fraternity and the king has to chose among those names only. Conventionally, the structure of the scrutiny is divided into three separate parts equal in number according to the rank of the nominees. That is to

say, in the first rank, the companions are to nominate three names belonging to the highest peerage, although there are exceptions. In the second part, usually, lords are nominated and in the last rank there are bannarets, knights, esquires and gentlemen. In each of them there are three different knights. Later in Elisabeth I' reign it has been decided

*that if any Nominations were taken from the Knights-Companions, the same should be entered in the Annales, though there were no Election made of any person into the Order at that time.* Which we suppose so decreed, out of great respect to those *Princes* and, Noble *Personages*, who in the future times should by the glory their actions appear but worthy the honour of *Nomination* into so illustrious an *Order*.<sup>25</sup>

There are two interesting things in this above quotation. First: we see the same was true in Richard III's time. There is a scrutiny, which followed no election but still registered to the *register*.<sup>26</sup> Second, this concept of the 'worth of nomination into so illustrious an order' may be the reason behind some of the nominees appearing in the lists, and the importance given to regularly registering the scrutinies by Henry VI's time may well be because of the same motive. Possibly then, since there are scrutinies surviving from 1440s, those concepts of 'great respect' and 'perpetual memorial' were the case in Henry VI's time. One other function of the scrutinies then was to fulfill "the perpetual memorial", of the important knights. At least we know that this was the case in Elisabeth 22: the Blue Book "*That the Chancellor himself delivered the Knights-Companions Votes to the Register, to be committed to writing, for a perpetual memorial;...*".<sup>27</sup>

One good example supporting the fact that the elections were not completely under the control of sovereign is that although in some scrutinies even if

---

<sup>25</sup> Ashmole, p. 292. Author's italics, the majuscule letters are exactly in that order.

<sup>26</sup> My italics, Anstis, pp. 217-20.

<sup>27</sup> Cited in Ashmole, p. 292. the author's italics and form of writing.

a nominee takes only one vote is chosen<sup>28</sup>, some other scrutinies did not end up with an election. That is to say no election took place after King evaluated the names available in the scrutinies and decided that none of them were suitable to the election to the order for whatever reason.<sup>29</sup>

There are a number of occasions in which we know that scrutinies were created but not recorded to the registers. For example for the record of 1425, it is certain that the duke of Burgundy was ‘nominated’ by the companions. Because while LN is silent, FR states that the dean of Windsor and Register of the order wrote down the votes but the scrutiny did not survive.<sup>30</sup> In another instance, it is stated in LN that both Sir John Fastolf and Sir John Ratclyf took equal number of votes but king chose Sir John Fastolf to the stall of Henry Lord Fytzhugh in 1426.<sup>31</sup> In 1427 again, The King of Portugal’s son the duke of Quinbery is chosen to the stall of Prince, Thomas Duke of Exeter. However the scrutiny of this event is also lost.<sup>32</sup> Still, in 1429, earl of Stafford and Sir John Radcliff are chosen to the stalls of Thomas Earl of Salisbury, and Thomas Darpyngham, but no scrutiny survived.<sup>33</sup>

In the following case, the scrutiny is said to be taken (but did not survive) in possibly in an unconventional way: In 1436, two stalls were vacant by the death of Henry, duke of Buckingham, the register therefore wrote down several voices in a scrutiny, and having wrote them delivered them to the sovereign. *ideo Scriba Singularum vocum in Scrutinio notas exscripsit & excriptas Supremo detulit.* The

---

<sup>28</sup> In Henry VI’s time, there is such an instance but I don’t remember it which one.

<sup>29</sup> For a general discussion and what happened after Emperor Sisismund’s death see Ashmole, pp. 294-5. for other example in Richard III’s time see Anstis, pp. 217-20,

<sup>30</sup> Anstis, p. 88; Ashmole, p. 282; FR., p.?

<sup>31</sup> Anstis, p. 96.

<sup>32</sup> Anstis, p. 100.

<sup>33</sup> Anstis, p. 103.

King chose the earl of Morteyne and Sir John Gray.<sup>34</sup> Another possible unconventional way occurred in 1432:

...the register in the prelates (sic) absence took the scrutiny, writing down the sentiments and votes of the persons present, for the choice of a brave knight to succeed the noble lewis[lord Boucher Chamberlain]" ....that John Earl of Arundel is to be chosen: *In absentia praelati Scrutinium Scriba subiit, consulta praesentium ac vota describens, in istam perstrenui Militis electionem nomili Lodovico...*<sup>35</sup>

There are also a number of cases where we know that an election occurred but there is no direct reference to the word scrutiny. In those examples, one can only guess whether a scrutiny was taken or the election is made simply by the king: for example in 1438, the duke of Austria is chosen to the stall of Emperor Sigismund, LN says that an election took place but there is no direct reference to a scrutiny neither in LN nor in FR.<sup>36</sup> Sometimes we know that some sort of an election took place but there is an indirect reference to a scrutiny. In 1435, for example, the eldest son (now king) of the King of Portugal was elected to the stall of the King of Portugal. The *votes* are *considered* by the king but no any direct reference to the word scrutiny.<sup>37</sup> In 1438, Albert the duke of Austria was chosen. Both LN and FR state that an election took place but again there is no direct reference to a scrutiny.<sup>38</sup>

Surviving evidence suggests that the regulation of Article 19, relating to the necessary number of members for an election to occur was followed carefully. There had been a number of cases where the elections were cancelled due to the insufficient number of members available for making an election chapter. It is interesting to note that those cases did mostly happen in Henry VI's time in accordance with the

---

<sup>34</sup> Anstis pp. 116-117.

<sup>35</sup> Anstis, p. 110.

<sup>36</sup> Anstis, p. 119; *FR.*, fo. 62v.

<sup>37</sup> Anstis, p. 114.

<sup>38</sup> Anstis, p. 119; *FR.*, fo. 62v.

political climax of the period. On the other hand in Edward IV's time since the political stability was much more acquired, there is only one instance. In 1431, there was a stall vacant in the companionship by the death of Sir Lewis Robertsacke. Since there was insufficient number of members the election is cancelled according to the statutes. Anstis refers to the statute of Edward III's time, but Jefferson showed that the old belief that the first statute of the Order of the Garter must have been produced in Edward III's time as soon as the order was founded is untenable. According to her, the first statute of the order is prorogued much more later in 1415.<sup>39</sup> In 1435 two stalls were vacant by the deaths of the emperor Sigismund and Lord Willoughby, but since there was insufficient number of members the election was cancelled.<sup>40</sup> In 1454, as well as in 1455, the elections were again cancelled due to insufficient number.<sup>41</sup> In Edward IV's reign however there is only one example: in 1475, since there are only five companions the king sent John Ascheley to supply, but 'the election did not come on immediately as far as we have any account'.<sup>42</sup>

#### **I.4 Previous Studies of the Order of the Garter**

Previous studies about the history of the Order can be divided into two main parts: the classical works that belong to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries produced mostly by the Antiquarians dealing with the institutional character of the Order such as the reason(s) why some statutes are prorogued, the possible reasons behind the introduction of new customs and ceremonial procedures of the Order; and the

---

<sup>39</sup> Lisa Jefferson, 'MS Arundel 48 and the Earliest Statutes of the Order of the Garter', *English Historical Review* 109, 1994, pp. 356-385; Anstis, pp. 108-9; Art. 18 Stat. Ed. III & Hen V, and again inserted in Art 19 Stat, Hen. VIII.

<sup>40</sup> Anstis, pp. 147-9.

<sup>41</sup> Anstis, pp. 151-2; 153-5.

<sup>42</sup> Anstis, p. 187.



modern academic studies analyzing the Order's different aspects such as its origin, foundation date, authenticity of its primary sources, and the possible political motives behind elections of the new knights to the Order.

Thus the first known significant interest to this unequalled royal organization came from antiquarians in the seventeenth century. For example, John Selden in 1614 in his work *Titles of Honour* classified the basic honor structures of the British Empire (on top of which there was the Order of the Garter) of the time and gave the short, popular, highly romanticized and scholarly unacceptable account of the Order bringing its origin to the Arthurian legend. Later Elias Ashmole was the first person who wrote a very detailed account of the Order's inner dynamics, its institution, its ceremonial customs and structures, and the meaning of its statutes. His work became so influential for the garter studies of the period that the content of this massive study will be elaborated in detail in below.

In the following century, John Anstis, Garter King of Arms of the period, edited with his own introduction, additional comments and corrections the original 'register' of the Order, (at least at that time it was the only *surviving* 'register' of the Order, since the so-called French Register as well as Ashmole's copy of it were missing) as yet another important primary source. This original register conventionally called as the *Liber Niger*, the so-called 'Black Book' of the Order (it was so-called because its cover is black) is now in Windsor Castle Library. The original document apart from giving specific account of the annual meetings of the Order, deals with the Garter Kings of Arms, as well as the other offices of the Order,

such as Chancellor, Prelate, Register, and Gentlemen Usher of the Black Rod.<sup>43</sup> In the nineteenth century, George Frederick Beltz in 1841 wrote *The Memorials of the Order of the Garter* the last published work of Belts.<sup>44</sup> The study gave specific narrative accounts of certain Garter knights, focusing on their idealized knightly lives and brilliant military careers. Rather than being a genuine work of study, the main aim of the work appears to provide the readers good examples of knightly deeds of particular knights who were seen by the society as the epitome of chivalry by their brilliant martial deeds, their courage in wars, their high understanding of loyalty to their lords and their courtly demeanors. In this respect, the study is a reflection in the nostalgia for the romantic age of chivalry. Sir Nicolas Harris Nicolas in 1842 in his work *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire* dealt with the Order's history.<sup>45</sup> The work dealt with all of the British chivalric Orders in general but giving emphasis to the uniqueness of the Order of the Garter as it was seen the most honorific imperial chivalric Order. Nevertheless, one thing that was missing in these early works was that they focused so much in the basic chronological Order of the events, lacking in turn, the political and social contexts in which those chivalric Orders in general and the Order of the Garter in particular have evolved. Thus in this sense their contribution is limited.

Studies of the Order of the Garter are not limited to the history of the Order alone. Coming back to Ashmole's massive work for example, which is more a study assessing the contemporary structure of the Order than a work of history; although historical assessments referring to antiquity are not infrequent. Elias Ashmole was a

---

<sup>43</sup> John Anstis, *The Register of the Most Noble Order of the Garter...Called the Black Book* (2 vols.; London 1724).

<sup>44</sup> G. F. Beltz, *The Memorials of the Order of the Garter* (London, 1841).

<sup>45</sup> Sir N. H. Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire* (4 vols.; London, 1842).

royalist in the Civil War, appointed by Charles I to collect the excise in Staffordshire in 1644, appointed commissioner, receiver and registrar of Excise of Worcester, 1645, controller and assistant master of Ordnance in Worcester, 1646 wrote the guideline of the institutional character of the Order in 1672 in his influential work the *Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*.<sup>46</sup> His work, although not a genuine historical study by modern standards, remains essential for Garter historians as it is one of the few available documents which provide detailed information in every institutional aspect of the Order as well as its image in seventeenth century mind. Thus a closer look at its content is compulsory.

In 1944, E. H. Fellowes wrote a brief account of British chivalry in *The Military Knights of Windsor, 1352-1944*. In 1960, before historians had started political analyses related to chivalry, A. B. Ferguson wrote a general work on English chivalry dealing with the causes of the decline and transformation of chivalry.<sup>47</sup> The Order's impact on the politics of the time is a recent focus of interest to historians. In 1972, John Milner's Master thesis opened the way for political considerations of the Order.<sup>48</sup> Juliet Vale's study *Edward III and Chivalry Chivalric*

---

<sup>46</sup> Elias Ashmole once thought to be an enigmatic figure became primarily concerned with the antiquarian curiosities by about 1660. He published some other books in different areas and created a collection of ancient manuscripts that he gave to Oxford University, most of which are now preserved in the Bodleian Library (while some of them are lost). Ashmole dedicated his book *Institution* to Charles II, (see the first page) and gave the first presentation copy to him. Charles in return probably granted him a pension of 400 pounds from the customs on paper. In the presentation copies to six other foreign princes who were also members of the Order and entitled to be the international knights of the Order, Ashmole produced specially printed dedications to them. In return, from them came gifts of a gold chain and medal (from the King of Denmark for example). It is highly probable that the other international knights also accepted the dedicated copies. In 1677 Ashmole was offered the official title of Garter King at Arms; nevertheless, he rejected it so that this 'honorable' title is to be conferred instead on his then father-in-law William Dugdale.

<sup>47</sup> Ferguson, A. B., *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry: Studies in the Decline and Transformation of Chivalric Idealism* (Durham, NC, 1960).

<sup>48</sup> J. D. Milner, 'The Order of the Garter in the Reign of Henry VI, 1422-1461', M.A. thesis (Manchester, 1972).

*Society and its Context, 1270-1350* (1982) gave the basic scheme for a coherent context for the relationship between chivalry and politics.

In 1987, John Gillespie wrote about female members of the Order as well as an article on Richard II's Knights.<sup>49</sup> These works, especially the latter, may have supported both to the history of the organization and to the politics of the period. A doctoral thesis by Diethard Schneider now published as *Der englische Hosenbandorden: Beiträge zur Entstehung und Entwicklung des "The Most Noble Order of the Garter" (1348-1702), mit einem Ausblick bis 1983* is also available. Although its scope of concern is relatively large, it is one of the few studies which used Ashmole's copy of the *French Register*. Nevertheless the study appears unaware of the differences between the scrutiny lists of these two extant registers as the voting tables created in this study are basically based on the Liber Niger but its French register's references are omitted. One of the most influential works dealing particularly with chivalry and curial Orders of Britain is Jonathan D'Arcy Boulton's *The Knights of the Crown*.<sup>50</sup> In this study, all of the chivalric Orders of the Great Britain are investigated. Maurice Keen's authoritative and epoch making study *Chivalry* examines the concept of chivalry in general and its evolution throughout the Middle Ages. The emergence of both military and secular chivalric Orders is separately discussed. The study also seeks for an answer to what the Order of the Garter meant for the English society.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> J. L. Gillespie 'Ladies of the Fraternity of Saint George and of the Society of the Garter', *Albion*, 17 (1985), pp. 259-78. and 'Richard II's Knights. Chivalry and Patronage', *JMH*, 13, no. 2 (1987), pp. 143-59.

<sup>50</sup> D'A. J. D. Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown. The Monarchical Orders of knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520* (Woodbridge, 1987),

<sup>51</sup> Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Heaven, 1987).

There are two other works, which do not deal particularly with the Garter's history but support to the history of the organization by analyzing the political developments of the late Middle-Ages. These are C. Given-Wilson's work of *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service Politics and Finance in England, 1360-1413* (1986) and C. A. J. Armstrong's *England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century* (1983). The latter may have given the way to a comparative approach to different curial Orders such as the Order of the Golden Fleece, the Croissant, the Stole, and the Jar. Another comparative study is Anne Payne and Lisa Jefferson's joint article of 'Edward IV: the Garter and the Golden Fleece, L'ordre de La Toison D'or. 1430-1505', in which the political role of the Order is investigated in the international affairs.<sup>52</sup> John Begent, although an amateur historian, wrote important articles on the Order of the Garter.<sup>53</sup>

International interest on the Garter history is relatively a late phenomenon. The most recent article about the Order is Raymond Waddington's work dealing with the relationship between the Order of the Garter and the politics of the Elizabethan period. In 2000, Hugh E. L. Collins's book on the Order of the Garter dealing both with the Order and the political events of the period between 1348-1461 was published.<sup>54</sup> While the study may lack first hand analyses of primary sources, its arguments about the relationship between politics of the crown and the Order of the Garter may be influential once they are confirmed after a reconsideration of the

---

<sup>52</sup> Anne Payne and Lisa Jefferson, 'Edward IV: The Garter and the Golden Fleece, *L'ordre de la Toison D'or, de Philippe le Bon à Philippe le Beau (1430-1505), Idéal ou reflet d'une société?* ed. Pierre Cockshaw and Christine Van Den Bergenpantens, (Turnhout: Brepolis, 1996).

<sup>53</sup> Begent, P. J., 'Ladies of the Garter', *Coat of Arms*, new ser. 8/145 (1989), 16-22, and 'A note upon the Practice of Encircling Arms with the Garter', *Coat of Arms*, new ser. 7/144 (1989), 186-95, and 'The Creation of the Office of Garter King of Arms', *Coat of Arms* new ser. 11/172 (1995) 134-40 also P.J. Begent, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter, 650 years*, (London, 1999).

<sup>54</sup> H. E. L. Collins, *The Order of the Garter 1348-1461* (Oxford, 2000).

primary sources.<sup>55</sup> In this study his arguments about the elections to the Order of the Garter during the reign of Henry VI will be analyzed. This study usually agrees with the claims made in Collins's study about the possible specific causes behind the elections of some specific knights. On the other hand, Collins's work seldom gives reasons behind the nominations of particular knights to the Order. This current study aims to fill the gap.

*L'ordre de la Jarretiere et L'ordre de Etiole* is an old but oddly neglected work.<sup>56</sup> It is merely a comparative study of the Order of the Garter and the Order of the Star founded by Jean II in France in 1351 from their foundation perspectives, and their basic structural differences. In this article, first, the possible causes behind the idea of founding secular Orders with reference to various examples from different European monarchies as well as the reason of success of these projects are discussed.

According to the author:

...l'ordre de la Jarretière, fondé à l'imitation des ordres légendaires et en fonction des projets de duc de Jean de Normandie, tout en conservant un caractère religieux fondamental, dissimulait, sous les aspects de l'éthique générale de la chevalerie, des intentions profondes de services dynastique et des prétentions politiques.

Consider that according to Y. Renouard, the patron Saint of the Order St. George is an imitation of a French project (the 'congregation') of founding a similar Order, as well as the colors of the Order of the Garter (i.e. the colors of the wearing of the members) are taken from the arms of France, which according to the author reflects Edward III's claim to the French throne, while, the Order of the Star is

---

<sup>55</sup> The work is extensively criticized by Lisa Jefferson due to the fact that the author relies on secondary sources instead of basing his arguments on his own analysis of primary sources. Private communication with Dr. Jefferson.

<sup>56</sup> Y. Renouard, 'L'ordre de la Jarretière et L'ordre de l'Etoile: Etude sur la genèse des Ordres Laïcs de chevalerie et sur le développement progressif de leur caractère national', *Le Moyen Age* 4 (1949), pp. 281-300.

founded for Jean II's affirmation to the French Throne. The study also suggests that the Order of the Garter has an intense religious tone, and one of the aims of its foundation is about the expedition towards infidels. This idea is however rejected by the recent studies, as the initial members of the Order were mostly the close friends of the Black Prince from the Campaign of Crecy, not any war hero towards infidels. The author however accepts the idea that one of the reasons of founding the Order of the Garter was to celebrate the victory of Edward III's close friends in the war with France but he also adds, it was not only limited to his close companions in the campaign of Crecy but in Poitiers and Guienne as well. Again according to the author, the only element, which is different from the project of *Congregation* is the secular and hermeneutic tone in the Orders motto *Honi soit qui mal y pense*.

However, according to the author, the influence of the Order of the Garter to the Order of the Star is also extremely visible: Jean II chose for the Order's congregation center *la Noble Maison de Saint-Ouen*, which is the French counterpart of the Windsor Chapel both from the dynastical perspective and from the point of view of symbolic value it possess for the English monarchy. Again, just like the members of the Order of the Garter, the members of the Order of Star gather once a year.

The only published study focusing particularly to Edward IV's reign is Ben Daw's work of *Elections to the Order of the Garter in the Reign of Edward IV*. He discusses the possible reasons behind the elections of each specific knight companions to the fraternity in the reign of Edward IV. He briefly analyses the careers and backgrounds of the knight-elects, and suggests that some similarities as well as some differences are available in their careers. He assumes that the sovereign had the ultimate authority in the election processes of the specific knights to the

Order and thus elections themselves reflecting the immediate decisions of the sovereign. In terms of the politics of the time of Edward IV, he argues that the political environment of Edward IV's time was very much different in which 'military classes' "licking their wounds after a series of military reverses had precipitated the total collapse of the Lancastrian position in France", when compared to Edward III's time where "the military success accompanied by a chivalric fervor shared by the English nobility and gentility".<sup>57</sup> He also emphasizes the fact, which is formerly elaborated by Charles Derek Ross that Edward IV gave particular importance to the Order of the Garter since his biggest construction project was the new Chapel of Saint George, which started at 1473.<sup>58</sup> He also underlies the fact that the military character of the Order was gradually changing as "by 1461 an awareness of social status outside it had pervaded the relations of those within it, in a way contrary to the statutes, which intended companions to be on an equal footing within the workings of the Order"<sup>59</sup> which I shall argue imply the fact that political as well as private considerations in the election to the Order were becoming still further visible.<sup>60</sup> He goes on to state that although the election was not a 'truly democratic elective system' (one may immediately ask why should there be one? Democracy is not related with the Middle Ages anyway) "there was always some correlation between the electors' votes and the sovereign's choice until at least the sixteenth century".<sup>61</sup> However this argument must be at least amended if not changed

---

<sup>57</sup> Daw, Ben, elections, p. 188.

<sup>58</sup> Daw Ben, "The Order of the Garter in the Reign of Edward IV" (unpub. B. A. thesis, Univ. of Manchester, 1993), esp. pp. 23-4; W. St. John Hope, *Architectural History of Windsor Castle*, 2 vols. (London, 1913), 2: 375-78; Charles Derek Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), p. 275.

<sup>59</sup> Daw, Ben, Elections, p. 190.

<sup>60</sup> Note that Collins argues that political considerations were already in use in previous periods.

<sup>61</sup> Daw, Ben, p. 190. he also gives footnotes: Boulton, Knights of the Crown, pp. 129-30; Belt, Memorials, p. xlix.



completely. It is not *always* the case that there is such a correlation: Note for example the election of Baron Carew. Although He only received one vote he was chosen to the Order. Similar to Collins, he misjudges the black book of the Order.<sup>62</sup> He argues that “the details of the chapters and elections *were recorded by the registrar of the Order in the so-called Black Book*,<sup>63</sup> which has survived to give accounts for most the years from 1416”.<sup>64</sup> This is exactly the same mistake Collins does. The deeds of the Order were not recorded in the Black Book but in the “French Register”. This Black Book, which Ben Daw is using is a copy produced by John Anstis and it is not the original copy. The original copy is the so-called French Register Ashmole, MS 1128.

The study also deals with *some*<sup>65</sup> of the available errors of the registers: The error, which allows the election of Henry duke of Buckingham to the stall of John Lord Berners on 26 February 1474. Daw claims that Berners lived on until May.<sup>66</sup> He also argues that in all three elections of Edward IV’s time<sup>67</sup> there is a striking similarity, which he claims suggests that companions ‘had prior knowledge of whom they intended to nominate’.<sup>68</sup> This thesis sounds fairly clear. It is highly probable that companions knew who was to nominate whom and behaved accordingly. Because, I do not see any other reasonable explanation of this unusual similarity. However, following this argument he immediately argues that this similarity of votes suggests

---

<sup>62</sup> Private conversation with Lisa Jefferson.

<sup>63</sup> My italics

<sup>64</sup> Daw, Ben, p. 190

<sup>65</sup> It is not understandable why he deals with only some of the errors.

<sup>66</sup> Daw, Ben, p. 191. Unfortunately he does not give any reference as to where he did find this information.

<sup>67</sup> The ones, which are registered in pp. 188-9; 190-1; 193-4. note that the first election Daw deals is not starting from the page 188 but 187.

<sup>68</sup> Daw, Ben, p. 191.

that companions ‘felt their combined votes could be successful’.<sup>69</sup> Although this may be at least some of the companions’ intention, I do not see any reason to believe that it was at least generally if not always the case. And there is no reason to believe that companions felt in this way. In fact there is evidence, which may lead us to think otherwise.<sup>70</sup> At least some of the companions felt free to nominate some people whose election were very unlikely. The reason for them to nominate those people may well be that companions wanted their friends to acquire the honour of being nominated *to such an illustrious Order*. Moreover, possible contrary evidence may be the fact that sovereigns did seldom consider the number of votes any nominee acquired when they were to decide whom to choose. That is to say there is a vague correlation between the votes a nominee acquired and he is elected or not.

Therefore, a work investigating the relationship of the Order to the high politics of the period between 1461-1485 i.e. by the beginning of Edward IV’s reign to the end of Richard III’s is still wanting. The period is important for the Garter history because, the wars with France were still a current dealing for the monarchs and the Wars of the Roses were perhaps the ultimate challenge of the late Middle-Ages for testing the loyalty of the nobles to their superiors. Although Payne and Jefferson’s article deal with the period, it does not primarily concern with the political dynamics of the area. Furthermore, perhaps interestingly, Richard III’s period is still void of any research of Garter history. This proposed research topic aims to fill the gap.

---

<sup>69</sup> Daw, Ben, p. 191.

<sup>70</sup> Remember the amendment made in an Article in Elizabeth I’s time. Nominating someone to the ranks was something honorary. We see accordingly in Edward IV’s time also people nominating their close friends or kinsmen.

## CHAPTER II

### EVALUATION OF THE PRIMARY SOURCES

The nature of the primary sources for the history of the Order of the Garter urges one to make a threefold classification: works particularly related to Garter history (official Garter documents); more general works dealing with the politics of the time; and supplementary individual sources, which sometimes give substantial clues about the politics of the realm and the individual deeds of the Garter companions. The various versions of the Order's registers (to be discussed in more detail below) are the fundamental official sources of information for the Garter history.<sup>1</sup> They are both related to the inner dynamics of the Garter companionship and give valuable information for the medieval history of the Order. For a more general understanding of the politics of the time one should also refer to the more general primary sources such as narratives or state papers, public records or parliamentary registers.<sup>2</sup> There are unfortunately no state papers for the Yorkist period however public records of especially the Chancery and Exchequer are important source of information.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Anstis, *The Register of the Most Noble Order of the Garter ... Called the Black Book* (London, 1724); *MS Ashmole 1128*, Bodleian Library, fos. 1-8 and 41-116.

<sup>2</sup> For example, G., Chastellain, *Oeuvres*, ed. Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove (8 vols.; Brussels, 1863-5) or La Marche, O. de, *Mémoires*, ed. H. Beaune and J. d'Arbaumont (4 vols.; Paris, 1883-8). *The Latin Brut*, in *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1913), 310-37; *A Northern Chronicle*, in *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1913), 279-91.

However, the analysis of these primary sources for each knight companion or Garter nominee may well surpass the scope of this study as the information is inevitably overwhelming. The chancery patent rolls for example give excessive information on the inner dynamics of the government and the nature and extent of royal patronage which may conceivably be the core of both the Garter history in particular and the political history in general. On the other hand, the data available for a single knight alone may sometimes give enough information which may well be enough to write a different dissertation topic.

Private letters and papers have long been recognized as important source of information on the area of the Wars of the Roses. They may give a good deal of substantial information. Thus, valuable correspondences include the Paston letters, an extensive letter collection of a gentry family of Norfolk<sup>3</sup>, the Stonor letters and papers, a shorter collection of papers of a well-established Oxfordshire family<sup>4</sup> but perhaps much more important in content than the Pastons as the Stonor family was much more inclined to the political affairs of the period, and the Plumpton letters, the letter collection of a Yorkshire family. The former two collections are especially important for the period 1461-71, while the Plumpton correspondence<sup>5</sup> is related to the period of Henry VII. Again, as Sir William Plumpton and his son Sir Robert were politically active in the North of England, the collection offers us a good deal of inside information on the basic dynamics of high politics of the realm.

---

<sup>3</sup> J.Gairdner, *The Paston Letters, 1422-1509 A.D.* (Edinburgh, 1910).

<sup>4</sup> *Kingsford's Stonor Letters and Papers 1290-1483* ed. Christine Carpenter (Cambridge; New York, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> *The Plumpton Letters and Papers* ed. Joan Kirby (New York, 1996) or alternatively, *The Plumpton Correspondence: Written in the Reigns of Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII, and Henry VIII*, ed. Thomas Stapleton (Gloucester, 1990).

Narrative sources are also invaluable sources of information, though historians must approach the validity of the information they provide cautiously. This study will avoid as much as possible, those accounts whose content have been criticized in terms of the validity of the information contained therein and those accounts which were apparently works of Yorkist or Tudor propaganda. In this respect, the work of Thomas More's *History of King Richard the Third*<sup>6</sup> for instance, or Polydore Vergil's accounts of the British history are not used. Although Dominic Mancini's chronicle *Usurpation of Richard III* gives individual information of an outsider, this account cannot be regarded as an objective source either. He was extremely critical of Richard's usurpation of the throne. Thus, none of the above-mentioned political histories may be of any great value for understanding the historical development of Garter companionship. An anonymous continuation of *Crowland Chronicle* which is possibly a southern product (the most probably candidate for his authorship is John Russell, bishop of Lincoln) gives more objective and impartial information on Richard's reign, while its author was by no means a completely a disinterested eye. Thus this may be counted as a more secure source of information. One should not ignore the fact that much of the manuscript was damaged by fire in 1731. The Warwickshire antiquary John Rous wrote a history of the earls of Warwick, called the *Rous Rolls*. The account focuses on the events of Wars of the Roses, and it was written during Richard III's reign. One can encounter the deeds of some other Garter knights, as Richard Neville had some sort of relationship with almost all of the Garter companions. On the continent, the Burgundian commentator Philippe de Commines, is also important for the Garter

---

<sup>6</sup> Thomas More, *Richard III: The Great Debate*, ed. P. Kendall (London, 1965).

history as the author was a foreigner and he knew much about the practices of the Burgundian court. Apart from providing general information on the court politics of the period, Commynes may have given some information for a comparative analysis of the Order of the Garter and the Order of the Golden Fleece, rather than the inner political picture of the Companionship *per se*. The most important narrative source for the period is the so-called *London Chronicle*, which is a collection of a series of civic narrative histories.<sup>7</sup> While its objectivity is still problematic, this chronicle has been the object of a significant amount of scholarly assessment over the years. It is also possible to find out pieces of information in different other chronicles of the period.<sup>8</sup> For each of the Garter knights of the period some individual accounts are available in Public Record Office (now National Archives) and the Bodleian Library.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Chronicles of London*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (1905, repr. Gloucester, 1977) and *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (London, 1938) or *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley (London, 1938) and J. Hardyng, *The Chronicle of John Hardyng, with a Continuation by Richard Grafton*, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1812) and J. Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (RS London, 1858);

<sup>8</sup> For example: Lannoy, G. de, *Oeuvres*, ed. C. Potvin (Louvain, 1878); Le Baker, G., *Chronicon*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889); Le Bel, J., *Chronique*, ed. J. Viard and E. Déprez (2 vols.; Paris, 1904-5); Le Fèvre, J., *Chronique*, ed. F. Morand (2 vols.; SHF Paris, 1876-81); Leland, J., *De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea* (6 vols.; London, 1774); *Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. W. Ullman (Henry Bradshaw Soc., 92; London, 1961); Otterbourne, T., and Whethamstede, J., *Duo Rerum Anglicarum*, ed. T. Hearne (2 vols.; Oxford, 1732); *The Boke of Noblesse*, ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1860); *The Brut*; or *The Chronicles of England*, ii, ed. F.W.D. Brie (1971); *Six Town Chronicles*, ed. R. Floney (Oxford, 1911); Walshingham, T., *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley (3 vols.; London, 1867-9); Waurin, J., *Recueil des Croniques et Anchiennes Istoire de la Grant Bretagne*, ed. W. and E. L. C. P. Hardy (5 vols.; London, 1864-91); *Winner and Waster*, ed. Sir I. Gollancz (Oxford, 1921, repr. Cambridge, 1974); Another edited version of it is also available: *Wynere and Wastoure*, ed. S. Trigg (297; Oxford, 1990).

## II.1 The Registers of The Order of the Garter, 1422-85

In the last decade, interest to the history of the Order of the Garter has ostensibly increased among scholars.<sup>9</sup> However, recent scholarship has largely been focused on the political causes behind the elections of the knights, whereas the companions' possible motives behind the nominations of individual knights, who are not chosen by the kings to the Order have been only partly discussed.<sup>10</sup>

The most important source for the history of the Order for the medieval period, is The Black Book of the Order or *Liber Niger*, (hereafter LN) which is now in Windsor in the Aerary, St. George Chapel. This is a large volume in folio bound in black velvet, written in Latin, and later copied for Ashmole by his private transcribers. This work was two centuries later edited and translated from Latin to English by John Anstis, Garter King of Arms of the period, in 1724. He also added

---

<sup>9</sup> G. F. Beltz, *The Memorials of the Order of the Garter* (London, 1841); N. H. Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire* (4 vols.; London, 1842); A. B. Ferguson, *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry: Studies in the Decline and Transformation of Chivalric Idealism* (Durham, NC, 1960); J. D. Milner, 'The Order of the Garter in the Reign of Henry VI, 1422-1461', M.A. thesis (Manchester, 1972); J. L. Gillespie 'Ladies of the Fraternity of Saint George and of the Society of the Garter', *Albion*, 17 (1985), pp. 259-78. and 'Richard II's Knights. Chivalry and Patronage', *Journal of Medieval History*, 13, no. 2 (1987), pp. 143-59; Anne Payne and Lisa Jefferson, 'Edward IV: The Garter and the Golden Fleece, *Lordre de la Toison D'or, de Philippe le Bon à Philippe le Beau (1430-1505), Idéal ou reflet d'une société?* ed. Pierre Cockshaw and Christine Van Den Bergenpantens (Turnhout: Brepolis, 1996); P. J. Begent, 'Ladies of the Garter', *Coat of Arms*, new ser. 8/145 (1989), 16-22; 'A note upon the Practice of Encircling Arms with the Garter', *Coat of Arms*, new ser. 7/144 (1989), 186-95, and 'The Creation of the Office of Garter King of Arms', *Coat of Arms* new ser. 11/172 (1995) 134-40; also P.J. Begent and H. Chesshyre, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter, 650 Years* (London, 1999); Y. Renouard, 'L'ordre de la Jarretière et l'ordre de l'Etoile: Etude sur la genèse des ordres Laïcs de chevalerie et sur le développement progressif de leur caractère national', *Le Moyen Age*, IV, (1949), 281-300; Diethard Schneider, *Der englische Hosenbandorden Beitrage zur Entstehung und Entwicklung des 'The Most Noble Order of the Garter' (1348-1702), mit einem Ausblick bis 1983* (4 vols., Bonn, issued 1988 [but completed 1983]).

<sup>10</sup> Hugh E. L. Collins, *The Order of the Garter, 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England*, (Oxford, 2000); Daw, Ben, 'Elections to the Order of the Garter in the reign of Edward IV, 1461-83', *Medieval Prosopography: History and Collective Biography* vol. 19 1998, pp. 187-213; Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs, 'Chevalerie...in som partie is worthi forto be comendid, and in some part to ben amendid': Chivalry and the Yorkist Kings, in *ST George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, ed by Colin Richmod and Eileen Scaarff (Windsor, 2001); Diana Dunn, Margaret of Anjou, Chivalry and the Order of the Garter, in *ST George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, ed by Colin Richmod and Eileen Scaarff (Windsor, 2001).

some further material, such as explanatory footnotes and an elaborate introduction whenever deemed necessary to make the topic clearer for the reader. The original manuscript of LN was copied at about 1534 probably by Robert Aldridge, register of the Order and Canon of Windsor from 1534 to 1537.<sup>11</sup> For most historians, this book is the authoritative source. However, there is yet another version of the Order's register, now in the Bodleian Library Bodley MS Ashmole 1128, fos. 1-8 and 41-116. Despite being an early modern copy of a text older than the *Liber Niger*, historians did not use it extensively.

The purpose of this chapter is to compare these two versions of the registers, especially with reference to the scrutinies and elections of the new knights, during the reigns of Henry VI, and Edward IV in order to determine the relative text value of these two manuscripts for reconstructing time history of the Order in that period. Both of the registers are important or significant primary sources for Garter history; but, Ashmole manuscript has been neglected by most scholars. It is important to note that the comparison of these two versions of the Order's registers indicates that there is a significant number of differences between the two accounts.

With reference to Ashmole's copy of the old French Register important flaws of LN can be convincingly determined. Nevertheless, Ashmole's copy is not the ultimate authoritative source: it has substantial deficiencies in its various parts too. There are discrepancies both in the scrutinies as well as other data related to particular sessions of the Order. Some of the discrepancies may well be the result of simple carelessness of the medieval scribes or early modern transcribers, when copying from one source to another, some others cannot be explained solely in terms

---

<sup>11</sup> Jefferson MS Arundel, p. 358. (in notes); Begent p. 79: in his endnotes: Ashmole, p. 199.



of scribal errors. The reasons behind these differences are difficult to explain. One possible explanation is that the scribes of the Ashmolean manuscript and that of *Liber Niger* thus, Anstis referred to different copies. Ashmole's copy is also important due to the fact that it provides substantial otherwise unknown information for the Order's history. Most of the discrepancies of the *Liber Niger* some of which are already mentioned by Anstis himself, are solved with the information provided by the French Register.

The registers are also called 'annals' of the Order because they mostly kept information related to the Order on the annual basis. The historians of the Order of the Garter have long been puzzled about the annals of the Order for its 650 years of history.<sup>12</sup> There are a number of different annals for different periods of the times recording the deeds of the Order. However there are only two different accounts (excluding one tiny record to be discussed later) related to the period this study covers. According to Ashmole's notes in MS 1128, there was a lacuna in the old paper manuscript from 1438 when the first scribe's hand stops until 1445 when a different scribe started to write the extant manuscript. This second scribe continued to write until 1458 and after that a number of different hands available sometimes for just one chapter meeting.<sup>13</sup> The occurrence of the same hiatus in LN suggests that the Windsor manuscript is also ultimately derived from the lost 'old paper manuscript'. Perhaps fulfilling a decree available in LN concerning the renewal of *Liber Nibellus*.

---

<sup>12</sup> The sixth chapter of Ashmole's *Institutions* deals with the Statutes and Annals (Registers) of the Order in detail. The importance of the statutes, for the order and possible explanations for their development in history (newly prorogued statutes and their possible reason for prorogation) are elaborated. Accounts of reforming and amending those statutes by various kings and queens are explained. The important amendments of Henry VIII are discussed in more detail and the extent and scope of the annals of the order are elaborated. Also see Begent, p. 79, Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, chapter 1.

<sup>13</sup> In 1459, again in 1461, 1464, 1465, 1467, 1473, 1474, 1477, 1478, 1483: *FR.*, fos., 63r, 75r, 76r, 76v, 79v, 80r, 81r, 82r, (two different hands) 85r, 86r, (two different hands), 86v, 90r, 90v.

Before comparing these two surviving versions of the register, it is worthy discussing the two manuscripts in a little more detail.

The first version of the register is the Ashmole's copy of the original 'Old French Register' as Ashmole calls it (hereafter FR). It is Oxford, Bodley MS Ashmole 1128, fos. 1-8 and 41-116, includes the Statutes of the Order in Latin as well.<sup>14</sup> This version of the register has been edited (but not published) by Lisa Jefferson, available in Oxford, Bodleian Library.

The second version is the so-called Black Book of the Order, the *Liber Niger*, now in the custody of the Dean of Windsor. Anstis edited this book in eighteenth century. He also added some further material in it. The LN written in Latin is now in the Aerary, St. George Chapel, Windsor.<sup>15</sup> This register is also physically different from the paper register of the Order this is not a paper but a vellum copy. Later in the eighteenth century Anstis published this manuscript with his own additional comments. Anstis after considering Ashmole's insertion to LN about some differences between these two texts, gave a brief account about the discrepancies between the *Registrum Ordinis Chartaceum* and the *Liber Niger* of the Order in the beginning of his edition. He also corrected in his footnotes some of the discrepancies of the *Liber Niger* with the actual historical facts. He wrote his own preface and introduction.

---

<sup>14</sup> Lisa Jefferson, 'MS Arundel 48 and the Earliest Statutes of the Order of the Garter', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 109, No. 431. (Apr., 1994), pp. 356-385. p. 358.

<sup>15</sup> Jefferson, 'MS Arundel', p. 358. (in notes); Begent *The Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p. 79: in his endnotes: Ashmole, *Institution, Laws and Ceremonies*, p. 199.

## **II.2 The Types of Differences:**

### **II.2.1 Ashmole 1128 and *Liber Niger* Compared:**

The information contained in these registers is in the form of the records of each chapter meeting. The notes on chapter meetings starts with the date of each session, usually comprises the lists of the companions as well as the prelates of the order who were absent or present in that particular session. The reasons of their absences are given. Any important event for the Order is additionally noted. Various notes concerning the Order are contained in these registers. There are separate entries for each session meetings. The information usually starts with the date of the session as regnal year. Then the names of each companion are listed as well as those of the prelates of the order, indicating whether they were present or absent. If they are absent, the reasons of their absence are briefly explained and the fines according to the statutes are noted. The registers then describe the decisions taken in those sessions, new Statutes, the names of the newly elected knight(s) if there is any, and the stalls to which they are installed, the empty stalls due to the death of the knight-companions, and special envoys sent to the international knights. Each year on St. George's Day members of the Order would meet together. Those annual gatherings were centered upon the fulfillment of the formal religious activities ie. Attending vespers and attending a requiem mass for the soul of the deceased companions. Those meetings and the accompanying religious ceremonies were the core elements for bolstering the Order's inner solidarity. The members' participation to them was thus regarded important. Accordingly, attendance lists of each individual meeting were routinely recorded in the registers.

There are substantial differences in all parts of the information contained in the two versions of the registers. The most important differences are related to the lack of information in one version or conflicting data. It is usually FR which gives more accurate and complete information: for example, the places of installations of the newly chosen knights are more complete in FR. There are a number of examples, where FR provides information about an individual knight installed to the place of a nearly deceased knight, which is lacking in LN. The second group of information, which is frequently lacking in LN is the attendance information of the knights-companions to the regular ceremonies and irregular meetings of the Order. Usually it is again the FR which gives a more complete list of individual knights whether they are absent or present, and if they are absent, the cause of their absenteeism and whether they are fined or not according to the Statutes. Also the scrutiny lists of these two registers conflict in many cases. It is usually impossible to decide which version gives the superior reading. I start to analyse the differences in chronological order.

Some surnames repeatedly appear in a single scrutiny list. Because they were nominated by various companions in that particular session and continued to be nominated in the succeeding sessions. This may in turn lead to an unintentional scribal error when copying from the source material. The problem of these repetitions is on the other hand the fact that it is hardly ever possible to determine whose mistake it is. For example in the nomination list of Sir John Fastolf for the year 1446, LN has 'Sir Will. Bonevyle', while in the French Register at the same point there is 'Messire William Ooldhalle'.<sup>16</sup> This discrepancy is a possible scribal

---

<sup>16</sup> Anstis, p. 133; *FR.*, p. 54.

mistake, because, both of these surnames already occur in both of the registers. ‘Bonevyle’ is repeated three times in LN, two times in FR, while Sir William Ooldhall is repeated twice in the FR and once in Anstis. Since both of the names are repeated in both of the registers, the question of which register is reflecting the correct votings of the companions cannot be determined.

On the other hand in some instances the whole name is completely different: for example in the nomination list of the earl of Salisbury for the year 1446, LN has there is ‘Dominus Lovell’ while in the French Register there is ‘le sire Clifford’.<sup>17</sup> Lord Lovel is already available four times in LN (excluding this sample). Sir Clifford is already available one times in LN (excluding this sample). Thus as above, this difference may also be due to scribal carelessness. This time LN is more likely to err. Because the most repeated name is Lovell, and in LN there is Lord Lovell instead of Clifford.

There are also occasional discrepancies due to the mere misspelling it is usually LN which gives the superior reading. In the nomination list of Sir John Fastolf for the year 1444, in the third group, all of the names have a degree of difference. The most striking one is that in LN, there is ‘Sir Henry Herbert’, while in the French Register, in the same place there is ‘Messire Henry Norbery’, Thus Herbert being the correct one.<sup>18</sup> Sir Henry Herbert is more probably because possibly there is no one who is called Norbery and who is close to influential people at that time.

---

<sup>17</sup> Anstis, p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

<sup>18</sup> Anstis, p. 130; *FR.*, p. 53. This is a good evidence supporting the claim that Anstis’s copy is not taken from the *French Register*. because, in Anstis there is an extra information which is not available in the *French Register*. Sir John Montgomery.

There are a number of occasions in which no explanation as to which entry may be correct is possible at all. One good example is that in the nomination list of Viscount Bouchier for the year 1474: there are two different entries leading to three different names. In LN, there is ‘John Nevill’ and ‘Tho. Haryngton, and ‘Thomas Kiryell’, while in the French Register there are only two names: ‘Sire Johan Wenlok’, and ‘Sire Thomas Kiriell’ which is repeated twice.<sup>19</sup>

In some instances while the available information does not conflict, one register occasionally gives more complete information to give a few examples: in the nomination list of the earl of Salisbury, for the year 1444, in LN, the entry is ‘Dominus Roos’, while in FR, it is ‘le Sire Robert Roos’.<sup>20</sup> In the nomination list of the earl of Shrewsbury, for the year 1454, in LN, there is simply ‘Dom. Foix’, but in the French Register it was recorded that this is ‘Messire Johan de Foix’.<sup>21</sup> In the nomination list of Sir John Fastolf for the year both 1455 and 1456, in LN, it is ‘Ro. Hungerford’, while in FR it is ‘Robert Hungerford’.<sup>22</sup> There are a number of more instances repeating this pattern.

Apart from scrutinies, the registers contain regular records of the yearly chapter meetings. These informations are more narrative in their nature and it is usually FR which gives important extra information. For example in a number of occasions a complete text or a part of it is omitted in LN. In 1422, for example FR gives the following extracts:

---

<sup>19</sup> Anstis, p. 166; *FR.*, p. 77.

<sup>20</sup> Anstis, p., 130; *FR.*, p. 53.

<sup>21</sup> Anstis, p. 127; *FR.*, p. 51. This Lord Foix is according to Lisa Jefferson Messire Johan de Foix Viscounte de Castellon.

<sup>22</sup> Anstis, p. 128; *FR.*, 50.

Excusez: Le Duk d'Excestre, Thomas Beauford (malade et pur tannte excusés);  
Le Counte de Westmerlande, Raufe (excusé a cause d'empotance); Le Counte  
Marchall, John ne pas excusés.<sup>23</sup>

This whole sentence is not available in LN at all. Anstis was aware of the deficiency of the record and explains in his footnote that the names of Duke of Exeter and Earl Marshall are omitted in the LN.<sup>24</sup> The more interesting point is that for the earl of Westmorland there is a different explanation: in LN for the earl of Westmorland it has been stated that *Comes Westmerlandiae probabilem causam absentiae misit ad concilium*. 'The Earl of Westmorland sent a probable cause of Absence to the Chapter'.<sup>25</sup> Thus this probable cause is 'empotence' according to FR. The existence of the name of the earl of Westmorland in LN and a related explanation to him suggests therefore that the omission of LN may not be a simple scribal omission. Because this set of information is written close to each other if it had to be omitted by the scribes, one would expect that it had to be omitted as a whole.

In the record of 1427, in LN again there are missing names and Anstis in his footnote attempted to explain the omissions: the names of the Duke of Exeter the earl Marshall, and the Lord Willoughby, who received the Robes of the Garter in this year, who being added to the 21 Knights here mentioned, complete the total number the Stall of the Lord Clifford remaining vacant this for the time being.<sup>26</sup>

In 1423,<sup>27</sup> first in FR the date of the session is apparent: the meeting took place *la vaille St George...le viime jour de Mai*.<sup>28</sup> In LN, on the other hand, it has

---

<sup>23</sup> FR., p. 24; Referring pages in Anstis are pp. 84-5.

<sup>24</sup> Anstis, p. 85 (in footnotes).

<sup>25</sup> Anstis, p. 86.

<sup>26</sup> Anstis, p. 85 in footnotes.

<sup>27</sup> Asm. fol 12 starts here. This session is also important because of the fact that possibly this is the first session in which a nomination took place but which the list of it did not survive. FR. States that the prelate of the Winchester *escrivantez les voicez et denominacions d'un chescun dez Chivalerz presentez a le journey*. FR. p. 27 Anstis mentions this in his footnote p. 88a. Another interesting thing

been only noted that the session took place on the Eve of St George. No date is entred. Second, in LN the expression is

*quorum Joanni Comiti, Domino Joanni Cornewale, et Domino Gukielme Harrington quae prius admiserant ibi condonata sunt.* Of whom (that is to say of the people who are present in this chapter) earl John, (possibly meaning John, Earl Marchall, FR helps us here to understand it immediately), Sir John Cornewale, and Sir William Harington were there pardoned what they had before committed.

In the FR on the other hand, the entries are separate for each people and as follows:

*Le counte de Marchall, John (excusez de lez defautez de devant) Messire John Cornewaille (excusez de tretoutz defautez predevante), Messire William Haryngton (excusez de tretoutz defautes per devannte).*<sup>29</sup>

Another example showing that LN is in tendency of outlining of information if the scribe thinks that these two expressions mean the same things. A very interesting difference is as follow. FR states:

Estrangers esteantz en leur pais qi ne poient bonment y venir et pur tant excusez: L'empereur de Rome, Sigemonde, Le Roy de Portugall, Le Roy de Danemarke, qi a cest fest primerment aviot suismise sez heaume tymbre et espé desuis son estall.

In LN, the equivalent entry is

Sigismundus Imperator, quia convenienter e Regno suo venire non poverat, excusatus est: Rex Protugalie qui sub hanc festivitatem, Galeam, Gladium, Vexillum et Appendices primum supra sedem suam appendenda curarat similiter.

That is to say the Emperor Sigismund was excused, because he could not conveniently come out of his Kingdom; The King of Portugal, who at this feast had

---

is that there are two different pages which are numbered as 88-89. And this is the mistake of the printing. These two pages are following each other in terms of the flow of information. So There may be a confusion in footnote references. In order to prevent this for the first pages numbered as 88-89 I use 88a or 89a. They are my insertions thus. Similarly, the pages of 90-91 are missing. This is also a printing mistake. Because there is no missing data between the pages of 89-92. Thus the rest of the papers flow in their real numbers.

<sup>28</sup> FR., p. 26 Jefferson's footnote; This date has been underlined and there is a correction mark in the RH margins. Anstis, pp. 88a-9a.

<sup>29</sup> Anstis, p. 88a; FR., p. 26.



first taken care to have his Helmet, sword, banner, and Appendages hung up over his stall, was excused in like Manner.<sup>30</sup> First as it is clear from these two above quotations, the entry of King of Denmark is omitted in LN. Instead what is noted on behalf of King of Denmark is noted as if it was said for the King of Portugal. Thus, this is probably another mistake of LN. If one considers the notice of the previous session that is to say the first session of Henry VI it becomes apparent that FR must be correct here. The name of the King of Denmark was simply omitted in LN and the entry related to him is inserted for the King of Portugal. On the other hand, the explanation related to the case of Emperor Sigismund is not available in the FR.

Additionally Anstis has already noted in his footnote that the names of the King of Denmark, the Duke of Bedford, Sir Thomas Erphingham and Sir Hertong Van Clux are omitted from the LN.<sup>31</sup> This notice is possibly made because of Anstis's carelessness because the name of Sir Thomas Erphingham is already available in LN and Anstis translated this sentence to English. But he is still mistakenly stating that the name of him is not appearing in the LN: *Dominus Thomas D'arpyngham corpore laborans*: Anstis translated it as Sir Thomas D'arpyngham was sick, but still he mentions in his footnote which is immediately at the bottom of the same page, that the name of this person is not appearing in the LN. For the other three names, the FR is not silent. The case of the King of Denmark is already discussed. Clux for example is possibly (there is an empty line between the title and the entry) under the title of *Estrangers esteantz en leur pais qi ne poient bonment y venir et pur tant excusez: Messire Hertonnk von Clux (hors de Reaulme au message*

---

<sup>30</sup> Anstis, p. 88a; FR., p. 26.

<sup>31</sup> Anstis, p. 89a.

*et servise de Roy devers l'empereur suisdit*).<sup>32</sup> The Duke of Bedford is under the title of *Absens et hors de Reaulme excusez: Messire le Duc de Bedforde, John, Regent de Frannce; et avec luy illoesqes: other names*.<sup>33</sup> Sir Thomas Erpingham is under the title of *Esteantez deins le Reaulme et excusez au cause resonable: Messire Thomas Darpyhngam (excusez par le deputé a cause de maladie)*.<sup>34</sup>

The three messages on the part of Henry VI to (1) the companions about the saying the mass for the soul of Henry Lord Fitzhugh who recently died and choosing another companion to the stall vacant by participating to the following session (2) to his uncle: the saying the mass for the dead Sir Robert Umfrevile as the statutes of the order dictates (3) to the prince: The choosing of a new companion in his place are omitted in the LN.<sup>35</sup> LN gives some additional information for the same chapter meeting: in the list of presents: the name of Henry, Lord Fitzhug is inserted but this name is simply not available in the FR.<sup>36</sup> Additionally, the particular explanation related to the case of Emperor Sigismund is again not available in the FR.<sup>37</sup>

For the session note of 1428, Anstis already noted in his preface and ‘adventured’ to claim that three more names as well as the name of Earl of Suffolk had to be added to the list. This is simply correct for any of the four names. The most important one is of course the case of the earl of Suffolk as although he accessed to Ashmole’s abbreviations about three other names, Anstis had no information of him at all. According to FR, Earl of Suffolk was *en France*. The situation of other two names is more complicated. Although at first glance *Le Sire de Wyloghby and Le Sire*

---

<sup>32</sup> FR., p. 26.

<sup>33</sup> FR., p. 26.

<sup>34</sup> FR., p. 27.

<sup>35</sup> FR., 27-8. Ashmole gives footnote: He dyed not untill after anno <4> 15. H. 6 vide lib N. p. <82> 93 ( “after” and “93” are later additions to the note).

<sup>36</sup> Anstis, p. 88a; FR., p. 26.

<sup>37</sup> Anstis, p. 88a.

*de Scales are En France – en lez guerres du Roy Honourablement occupiez* may be interpreted as these two companions were under the same title, when considering the general lack of organisation of the register of this particular session this may not be an obvious conclusion. Consider for example although the first list of this session may seem at first look as the list of the presents in fact it is a general list of companions. If there is are additional informations in the line of each companion explaining his particular case, then this companion is absent. Or, there is no such information then this companion may well be present. The list the people who are present and the people who are absent are written down in a single list. Accordingly, one can also claim that the phrase of *en lez guerres du Roy Honourablement occupiez* may simply refer to *Le Sire de Wyloghby*, and in this way *le sire de Scales* may simply belong to the list of presents which is the case according to the LN.<sup>38</sup> If this is true, then Ashmole have misinterpreted the information. The confusion here however, is very easy because of the general lack of organisation of this particular session. This kind of a lack of organisation is not a frequent thing in FR. *Le Sire de Boucher, Chamberleyne de Roy and Le sire de Hungerforde Tresorer d’Engleterre* are again among the list and since there is no additional comment for them to be absent, one may safely assume that they are present. No information is available for them in the LN.

Additionally in FR there is an information stating that

---

<sup>38</sup> Anstis, p. iii, p. 101; FR., p. 38. Also note that if the title of *en lez guerres du Roy Honourablement occupiez* would refer to all of the people who are written down below that title then, Messire John de Cornewaile, Messire Johan Robessart, Messire Johan Fastolfe, Messire William Felyppe, Messire Symode de Felbrige, Messire Roberte Dumfrivyle and Messire William Haryngton must have belonged to the same title. That is to say they had to be in France. But from LN we know that they were present in this chapter. Thus, *Le sire de Scales* is simply present not in France. The person who is in France and honorablement occupiez is only Lord Willoghby.

*Le Duc de Quimber (qui au present fuiste estallé en place avaunte le Duc d'Excestre par un aprocurateur en persone monsire John ke seigneur Tytofte, Seneschall d'Ostele de Roy.*

On the other hand LN reads: *Dux Quimbriae in hac celebritate per procuratorem suum Joannem Dominum Typtoft domus Regiae Dispensatorem in sedem seam solemniter introductus*, that is to say The Duke of Coimbro was at this feast solemnly installed by his proxy John Lord Typtoft, steward of the King's household.<sup>39</sup> Here as as it is clearly seen from the comparison of these two texts, the name of the duke of Exeter is available in the FR but not available in LN. The duke of Coimbro is installed in one place before of that of the Duke of Exeter..

In the record of 1429, a very important set of information is available in the FR. It is about installations of two newly elected knights and another knight to be installed at this partcular session. In the registry of this session Messire Johan Raddeclyffe there is an explanatory notice suggesting that he was *enstallez en sa persone au temprs de la feste*.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand in the LN there is no any additional information of this member except his name to be present. The more important information that the FR is providing is that

et pur tannte q'a present y feurent deux estallez de la companie voidez au cause dez nirte de ke Counte de Sarisbirse, Thomas (qi dieu assoiel), qi passa a le sege mavez d'Orliencem et par ke morte monsire Thomas Darpyngham, trevaliant chivaler (qe dieu assoiel), I fuist faite un escrutine pour novell eleccion de Chivalerz en place de ceux qe feurent trepassez. et I fuist trové q'entre lez autres le Counte de Stafforde fuiste digne par l'avace du Sovereigne pur estre nommé a l'estalle avant monsire Thomas Darphyngham; et monsire Johan Radclyffe a l'estalle devante le counte de Sarisbirse, Thomas, le vailiante. Et parensi ils feurent enstallez en lez lieux et estallez suisditez.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Anstis, p. 102; FR., p. 38.

<sup>40</sup> FR., p. 39.

<sup>41</sup> FR., pp. 39-40.; referring parts in LN are Anstis, pp. 103-4.

The referring part in LN only gives the names of the newly elected knights as well as the deceased ones but their place of installation is not available in the LN but available in FR. What is more surprising is that neither Anstis nor Ashmole are aware of this extra knowledge.

In 1430, first, the dates of the session are different in these two registers. According to LN, the session is held in 22<sup>nd</sup> of May while according to FR it is held in 20<sup>th</sup> of May.<sup>42</sup> Additionally, as Anstis noted in his preface the name of William Harrington is omitted in the LN but available in the FR under the title of *avec le député, presentz a le feste*.<sup>43</sup>

Another important set of information related to the installation of two knights in FR is again lacking in LN. Anstis is completely silent about this fact. In FR it is clearly stated that:

Et pur tante q'al presente journey j feurent deuz estallez voidez par lez trespassements del Duc de Bedforde, John ( qe dieu assoille) et par le morte du Counte d'Arundel (a dieu commandé), j fuit faite un scrutine par le Registreur de l'ordre escrivant les denominacions dez voicez d'un chseun compaignon de l'ordre presente a le journey. Et par examinacion de ycell I fuist trové qe le Counte de Morteyn nommé a l'estalle de Counte d'Arundel fuit digne; et monsire John Grey de Rythen nommé a l'estalle devant le duc de Bedforde fuit digne etc.<sup>44</sup>

Thus earl of Mortheyne was installed to the stall vacant of the earl of Arundel, and the Sir John Grey of Ruthin was installed to the stall of John, Duke of Bedford. Anstis in his footnote says that 'this book doth not acquaint us into which of the two vacant stalls this Earl was elected, but from the Windsor-Tables we learn, that he succeeded

---

<sup>42</sup> Anstis, p. 105; FR., 40.

<sup>43</sup> FR., p. 41; Anstis., p. iii, 107.

<sup>44</sup> FR., p. 47.

the Earl of Arundell in the eighth Stall on the Prince's side'.<sup>45</sup> The information Anstis provides is supported by the information available in the FR.

The session note of 1437 is particularly important because it is one of the rare cases, which LN gives a fuller list of companions but the FR is very scarce in information. That is to say in FR only the names of the presents are noted but the absents are completely omitted. But in LN the absents are given by name and by reason of their absenteisms. One possible explanation for this lack of information of FR may be that by the end of the presents, the folio is over and the following year's registrations start by fol 62 v. perhaps there is a missing folio in FR.<sup>46</sup>

1444 is the first year of the surviving scrutinies and the date is again different both in terms of year and day. According to the LN, this session was held *anno vicesimo tertio Regis Henrici Sexti, duodecimo die Maii*, in the twenty third year of Henry VI, 12<sup>th</sup> of May, while on the other hand, in the FR, the date is, *le vii jour de Maii, L'an du regne nostre Souverain Seigneur le Roy Henry vi apres le conqueste xxiiii*. The Seventh Jour of May, the twenty fourth year of Henry VI. For the difference in the day of the session, it is possible that either the writer of the LN read the roman numeral 'v' as 'x' or the writer of the FR read the roman numeral 'x' as 'v'.<sup>47</sup>

Additionally, for the ongoing scrutinies Anstis in his footnote noticed that the name of Sir John Beauchamp afterwards Lord Beauchamp of Powick although a member of the Order before this date, was appearing in the scrutinies incorrectly.<sup>48</sup> John, Lord Foix, Viscount Castellon and Lord Greyley was elected to the Order in

---

<sup>45</sup> Anstis, p. 117, in footnotes.

<sup>46</sup> The referring part in FR, p. 47.

<sup>47</sup> Anstis, p. 126; FR., p. 50.

<sup>48</sup> Anstis, p. 126 in footnotes.

this session. But in the LN there is no information as to whose stall he was elected. Anstis noted in his footnote that the only empty stall must have been that of Sir Heretonx van Cleux. This is completely confirmed by FR, as the register noted *Messire Johan de Foix, Viscount de Chastelon, sire de Greyley, est esluz en lieu de Messire Her Tank Clux.*<sup>49</sup>

Moreover, there is again some further information in FR. A new Statuete was established concerning the payments of Marquises, Earls and Dukes for their appurtenances and helmets are hung up. In the LN there is no separate date for this entry. That is to say, for the LN it appears that this new statute is possibly proroged in this same session. But in the FR. it is clearly stated that this statute is proroged in a different date: *Lundy le ix jour de Maii.* Monday, May 9.<sup>50</sup> This date is different from the date of the election session. Thus this statute was decreed by the king after the session. This additional information in FR may be an evidence to the claim that the correct date of the election session was the one which is registered in FR but not in LN. Still there is one more additional information in FR. John Depden one of the Canons of the chapel of Windsor is made the register of the order. This note is available in the LN but there is no date related to this information. On the other hand, the FR claims that John Depden is made the register of the order *le vii jour de Maii avanttdit.*<sup>51</sup>

Additionally, there is an expression which is not clear in LN but clear in FR: *Omnes absentes ad unum pro excusatis Supremus habuit.* ‘All that were absent the sovereign excused to a Man’. This is the translation of Anstis. But in the FR the

---

<sup>49</sup> Anstis, p. 128; FR., p. 51.

<sup>50</sup> FR., p. 51; referring page in LN, Anstis, p. 128.

<sup>51</sup> Anstis, p. 129; FR., p. 51.

expression is *toutz ceux de la compaignie du Jartier que sont absentz sont excusés per le sovereign*. This sentence can be translated as ‘all of the absents of the companionship of the Garter are excused by the king’.<sup>52</sup> There is certainly a difference of interpretation here and since the expression in LN implies a strange meaning I shall argue that the correct information is the expression contained in LN.

For the session note of 1447, the most important addition of FR is a Memorandum:

il est ordonné quil sera au plesir de chescun chivaler de l’ordre du temps de son installacion, si Jartier Roy d’Armes de l’ordre avera la Robe qu’il portera quant il sera installé ou de l’argent pour la Robe, de chescun selon son estate: c’est a savoir d’ung Conte pour sa Robbe x marcs, d’ung Baron v livres, d’ung Baneret iiii livres, d’ung Bacheler iiii marcs’.<sup>53</sup>

Now there is a huge problem here: Consider the footnote of Anstis:

“Whatever might be the Inducement, Our compiler [he is possibly talking about the compiler of LN] hath omitted a Decree [he is talking about the above mentioned Decree] made in this chapter touching the Right of Garter King of Arms, which Mr. Ashm. hist p. 461, found in the Registr. Charac. fol. 25b. and hath translated it into English “That it was ordained to be at the peasure of every Knight Companion at the Time of his installation, whether Garter [King of Arms] should have the Garment, which each knight did then wear, or a composition in Money according to estate.” According to an ancient manuscript in the Custody of this Collector, there were several other Fees settled at the same Chapter, which is there said to have been held on 27 November in the 26 Year of Hen. VI, wherein this Sir Fracis Surienne was elected, and in Truth this computation must be right, for this entry in this Black-book on 27 Nov. ejusdem anni being after the celebration of the Festival, on St. George’s Day, in the 25 Year, must of Course relate to the 26<sup>th</sup> Year of his Reign, which commenced on the Last of August”.<sup>54</sup>

As it is clear from the above quotation that the translation of Ashmole is not the correct translation of the memorandum of the FR. The part of the memorandum related to the fees of the companions is omitted from Ashmole’s translation. On the

---

<sup>52</sup> Anstis, p. 129; FR., p. 51.

<sup>53</sup> FR., p. 55.

<sup>54</sup> Anstis, p. 134 in footnotes.



other hand we understand from Anstis's footnote that Ashmole states that there is an ancient manuscript in the custody of Ashmole and that in that manuscript there are several other fees settled at this chapter. Again it is clear from the above quote of FR that this ancient manuscript is nothing else but the FR. Since Anstis had no access to the FR, he thought that there is a separate manuscript in which the fees are written. Moreover Ashmole in his translation uses "[king of arms]" as if those words were not available in the original text of FR but the additions of the translator. But it is evident that in the FR those words are available. Nevertheless, the intriguing question is why Ashmole only partly translated the above-mentioned quotation of the FR.

The election of new knights into the particular stalls of particular deceased members is problematic when compared the information of these two registers. The LN is stating that King of Aragon was chosen into the stall of the Count D'Auvranches, King of Poland into the stall of the duke of Coimbro, and the duke of Brumswick into that of the duke of Suffolk.<sup>55</sup> FR states that the King of Aragon was chosen to the stall of the *count of D'Auvran*, the duke of Brumswick to that of the duke of Coimbro, and the king of Poland to the stall of the duke of Suffolk. Anstis was aware of this discrepancy as he explained in his footnotes that Ashmole referring to the FR imports the information that the King of Poland is elected to the stall of the duke of Suffolk.<sup>56</sup> According to the FR, the duke of Brumswick was chosen to the stall of the duke of Coimbro, the king of Portugal is elected to the stall of the duke of Suffolk. The King of Aragon was chosen to the stall of *Count d'Auranche*. This last

---

<sup>55</sup> Anstis, p. 142.

<sup>56</sup> Anstis, p. 142 in footnotes. Ashm. in Museo. as also Vinc. MS in Off. Arm n. 417. and both agree that the Duke of Brumswick was chosen into the stall of the Duke of Conimbro. In the FR on the other hand, it is clearly stated that King of Poland is chosen to the stall of the duke of Suffolk. FR., p. 60.

information is the same in both of the registers. But this information is also problematic for its own sake.<sup>57</sup> The other two names are different. Thus there are two different information in two different people's installations. The footnote information of Anstis explains the difference clearly that the duke of Brumswick was chosen to the stall of the duke of Coimbro, discarding the information presented in the LN stating that The duke of Brumswick was chosen to the stall of the duke of Suffolk. Therefore, the correct information is that of the FR, which claims that the Duke of Brumswick was chosen to the stall of the duke of Coimbro. This further suggests that the information in the FR is more accurate. Therefore it is highly probable that the correct information for the case of the king of Poland is of FR. thus, The King of Poland is chosen to the stall of duke of Suffolk but not to that of Duke of Coimbro as LN suggests.

Perhaps, the most important information FR is giving is that in the LN there is a scrutiny whose date is completely missing but the date is clearly stated in the FR. According to the FR the scrutiny is presented *xxviii Jour de May L'an de son Regne xxix*, the session took place in the Westminster in the room (possibly bedroom) of the King. This information is totally lacking in the LN. Anstis is aware of this fact and tries to give an explanation in his footnote. He says that the word *subinde* signifies a distinct chapter, as some of the nominators are different from the nominators of the previous session. But the interesting thing is that Ashmole is also silent, because in Anstis's footnote there is no any reference to Ashmole.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> But note that three pages later, there is another insertion in FR in p. 62 after an unrelated scrutiny list in which the name of the King of Aragon is not available. It states that the King of Aragon is chosen to the stall of Sir John Robesart. FR., p. 62.

<sup>58</sup> Anstis, p. 75, pp. 142-3; FR., pp. 61-2.

For the session note of 1451 again we encounter another discrepancy. In LN it is noted that the earl of Exeter was deputed to the session. Anstis was aware of this apparent mistake and tried to explain this mistake because John, Holland Duke of Exeter died well before that time and, his son Henry inherited that title, but he must have been a minor. Additionally, Henry although nominated never elected to the Order. This mistake of LN is corrected with the fact provided in FR. According to the FR, the deputy is neither John, Holland Duke of Exeter nor his heir Henry but John, earl of Shrewsbury.<sup>59</sup> What is more important is the fact that Ashmole was already aware of this fact but did not give an explanation of it in his marginal notes in his MS copy of FR. He simply underlined the name of the earl of Shrewsbury in the FR and written *per Exoniae Comitem*, the phrase available in the LN for stating that the earl of Exeter was the deputy. Thus, it appears that Ashmole did not decide which information was the correct one.

In 1454, the only omission of LN is the fact that Lord Faucomberg was in prison in France. This expression is already available in both of the registers for the previous session but this time, the LN omitted this information. For the session note of 1455, the tradition of FR of giving the name of the day the session took place and the tradition of LN of omitting the name of the day but simply giving the date still continued routinely. According to the FR, the session took place in 'marsdy': tuesday. In this same session additionally, in the list of presents, in the LN, there are five names (including the King) but on the other hand, in the FR there are six names (including the King). The name of Duke of Somerset is lacking in the LN.<sup>60</sup> The rest are the same: Duke of Buckingham, Lord Sudeley, Lord Beauchamp, and Viscount

---

<sup>59</sup> FR., p. 62.

<sup>60</sup> Anstis, p. 153; FR., p. 68.

Beaumont. Nevertheless there are other differences between these two versions in the notes of this chapter meeting: for example, the name of Lord Willoughby is lacking among the names of the companions whose stalls were vacant because of their deaths in the LN. Thus, in the FR there are four names mentioned as the stalls voids for the deceased knights, but on the LN there are three names mentioned.<sup>61</sup>

In 1456 the same tradition of giving the day of the session in FR: Joesdy: Thursday. Additionally, as Anstis already noted, the names of the Lord Fauconberg and Lord Rivers were missing in the LN but available in the FR under the title of a Caleys.<sup>62</sup> The other addition of FR is that under the title of stalls voids, there are four names in the LN but five names in the FR. The name of Lord Willoughby is missing in the LN. The rest are: Emperor Sigismund, the Duke of Somerset, the earl of Shrewsbury and Lord Hastings.<sup>63</sup>

For the session record of 1457, LN is not giving information in whose stalls Lord Welles and Lord Stanley were installed, but the FR is giving those informations in full detail: Le Sire de Welles feust enstallez mesme l'eure par le Sire Sudley <devant la messe> a l'estalle de Sire Willughby et oia la dite messe de Salus populi. Le Sire de Stanley Thomas feust enstallez mesme l'eure par le dit Sire Sudley a l'estalle le Sire Hastynges et oia la dite messe de salus populi.<sup>64</sup>

For the record of 1458, Anstis was aware that two of the companions were not named in LN. He gives no further discussion except mentioning this information. The FR is again clear here: the earl of Shrewsbury is within the list of companions who are present in this chapter while he is lacking in the LN. John Fastolf is in the

---

<sup>61</sup> Anstis, p. 154; FR., p. 69.

<sup>62</sup> Anstis, p. 155 in footnotes, FR., p. 70.

<sup>63</sup> Anstis, p. 156; FR., p. 70.

<sup>64</sup> FR., p. 72. Referring pages in Anstis, pp. 160-1.

list of the *absents and excuseds*. He was excused *por sa viellesce*.<sup>65</sup> Thus with these additions the number is totalled to twenty four, and complete now.

## II.3 Edward IV

### II.3.1 Differences of Names in the Scrutinies:

Sometimes complete names are different in both of the registers. In the nomination list of the Earl of Essex, for the year 1474, in Anstis, there is ‘Sir Tho. Bourchyer’, while in the French Register the entry is ‘Messire Johan Parre’. This can be a scribal mistake on the part of the Ashmole’s copy, because the name of John Parr is already available in this scrutiny list three times, thus the Ashmole’s copy may have simply repeated this name once more in stead of Sir Thomas Bouchier who is nominated only once in this scrutiny (of the *Liber Niger*, none in Ashmole’s copy) and never nominated again in the Order’s history. On the other hand, one is wondering wheter this scribe was so careless to completely omit a person who is nominated only once. Again in the same nomination list of the same person, there is a spelling difference: in Anstis, there is ‘Sir William Parre’ while in the French Register there is Messire Guillaume Parre’.<sup>66</sup> Again in the nomination list of Sir John Ascheley, in Anstis, the entry is ‘Lord Awdley’, while in the French Register it is ‘le Sire Daudeley’.<sup>67</sup> This is definitely the mistake of the Ashmole’s copy because John Sutton, Lord Dudley was already a member of the Order.

---

<sup>65</sup> FR., p. 74.

<sup>66</sup> Anstis, p. 187; FR., p. 88, [fol, 82 v].

<sup>67</sup> Anstis, p. 191; FR., p. 91.

There are occasionally other sort of differences for example in one occasion the difference is not in the nomination list of anyone but in the nominator. In LN, it is the Duke of Buckingham who nominates, while in the French Register, the nominator is the Duke of Clarence. The people they nominated are the same.<sup>68</sup> This cannot be explained in terms of scribal mistake. Because if the actual nominator is the Duke of Buckingham then we have no reason to think that scribe made a mistake of reading the below or above line's name because in this case, the duke of Clarence is simply non available in the scrutinies at all. Similarly if the actual nominator is the Duke of Clarence, then the name of the duke of Buckingham would not be available in the scrutiny list at all. Unfortunately what we know about this session is limited to scrutiny and the election which took place after this scrutiny. There is no attendance or absenteeism list for this session. Thus it is impossible to determine who was actually absent.

There are also places where FR completely lacks information while LN gives full details. For example although in Anstis, the nomination list of the Duke of York and Duke of Suffolk are full of nine people, in the French Register their place is empty. That is to say, If one is to believe to the French Register they did not nominate anyone at all, or their votes are missing.<sup>69</sup> In the nomination list of the Duke of Suffolk in Anstis, there is William Stanley while in the French Register the space is empty. Thus in the French Register there are only eight people nominated.<sup>70</sup> William Stanley is nominated nine times (excluding this vote) in this scrutiny, thus perhaps the scribe of the Liber Niger made a mistake by filling the empty space with

---

<sup>68</sup> Anstis, p. 193; *FR.*, p. 93.

<sup>69</sup> Anstis, p. 195; *FR.*, p. 95, [fol. 45].

<sup>70</sup> Anstis, p. 206; *FR.*, p. 103.

the name of a nominee who has got many votes. Perhaps then one nominee of the Duke of Suffolk is missing.

The following discrepancy is perhaps the most striking discrepancy of all of the scrutinites. In the nomination list of the duke of Gloucester, there are important differences both in spelling and in name. First, in Anstis, the entry is Duke of Brittany, while in the French Register it is 'Le Roy de Hungueris'. The insertion of the name of the king of Hungary can be a scribal error if one is to believe that the scribe of the Ashmole's copy made a mistake of giving a name of a nominee who is unanimously voted in the following election session, but not nominated in this session at all. That is to say according to the *Liber Niger*, the king of Hungary was not nominated in this session at all. In the Asmole's copy he is only appearing once. But he is unanimously nominated in the following session, which took place in a later date, but immediately following this former scrutiny in the register.<sup>71</sup>

Consider the following case with the above mentioned case of the earl of Essex. The discrepancy is possibly due to the fact that one of the scribes simply because of carelessness switched one individual entry between the votes of the earl of Essex and the earl of Norfolk. Note that the nomination lists of these two companions are written down in a row: In the nomination list of the Earl of Norfolk<sup>72</sup>, in Anstis, there is Richard the Queen's son while in the French Register there is 'le Duc de Bretagne'. Simply the opposite of the case of the Earl of Essex.<sup>73</sup>

The discrepancies are not exclusively limited to the scrutines. Theoretically each session had to be registered by the registers of the Order. In these session notes

---

<sup>71</sup> Anstis, p. 196; *FR.*, p. 96.

<sup>72</sup> Here Anstis warns us in his footnote that this must be a mistake because the King's second son Richard, Duke of York was not created Duke of Norfolk till the Seventh of February following. He does not say anything why a duke is called as an earl. Anstis, p. 198 footnote.

<sup>73</sup> Anstis, p. 198; *FR.*, p. 97.

there are various types of discrepancies between these two copies. These differences can hardly be explained in terms of scribal errors. In Anstis, the Earl of Warwick and Lord Sudeley were employed abroad while in the French Register, Earl of Warwick, Lord Sudeley and Lord Beauchamp were ‘excuses par le Roy et leur lettres qu’ilz sont maladez’.<sup>74</sup>

One point in which the Ashmole’s copy solves a problem available in the *Liber Niger* is the following case: In Anstis, Lord Dudeley and Lord Beauchamp ‘pleaded indisposition for an excuse by their letters’, here Anstis gives a footnote explaining the fact that since lord Dudley is already available in the list of the people who are present in that session, he claims that this lord Dudley may well be lord Sudeley. In the Ashmole’s copy on the other hand, there is no need to such an explanation: Not lord Dudeley but Lord Sudeley and Sir Beuachamp are absents and excused by their letters that they are ill. Thus here French Register appears to be more accurate than Anstis’s copy, because Anstis’s problem is not available in the French Register.<sup>75</sup>

FR is more complete during Edward IV’s reign in the information it gives for the particular vacant stalls and the exact stalls to which companions are installed: The following is an example of the case in which in LN there is ambiguity but FR is far more clear:

‘stalla vacantia Le stalle de Prince

estalle est voide par mort le Sire Beauchamp

le stalle de Counte de Wiltshire pur le Counte de Northumberland qui est  
esleu

---

<sup>74</sup> Anstis, p. 176; *FR.*, p. 81 [fol. 39].

<sup>75</sup> Anstis, p. 179; *FR.*, p. 83. Anstis, p. V, explanation is available.



Le Stalle de le Sire Mountjoy pur le Counte de Urbyne<sup>76</sup> qui est esleu<sup>77</sup>

Here Anstis, noted that ‘the Count of Urbin was elected to the Stall which was Lord Montjoy’s, and the earl of Northumberland to that which was the earl of Wylschhire’s. His stall was also reserved for the Prince. There was one also vacant by the Death of Lord Beauchamp’.<sup>78</sup> Clearly then in LN, the expression about ‘his stall’ is vague. Whose stall was also reserved for the Prince? But in FR, there is one stall vacant: That of the Prince.

FR is superior in the lists of absenteeisms of individual companions. It both gives extra information and it is occasionally more detailed in the explanatory notes of the absent knights consider for example the following extracts where Ashmole himself was aware of this difference and gave in his copy a latin explanatory notice:

Absentes in Capitulo hora tercia presentes in Regno:

Le Duc de Clarence que puis excusé par le Roy de son non venu

Le Sire de Hastynges que puis excusé par le commandment du Roy<sup>79</sup>

Le Sire Scrope excusé par comandement du Roy

Le Sire de Sudeley Le Sire de Dudley excusé par comandment du Roy

Count de Douglas excusés pa le Roy pour reasonable cause.

Le Count D’Essex<sup>80</sup> excusés par le Roy pour reasonable cause.

Messire John Asteley excusé par ces lettres par Garter envuyés.

All these individual explanations are clearly lacking in LN which only mentioned these names to be merely absents. Similarly in LN, the only note available for the the religious men related to the order is that ‘the prelate and Abbots were also

---

<sup>76</sup> Note that the Count of Urbin is not always *Duc de Burgoyne* in Ashmole’s copy.

<sup>77</sup> *FR.*, p. 92.

<sup>78</sup> Anstis, pp. 192-3.

<sup>79</sup> There is a footnote of Jefferson here: ‘Ashmole has inserted here the name of le Count D’aroundell’

<sup>80</sup> Here there is a footnote from Ashmole: ‘He is reckoned above as present’.

charged with Absence'. On the other hand, in FR they are separately handled: for example it has been denoted under the title of *Absentz sanz excusation* the descriptive titles of the abbots: 'L'evesque de Winchestre, Prelate de l'ordre', 'L'abbé de Tourhill', 'L'abbé de Medenham'.<sup>81</sup>

In some occasions LN is more clear in details for example In LN, 'Lord Scroop was gone to St. James' [of Compostella in Pilgrimage] while in the Ashmole's copy it is simply denoted that 'Le sire Scrope excusé par le Roy en tant que est hors de Realme'.<sup>82</sup> LN occasionally provides superior reading in the notes related to the particular cases of international knights. The following note is possibly an example of mistake made by misreading the name by either the writer of the original FR or Ashmole's scribes. In LN in 1463, the King of Poland, King of Naples, and Count of Urbin 'were attending on their affairs at home', while in FR instead of King of Poland there is *Le Roy de Portingale*, Since the king of Portugal was not a member of the Order in this time this is in all probability a possible misreading of the name of Poland as Portugal.<sup>83</sup> In FR again, there is Le Duc de Burgoyne instead of Count of Urbin.

One fundamental difference between these two copies is that, whenever there is a surviving register (ie. note in the register) for a particular session of the Order, LN usually gives extra information for clearly describing the year the register is referring. For example, if the Ashmole's copy is simply referring to a session which happened in the 26<sup>th</sup> year of Henry's reign, Ashmole's copy simply notes that 'in the 26<sup>th</sup> year of the most renowned King Henry VI's a session is held'.

---

<sup>81</sup> Anstis, p. 209; *FR.*, p. 106.

<sup>82</sup> Anstis, p. 204; *FR.*, p. 101.

<sup>83</sup> Nevertheless, in Anstis there is a similar mistake in the scrutinies as Anstis is aware of this, in p. 188 he explains in footnotes that Alfonsus King of Portugal had been elected and installed long before this time. see intro p. 52-3.

Nevertheless, Anstis gives additional important historical information which is not related to order's history, but which is helpful in finding the date of the year easily: 'in the same year happened.....'. eg: 'In this same year Queen Elizabeth brought forth her eldest daughter Elizabeth'.<sup>84</sup> This pattern is regularly repeating in Anstis.

In Anstis there is a comment in the *Liber Niger*, which cannot be produced from what is available in FR:

After this nomination the king having fully and duly considered all Things, and degraded Lord Duras, for that he having deserted him, flying like a Bat over the Side of the King of France, had sworn Obediance to him, decreed that Sir Thomas Montgomery, a singular good Knight should be chose out of Hand in his Stead; which was immediately agreed to by a general consent, and was afterwards done with no unbecoming Solemnity.<sup>85</sup>

On the other hand, the only text available in FR is a simple explanatory notice:

Et fait remembrer que le Roi a esleu messire Thomas Montgomery a l'estalle de Sire de Duras pour le Renoncuacion que le dit Sire de Duras a fait pour cause qu'il est juré home feal et subget du Roy de France.<sup>86</sup>

Another insertion in Anstis, which is available in the *Liber Niger* is the following paragraph.

A certain ambiguity in the Statutes which might be misinterpreted, was there removed by the Authority of a Sentence.'Tis required, that all the knights companions or Brethren coming to the appointed Feast, should be there the Day before at the hour of Tierce, at the House in which the Chapter is of Custom used to meet, here arose a Doubt, which was this third Hour, whether that which was the third after Noon, or that which by ecclesiastical Usage is so called after Prime. And Because it seemed more agreeable to the Statute, the Reason of the Statute, and the penalty therein enjoined to have it taken for that after Prime before Noon: it was decreed, That it should form that Time to be so observed inviolably. The Sovereign giving Judgement, and there was not one of the others then present, whom we have before reckoned up, but greatly approved it.

---

<sup>84</sup> Anstis, p. 179.

<sup>85</sup> Anstis, p. 199.

<sup>86</sup> *FR.*, p. 98; Jefferson's footnote: 'This phrase is underlined in the MS'. Anstis, p. 199.

In *FR* this information has no equivalent.<sup>87</sup> Anstis gives an explanatory notice in his footnote about a manuscript of Mr. Thynne (Francis Thynne, Lancaster Herald). Though today it is missing, there was an additional manuscript under the personal custody of the collector. It is thus highly probable that *LN* took this extra information from that manuscript.<sup>88</sup>

Therefore the sources of the Order of the Garter are problematic. The register survived in two copies and there are many differences in these copies. In many ways the old French register is superior. However, in some instances *Liber Niger* provides extra information.

---

<sup>87</sup> Anstis, pp. 201-2; *FR.*, pp. 99-100.

<sup>88</sup> See Anstis, p. 197.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS TO THE ORDER OF THE GARTER DURING THE REIGN OF HENRY VI**

#### **III.1 Introduction**

This Chapter deals with the elections and nominations to the Order of the Garter during the reign of Henry VI. There is little surviving evidence for the Order's history during the years of 1422-45 in terms of both elections and nominations of new knights to the Order. For this reason this period will only be partially discussed. There are a total of six surviving scrutiny lists during Henry VI's reign. The first surviving scrutiny dates to 1445 and the rest date respectively to 1446, 1447, 1448, and 1453. In a number of instances there had been elections for which the scrutiny lists do not survive. Since the actual political power during this period was in different hands, for example first in the Duke of Suffolk, and then the Duke of York, the nomination strategies in these surviving scrutiny lists will be analysed in accordance with political decisions of those real focuses of power but not king Henry himself. The nominations of particular people will be discussed together because they were nominated repeatedly by a number of companions usually by the same group of a political faction.

But the fate of this Solemnity, much like that glorious body the Sun (whose lustre at such times it strove to outshine) had at sometimes its short

intermitting Clouds, at others, long nights, and the glory thereof appeared but now and then, when the pleasure of *sovereign* grew auspicious, or the honor of the *Order* became placed upon more generous spirits. And to say truth, there may grow an excess in such solemnities, even to sunset; which is then best cured by a long abstinence.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout the period which historians traditionally call ‘The Wars of the Roses’, political tensions between the great magnates were hardly ever absent in England. In the problematic years of Henry VI, firstly, the Duke of Suffolk, then his rival the Duke of York were the real focus of power. The political picture was further complicated by the intervention of other magnates such as John Beauford, duke of Somerset, Henry Holland, duke of Exeter, and later Richard Neville, earl of Warwick. Considering the fact that their allies had to behave in accordance with their peers, political tension in the upper class of the English society was accordingly at its peak. The same tension within the inner body of the fraternity is also valid for the history of the Order during this period. During the turbulent years of Henry VI’s later reign in which political power changed hands so rapidly, the members of the companionship in any particular period of time in question were composed of different factions of the rival forces due to the fact that new actors in the political scene were eager to nominate their own allies to this ‘honorable’ Order while being unable to degrade their potential rivals from it. A late friend of Henry VI, the Duke of Gloucester would therefore find himself under the bond of companionship with a complete newcomer such as Lord Dudley. It was additionally not uncommon to see various Garter ‘companions’ damaging the chivalric ethos of their ‘most noble’ fraternity by enrolling in rival factions and waging private wars with each other. Thus, if one of the aims of the Garter companionship was to provide further

---

<sup>1</sup> Elias Ashmole, *The Institution, laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London, 1971), p. 339.

solidarity between the members of the Order, this aim was hardly ever achieved. In contrast, this was not entirely true for the reign of Edward IV. In Edward's minority years, political power was focused in one man, namely Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, and so-called 'the Kingmaker', and by Edward's second reign, the king was usually very much in control (except for relatively shorter intervals of time such as Clarence's rebellion). Accordingly, the social composition of the Order became much more homogenous in the members it recruited as well as its current ones. In this way, political solidarity was achieved, and different members of the Order did not frequently quarrel with each other. The exception is the duke of Clarence. This chapter discusses the reasons behind both the elections and nominations of Garter Knights in the reign of Henry VI and especially his later years since the surviving scrutinies belong to that period.

The importance of the scrutinies lies in the fact that although "the political currency of the Order was very much in the sovereign's hand,"<sup>2</sup> individual choices of the knight companions are merely reflected in the scrutinies lists, not in particular choices of the sovereigns. Although they occasionally have some repetitive character, the scrutinies were by no means simple formalities. Sometimes particular members nominated particular names for various reasons. Furthermore even if the attendance of a minimum of six companions was sufficient to make an election meeting, the number of knight companions participating in nominations has sometimes passed well beyond that number especially in relatively stable years.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Ben Daw, 'Elections to the Order of the Garter in the Reign of Edward IV', 1461-83, p. 187. After all whose sovereignty are we to count for? Was the elections Henry VI's choice or Suffolk's? no decisive answer can be given easily.

<sup>3</sup> Eight companions in the first surviving scrutiny, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; six companions in p. 130; six companions in pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; six companions in pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61; six companions in p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; six companions in p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67, eight companions in pp. 166-7; six companions

Clearly then, nominations had a meaning to knight companions. Thus, some of the nominees may be presented to the king's attention solely for honorary purposes. That is to say for the members' aim of bequeathing their close friends or sometimes relatives the 'honour' of being named within the register of 'such noble an Order' for the future memorial. Moreover, since the companionship was strictly limited to twenty-six companions, some prominent men whom the king as well as other knights-elect might well have thought merited membership may well be left unelected due to this exclusive limitation. Hence 'to be nominated' (even if not elected) in a way may show that at least companions, if not the king, thought that the nominee had the necessary chivalric (as well as sometimes political and parental) qualities to be elected to the Order. Additionally, focusing on scrutiny lists as well as elections may give a more complete and coherent picture in grasping the political dynamics of the time. Thus, not only elections but also nominations have both political as well as chivalric significance behind them as well. The first available scrutiny list is from 1445. Thus, first the political situation of the period must be briefly discussed. On the other hand, one must avoid exaggeration the king's as well as nobles' patronage networks were by no means limited to nominations and elections of the knights to the Order of the Garter. Nevertheless, the kings and great magnates and even lesser peerage to some extent ostensibly used the Order of the Garter for this means. Apart from the king's elections, one would reasonably expect that the great nobles of the period also tried to make their allies and close friends by nominating them to the Order.

---

in 187-8; seven companions in pp. 190-1; ten companions in pp. 194-6; in 93-4, eight companions pp. 196-9; et cetera, note that in relatively stable periods of time, companions are willing to participate to the nomination sessions and give their votes, probably because they believed it had a genuine meaning.



Elections to the ‘knighthood’ in general, and election to the knightly Orders especially to the Order of the Garter, were on the other hand different things. Throughout the later years of Henry VI’s reign most of the knights were elected to the knighthood not because they had strong political connections but either because they made great careers in the wars with France, or they were still militarily active.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, as we shall see, while military merit was somehow important for at least a small group of Garter nominees and knights, it was by no means the only necessary consideration for the majority of the nominees. A closer look to the political scene of the period may clarify the picture.

By the end of 1443 political power was remarkably passing to those who currently dominated King’s household and court, the head of which was clearly William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, and steward of the Royal Household.<sup>5</sup> Suffolk was aware of the importance of acquiring the loyalty of his servants for the security of his political career, and accordingly, he was visibly in need of favouring his loyal servants of the Royal Household. He became successful. He and his allies constantly used Garter nominations in their aim. Here is the complete list of people he personally nominated to the Order:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Antis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Foix	3	Y

---

<sup>4</sup> Given-Wilson, *Royal Household*, p. 282.

<sup>5</sup> Note that Pollard refers him as ‘Earl of Suffolk’ because he was simply an earl at that time; A. J. Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509* (New York, 2000), p. 122; and in *Registers* he was called ‘Marquess’, because he was promoted to marquess in 1444 and duke in 1448: Pollard, *Late Medieval England*, p. 124 Also see Ralph Alan Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI* (Phoenix, 1998), pp. 284-86.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir James Fenys	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Richard Woodvile	2	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Dudley	2	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	3	Sir Andr. Dalmade	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	3	Sir Jo. Beachamp	2	Y
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	3	Y
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Rich. Woodvile	2	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Robert Roos	1	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Say	3	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Earl of Northumb.	2	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Earl of Devonshire	1	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	1	John De Waynoda	3	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Rambrith de Walsey	2	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	1	King of Portugal	1	Y

It is apparent that Suffolk was in need of the support of the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Devonshire and the Earl of Oxford. Lord Lovell was a good war commander whose help might be needed anytime, Lord Audley and Dudley were the members of the old nobility. They were not active in politics but their service in the governmental affairs was always needed. The sons of these two men were elected to the Order in Edward IV's time (see the next chapter). Sir Richard Woodville was the son of Anthony Woodville the father of the future Queen Elizabeth and the wife of Edward IV. Three interesting names who are nominated only by Suffolk are John de Waynoda, Sir Andrew Dalmade and Rambrith de Walsey. The possible causes behind Suffolk's nomination of these three people require further study. A new group of people who had no direct connection with the old nobility was promoted to the upper class. Apart from being bequeathed to different offices, these 'new comers' were all regularly nominated to the Order. For example, in April 1439 Sir Roger Fiennes,<sup>6</sup> a not infrequent Garter nominee was accordingly appointed Treasurer of the Household, as well as his brother James,<sup>7</sup> a knight of the body, later Lord Saye and Sele,<sup>8</sup> who later succeeded to the office of Chamberlain were nominated by a certain group of companions (the future allies against York) under different sessions. For example Lord Saye and Sele was expectedly nominated by Marquess Suffolk himself and two neutral figures.

---

<sup>6</sup> Sir Roger 'Fenys' (possibly the same person) was nominated Anstis, *Registers*; p.127-28; *FR.*, p. 51. p. 130; pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; by Lord Sudeley, a powerful and loyal member of the alliance, three times, by Sir John Beauchamp, another loyal but not so politically powerful man, two times, by Marquess of 'Southfolk' himself one time, and again by Sir John Fastolf, one time, and lately by Earl of Shrewsbury one time, the origin of the alliance is then apparent.

<sup>7</sup> Note that he was also nominated in the first scrutiny in 1445. Anstis, *Registers*, p. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51. by Lord Sudeley, Sir 'Jo. Beauchamp', Marquess 'Southfolk'.

<sup>8</sup> Lord 'Say' was nominated by Marquess of 'Southfolk' himself, Sir John Beauchamp, Sir John Fastolf, but not chosen: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Say	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Say	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Say	2	N

However, since Saye was at the very beginning of his career, his nominations were not acknowledged by all of the members of the companionship. On the other hand, it is also important to note that in Henry VI's time, the elections and nominations occurred usually only by six companions available, the minimum necessary number for an election took place. This practice was quite different in Edward IV's time where in a nomination session sometimes ten companions were present. In this way Lord Saye's nomination is significant because he took half of the total votes of the available candidates. Here it is appropriate to discuss the particular example of Lord Saye: William, Lord Saye was the chief of a group of prominent men in Kent. Accordingly he was particularly close to Suffolk (since he sought the political support of the regional notables) as he was nominated by himself to the Order. However, political power was used reciprocally. The local group headed by him, and another group of men associated with him through the royal household, seemed to dominate Kent and its environs throughout Suffolk's supremacy. Even if the evidence coming from the Paston Letters of the misdeeds of Tuddenham in East Anglia may be an exaggeration (since the Pastons were on the losing side and thus not impartial), the evidence of similar abuse of Lord Saye in Kent and Sussex

revealed by official inquiries in 1450, suggest that a degree of aristocratic lawlessness on the part of Lord Saye.<sup>9</sup>

Saye probably used his Suffolk connections for his courageous moves in the region. However, this stroke him back as his oppressions in the shires later seen by the rival faction as a self-interested and treasonable rule at the center.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, local people rebelled against him and those rebels used the same sort of argument York used for convincing people that the throne was usurped. That is to say Suffolk like York, declared them traitors, locally in Kent, Lord Saye was declared traitor in local level.<sup>11</sup> His career tragically ended and the king was unable to save him: after Henry VI's army took the Blackheath back from the rebels (Jack Cade's followers) some of the king's followers "at Blackheath sympathized with the rebels and threatened to join them unless certain prominent household men (including Lord Saye and Bishop Aiscough) were dismissed. At this the king's nerve failed, he acceded to the arrest of Lord Saye, withdrew to London and on 25 June abandoned the capital".<sup>12</sup> Rebels occupied Southwark "on 3 July gained control of London Bridge and poured across the Thames into the city. For three days the city was pillaged. On 4 July Saye was taken from the Tower, 'tried' at guildhall and executed".<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 125.

<sup>10</sup> John L. 'Watts Polemics and Politics in the 1450s' in *The Politics of Fifteenth Century England: John Vale's Book* ed. Margaret Lucille Kekewich, Colin Richmond, Anne F. Sutton, Livia Visser-Fuchs and John L. Watts (1995) p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> Griffiths, *Henry VI*, p. 629.

<sup>12</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 131.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 131.

In 1439 similarly, Sir Thomas Stanley<sup>14</sup> a very frequent Garter nominee both in Henry VI's and Edward IV's time, and later in Edward's time a member of the Order, was also made Controller. He occasionally, changed political sides afterwards and became again a favourite of Edward IV throughout his reign thus was frequently nominated. However, his worst position in his political career was when the Duke of York took political control. Because, although the reason is not clear, York did not like Stanley and accordingly sponsored a bill to remove him from his office of Controllershship.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, this name was never nominated by York while others nominated him regularly.

In 1441, Sir Ralph Butler, soon to be created lord Sudeley, was appointed as Chamberlain.<sup>16</sup> He became a member of the Order, participated as many sessions as possible and thus nominated a number of different names of various origins (including Suffolk's favorites such as Sir James and Roger Fiennes Earl of Devon) in various sessions, and also relatively neutral and old figures such as Lord Foix. In accordance with Suffolk's probable plan of forging an alliance with Norfolk, he nominated him with Suffolk in 1445.<sup>17</sup> Although the scrutiny list he was nominated and elected is missing, he was an active participant in the nomination sessions. Consider for example the below table:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Foix	1	Y

---

<sup>14</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-28; *FR.*, p. 51. pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67. Sir William Stanley: pp. 187-88; pp. 190-91; pp. 206-7; pp. 211-12; (not chosen); Lord Stanley: pp. 187-88; pp. 190-91; pp. 193-94; pp. 194-96; pp. 196-99; pp. 206-7; pp. 211-12; pp. 217-20. (not chosen in Henry VI's time).

<sup>15</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 134.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>17</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp.127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Roger Fenys	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir James Fenys	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir William Bonevile	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Roger Fenys	2	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir John Beauchamp	1	?
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	3	Y
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Albro	3	Y
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Laware	1	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir John Popeham	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Roger Fenys	2	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	3	William Bonevyle	1	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Visco. Bourghch	1	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	3	N

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Wylshire	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N

As one can see he was one of the most trusted servants of the Duke of Suffolk: he participated in all the nomination sessions except 1453 when Richard, Duke of York came back from Ireland. Most of the men he nominated are in accordance with the general opinion. Some occasional differences are Earl of Devonshire and Lord Albro. I am unable to determine any particular reason for his nomination of these two individuals.

After Suffolk took control of the council and the important offices passed to his allies, there was neither division nor conflict between courtiers and councilors; the emergent courtiers were also the principal councilors. Thus, in accordance with the political stability within this short period of time, there was a short unity in the character of the Garter nominations. Luck also favoured Suffolk in his attempts to establish complete control of the political situation in England, as previous high office members and Garter companions (who were not directly connected to Suffolk) were already dead or too old to fulfill their jobs properly. Tiptoft and Chichele had already died in 1443; and Hungerford and Alwick retired because of old age. Gloucester was out of the political scene by 1441 as was Beaufort by the end of



1443. The posts emptied by their withdrawal were soon filled by the ‘new courtiers’, John Sutton, Lord Dudley,<sup>18</sup> and John, Lord Beaumont, all of which were regularly nominated to the Order by various companions.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, another frequent nominee, Lord Moleyns,<sup>20</sup> was to become the Keeper of the Privy Seal early in 1444 and perhaps a more valuable figure, Lord Sudeley,<sup>21</sup> replaced Cromwell as Treasurer in mid-1443 and was soon elected to the Garter companionship. Only Cardinal Kemp (whose nomination or election was out of question because of his religious status did not appear in Garter nomination lists) and the Chancellor, John Stafford,<sup>22</sup> remained among the leading councilors of the minority.<sup>23</sup> Note that many of them were regularly (and others occasionally) nominated to the Order of the Garter. Some of these prominent men were elected sooner or later whenever there was an open position, some were not, partly because the maximum available number of fraternity was limited and partly because each of these new favoured men were not equally favoured, or some of them changed political sides and accordingly disfavoured. There was obviously a great many difference between for example, the political importance of Lord Sudeley and that of Sir Roger Fiennes. Thus, the political unity in the Order both in terms of nominations and, to a degree, elections was established in Suffolk’s time but it was to change soon when Richard of York would decide to take control of political power. The members would be soon grouped under different

---

<sup>18</sup> He was nominated by Marquess Suffolk, Earl of Shrewsbury, Duke of Exeter. Political alliance is apparent. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51.p. 130. from 1460 onwards Lord Dudley consistently attended to the Garter nomination sessions. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-7; pp. 187-88; pp. 190-1; pp. 194-6; pp. 196-9; pp. 206-7; pp. 211-2; pp. 217-20.

<sup>19</sup> Viscount Beaumont participated to two nomination sessions: Anstis, *Register*, p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67; it appears that his nominations were in accordance with his alliance.

<sup>20</sup> Moleyns: Robert, Lord Moleyns (1444), Lord Hungerford (1459) (ex. 1464). Hungerford Family was regularly nominated. Anstis, *Register*, p. 127-28; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67; pp. 166-67;

<sup>21</sup> He was to be chosen to the Order soon. Anstis, *Register*, p. 132; *FR.*, p. 53-4;

<sup>22</sup> Already a member of the Order, and a non political figure by the time.

<sup>23</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England 1399-1509*, p. 123.

factions within the body of Garter companionship. That is to say, the above-mentioned newcomers suddenly possessed a further bond of loyalty (apart from their *a priory* bond of loyalty due to the fact that they were all knights of the body swearing the oath of allegiance to the king) with a future rival magnate, the Duke of York.

This initial transfer of power favouring Suffolk's allies was arranged by Cardinal Beaufort probably with the valuable help of his kinsmen who were already elected to the companionship and were still active in politics, although not very influential on political scene. For example, Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury,<sup>24</sup> was somewhat related to the Order in exactly this period.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, it is interesting to note that Edmund Beaufort, earl of Dorset, later promoted marquess and a king's councilor from 1444 was never related to the Order.<sup>26</sup>

From 1444 until 1450, there were only a few important disturbances of the peace.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, the underlying tensions between rival factions were sharpening openly. Garter nominations sometimes reflect these underlying polarizations. Accordingly, one striking point in following the scrutiny lists is that the members of the both alliances attempted to draw the Duke of Norfolk to their side around 1445. Thus he was nominated by all of the members of the alliance: duke

---

<sup>24</sup> He was already chosen and his election scrutiny is missing. He nominated at least in two sessions but his choices were as eclectic as possible. He nominated similar men but his votings are not exactly the same with any of the companions in any session. Anstis, *Register*, p. 130; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67; pp. 166-7; Anstis argued that the last scrutiny list of him must be a mistake as he died before that time, however, his scrutiny list is also available in the *French Register*.

<sup>25</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England 1399-1509*, p. 123.

<sup>26</sup> There is no record of any 'earl of Dorset' showing that he was chosen or even nominated in Henry VI's time. 'Marquess Dorset' was nominated very lately in Edward IV's time and immediately chosen. This Marquess Dorset was probably his heir Anstis, *Register*, pp. 193-4; pp. 194-96.

<sup>27</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 125.

of Exeter, Marquess Suffolk, Lord Sudeley, Lord Willoughby, and Sir John Fastolf.<sup>28</sup>

For a complete list of his nominators consider the below table:

Year	Anstis p	Knigh	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wyloughby	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	3	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	Y
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Northfolk	3	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y

<sup>28</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51..

Norfolk was regularly nominated by a number of companions (almost all of the companions who participated in the election sessions) but then duke of Norfolk was elected to the Order by the members of this political faction. He was given the honour of Garter, However, the project of getting his loyalty to Suffolk simply did not work: when York returned from Ireland in September 1450 (some five years after the first surviving nomination lists), his priority was to regain influence in domestic politics.<sup>29</sup> He tried to find support and succeeded to a degree, as he worked with the Duke of Norfolk,<sup>30</sup> to nominate York's own chamberlain Sir William Oldhall,<sup>31</sup> who was Speaker of Commons. Clearly then, Garter companionship did not always work as a firm political tool, because the Duke of Norfolk changed side. He did not hesitate in making alliance with the Duke of York in 1450. When York returned to England from Ireland and found Suffolk in power, he mobilized the support of those who had suffered under Suffolk with the help of his ally Norfolk.<sup>32</sup> Norfolk's political help to York was not limited to his war: After Henry VI's mental collapse, a Great Council is summoned which met on 21 November. It was Norfolk,<sup>33</sup> who

---

<sup>29</sup> Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', p 287.

<sup>30</sup> In fact their relationship may be older than Jones suggests because York nominated Duke of Norfolk (but not Chosen) in 1447, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; and Somerset nominated him in 1448, this time chosen, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61.

<sup>31</sup> He was nominated at least two possibly three times to the Order: Anstis, *Register*, Duke of York, Sir William 'Oodale', pp.132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; Lord Dudley, p. 166-67; Sir William 'Odar', by Lord Scales and in the *French Register*, their pronunciation are still much more different, p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60. (also see above)

<sup>32</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 133; *FR.*, p. 53-4. In fact their relationship may be older than Jones suggests because York nominated the Duke of Norfolk (but not Chosen) in 1447, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; and Somerset nominated him in 1448, this time chosen, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61. It is clear from the above nomination pattern that the Duke of Norfolk has changed political sides regularly. He has been accordingly nominated many times by the members of the different factions: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; p.141; *FR.*, p. 60; pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61. Some of his nominators were their rival parts. This man is a good example showing how flexible and fragile the political climax was.

<sup>33</sup> Norfolk was a constant Garter nominee throughout 1445-50. Though his political maneuvers were complex, his nomination patterns are very clear, he nominated in accordance with dominant political

presented charges of treason against Edmund Beauford, and demanded “his removal to the Tower to await trial”.<sup>34</sup> The other striking point within this context is that Beauford had nominated the Duke of Norfolk two years earlier when the latter was eventually elected to the Order.<sup>35</sup> The other point is that, while they were both the members, the inner solidarity of the Order was damaged again. Therefore political considerations usually surpassed honour in many respects and that the Order sometimes failed to give a conspiracy or unity to their members.

Additionally, Suffolk was trying to eliminate the opposing local gentry whenever necessary and, in one instance, around 1445 Viscount Beaumont supported Suffolk’s challenge to the local influence of Lords Cromwell and Willoughby. Both Cromwell and Willoughby were already members of the Order 1445. As far as the evidence is concerned, Cromwell did not participate in any official meeting of the Order, probably because he had already chosen his political side in the opposing party. Lord Willoughby on the other hand participated in one election session and not surprisingly, he nominated Duke of *North folk*.<sup>36</sup> For all the people he nominated consider the below table.

Year	Anstis p	Knights	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Willoughby	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Willoughby	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Willoughby	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N

---

figures in the first election session he participated and this pattern did not change in his following election sessions.

<sup>34</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 141.

<sup>35</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

<sup>36</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 125; The other knights he nominated are as follows: Earl of Oxford, Duke of Warwick, Lord Lovell, Lord Wells, Lord Laware, Sir Ro. Schotesbrook, Sir Thomas Kiriell, Sir John Montgomery. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; Lord Cromwell is nominated by Sir John Fastolf, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

Year	Anstis p	Knigh	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Laware	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Wells	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbrook	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir John Montgomery	2	N

There is noting unusual in this table except the name of Sir Robert Schotesbrook. However, I did not encounter any particular relationship between these persons which may cause Lord Willoughby to nominate Sir Robert. The other names were usual nominees, regularly or occasionally nominated to the Order. Lord Lovell, Lord Wells Lord Laware and Sir Thomas Kiriell were all good commanders of war. The Duke of Warwick and the Duke of Norfolk were his allies.

Furthermore, Beauford's help was further rewarded by Suffolk at least on two more occasions: as part of a secret agreement over Maine, Edmund Beauford, (by this time, *Marquess* of Dorset, thus another reward), a major landowner in Maine, was appointed to the vacant office of 'Lieutenant General of Normandy', which formerly belonged to Richard of York.<sup>37</sup> Additionally, Suffolk was not hesitant in eliminating his enemies even if they were already a member of the Order: for example, he wanted to remove the Duke of Gloucester (apparently an old Garter companion by the time), from the political scene. Accordingly, in 1447, at Bury St.

---

<sup>37</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 127.

Edmunds, for a meeting of parliament called in Suffolk's own county, Gloucester was arrested, thrown into prison and accused of treason, and was soon dead.<sup>38</sup>

Returning to the national politics, by 1445, Suffolk himself was the ultimate focus of power in East Anglia, and Fiennes in Kent and Sussex; Lord Beaumont in Leicestershire and Lincolnshire; the family of Stanleys in Cheshire. Other friends of the new nobility, such as Earl of Salisbury in north-eastern England and, in south Wales, Gruffyd ap Nicholas,<sup>39</sup> who was later elected to the fraternity, emerged as a deputy for royal justiciars and marcher lords, securing personal control of the region for the advancement of his own ends. It was again at about this time, too, that in North Wales Sir Thomas Stanley (see above) began to create his hegemony. The royal household itself grew as big as possible, as ambitious or well connected gentry were recruited to the new court (and thus to the nobility) as the knights and esquires of the body.<sup>40</sup> The whole picture can be applied to the Garter nomination lists of the period (excluding of course international knights whose election and membership was already genuinely symbolic in some occasions and sometimes was well related to the politics of the international affairs). There was a clear coherence and unity in the behavior of the knight companions *who regularly attended to the fraternity's official sessions*, and thus Garter nominations (but *not* the inner body of the Order as a whole since certain members of the rival groups were already chosen to the companionship by the former political authority) reflected this unipolar political

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. p. 128.

<sup>39</sup> For a detailed analysis of this family's political role in this period in particular and his son's political impact in later years see: Ralph A. Griffiths, *Sir Rhys ap Thomas His Family: A Study in the Wars of the Roses and Early Tudor Politics*, (Cardiff, 1993), A book Review is also available in *Medieval Prosopography* 1995 16/1, pp. 125-32. by Compton Reeves.: The fortune of Rhys up Thomas's family "were a touchstone of political, dynastic, and social developments in England and Wales during the Wars of the Roses and the Tudor century that followed". Griffiths, *Sir Rhys ap Thomas His Family*., p. ix.

<sup>40</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 124.

order, because only one man, Suffolk, dominated the political scene, and he was trying to strengthen his position. In order to achieve this goal, the firm loyalty of the localities was certainly important. Just as Edward IV would attempt later to gain the allegiance of his northern subjects by choosing some of its leading members to the Order of the Garter (see the next chapter), so Suffolk attempted to establish a balanced combination of gentry class families in order to get complete local control. His and his allies's choices were as eclectic as possible. However, although big political powers' concerns for dealing with the localities remained the same, as we shall see, after a while, in a striking accordance with the political change in the upper levels of the English political scene, Garter nomination pattern has also remarkably changed.

However, it would be inaccurate to state that Garter elections and nominations were used effectively in organizing the international relationships in this period (both in Suffolk and York's political supremacy) probably because great magnates focused much more on inner turbulences and in turn failed to give the international affairs its proper attention. The following instance may elaborate the point: in 1443, John Duke of Brittany, who was so far generally politically neutral but continued his old alliance with England, was succeeded by his Francophile heir Francis. Two years later in 1445 Francis had officially abandoned the old English alliance, accordingly in 1446 he gave homage to Charles VII. However, Henry VI refused to accept this fact. Instead he supported the cause of the duke's brother Gilles, who was firmly continuing his father's tradition and thus was still an English ally. (Perhaps one other reason for his political closeness to England was that he spent some of his youth in England.) Not surprisingly (and perhaps justifiably) Gilles



was arrested on the charge of plotting with the Englishmen to depose his brother.<sup>41</sup> Accordingly Francis was never nominated to the Order. However, the difficult question is why Gilles was not nominated in this critical political period. It is clear that England supported Gilles but opposed to Francis. We know that alliances were usually favoured by the political authority by giving their loyal subject Garter companionship. There are many examples to show this attitude in the Order's previous history.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless this time this did not happen. But interestingly, as the alliance of the following heir of the duke of Brittany continued, the reward came from Edward IV (however lately). The heir Duke of Brittany was nominated first in 1472 by the beginning of Edward's second reign probably because he continued his alliance with the English crown.

In 1444-7, preference was given in any situation to courtiers and the queen, leaving many others, especially captains of war, the wardens of the marches and the captain of Calais, by themselves. But this unfair situation was relatively compensated by nomination and election of important war leaders to the fraternity. Although nominating and electing good soldiers to the Order was a traditional practice since the Order itself was initially a martial Order, The above mentioned cause is perhaps one reason why Thomas Kiriell was in fact nominated and chosen. King was trying to compensate the unfair situation. However, the other explanation may also be correct. Good soliders such as Sir Thomas Kiriell and Sir John Wenlock may well have been rewarded by nomination and election.

In 1450, the Commons tried to impeach Henry VI's chief minister the duke of Suffolk. Commons believed that he had had an influence in the death of the Duke of

---

<sup>41</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 128.

<sup>42</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, pp. 201-20.

Gloucester, and also that the Duke of Somerset and the Duke of Warwick had been ruined by the same means. John Beauford, Duke of Somerset, died in 1444, and Henry Beauchamp Duke of Warwick in 1445.<sup>43</sup> Suffolk's regime ended in 9 January 1450 with the murder of Adam Moleyns by soldiers, and the new regime was established thereafter. Firstly political authority on the kingdom had to be established. By 1451, the leading nobles of the political scene were Somerset, the Duke of Buckingham,<sup>44</sup> and the Earl of Shrewsbury.<sup>45</sup> By the beginning of September of the same year, Earl of Shrewsbury,<sup>46</sup> Somerset's brother-in-law, was appointed Lieutenant of Guyenne,<sup>47</sup> and was allowed to take the law into his own hands in 1451-2 in the long dispute of his countess with Lord Berkeley. After Dartford, Lord Bonneville was supported in Devon. On the other hand Lord Cromwell slipped from favour.<sup>48</sup> Here is a complete list of the nominations of the Duke of Somerset:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Clyfford	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Rich Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Robert Odar	2	N

---

<sup>43</sup> Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Crown and the Royal family in Later Medieval England' in Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherborne *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages* ed. (New York, 1986), pp. 16-7.

<sup>44</sup> The situation of Duke of Buckingham was also flexible. He nominated in different times different people. So his alliance may be shifting. Make the individual analysis.

<sup>45</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 134.

<sup>46</sup> He was already a member of the Order. He nominated many names. But it appears from the nomination lists that he was in accordance with Suffolk and later Somerset so he may have changed his alliance. He nominated Duke of Exeter, Sir Roger Fenys, Sir Thomas Stanley when he was actively enrolled in Suffolk's politics; but on the other hand, he also nominated Earl of Oxford for example, or duke of Warwick and, duke of Devonshire and Duke of Norfolk, who were somewhat closer to York. Interesting man indeed this Shrewsbury. He deserves special attention and closer inspection.

<sup>47</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 136.

<sup>48</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 136.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Earl of Northumb.	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Milan	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Bromiswych	3	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	Y
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Bonevyle	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	Y
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N

Somerset's nominations of Lord Lovell and Lord Clifford are easy to explain: both were good soldiers whose help might be needed anytime. The cause behind his

nomination of Lord Audley may well be similar with that of the duke of Suffolk. He was not a highly political figure but was a member of the old nobility whose help might be needed. The nominations of the duke of Exeter, the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Oxford were completely political. Lord Bonville was another constant Garter nominee and then a member afterwards: he was, for example, nominated by Lord Sudeley in two different sessions and once by Sir John Fastolf, before he became Lord Bonville and once more by the Duke of York himself. After he became Lord, he was nominated by the Duke of Somerset and his ally earl of Shrewsbury and some other names in various sessions.<sup>49</sup> Lord Cromwell, on the other hand, was never close to the companionship. He is nominated once by Sir John Fastolf just before he fell out of favour probably because as an act of courtesy in his previous acts.<sup>50</sup> The nominations of the Duke of Buckingham paralleled those of his ally the Duke of Somerset.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Popeham	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesnroke	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Visc. Bourghch	1	N

---

<sup>49</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-3;

<sup>50</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Will. Moundford	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbrook	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Bromiswych	2	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	The Emperor	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	Viscount Lyle	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	L. Hungerford	1	N

They both nominated the Duke of Brumswick, Duke of Exeter, Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Bouchier, Earl of Oxford, Earl of Wiltshire, Lord Lovell, Lord Audley, Sir Richard Harrington, Sir Edward Hull, Sir Roger Stotesbrook and Sir Thomas Rempston.

The Duke of York intervened in Somerset in September to impose order on Thomas Courtenay the earl of Devon (d. 1458).<sup>51</sup> Besieging Lord William Bonville (d. 1461), who had been famous for his good military career, was nominated to the Order by Lord Sudeley in 1445 and 1447 and by the Duke of York and Sir John Fastolf in 1447.<sup>52</sup> Devon at this time was York's ally; he was in effect intervening on his behalf.<sup>53</sup> This dispute between the Earl of Devon and Lord Bonville is used to explain Bonville's alienation from the Court and his subsequent support for York after the first battle of St Albans. Accordingly he was nominated by the Duke of York as a reward for his military support.<sup>54</sup> Consider the table:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Bonevyle	3	N

---

<sup>51</sup> Earl of Devonshire was nominated three times: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; in the first nomination by Marquess Southfolk, Lord Sudeley, Lord Scales, and Sir Jo. Beauchamp. Thus, perhaps initially, he was Suffolk's ally or Suffolk was trying to gain his alliance. In the second nomination he was nominated by Marquess Suffolk, Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Scales, and Lord Sudeley. In the third session he is nominated by Marquess Suffolk, Lord Sudeley, Sir John Beauchamp. So Suffolk consistently nominated him. Note that York did not nominate him at all.

<sup>52</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61; p.150; *FR.*, p. 67; pp. 166-7.

<sup>53</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 135.

<sup>54</sup> S. J. Payling, 'The Ampthill Dispute: a Study in Aristocratic Lawlessness and the Breakdown of Lancastrian Government', *English Historical Review*, 104/413 (Oct., 1989), pp. 881-2; Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y

However, it is also striking to note that the members of the rival faction, the Duke of Somerset, earl of Shrewsbury and Lord Sudeley also nominated him in 1448.<sup>55</sup> In 1453, he was again nominated by the Duke of Somerset, earl of Salisbury and Lord Beauchamp.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore in 1461, All Warwick adherents also nominated him: the Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Bouchier, Earl of Salisbury, Lord Beauchamp, Lord Wells, Lord Dudley, Lord Rivers, and Lord Berners.<sup>57</sup> Therefore, gaining the political support of important commanders was important for any political side. But on the other hand, in 1452, York directed his political supporters towards the earl of Devon and Lord Cobham<sup>58</sup> (whose military service was lately rewarded by a Garter nomination in Edward IV's time) against the Duke of Somerset.<sup>59</sup> York has been defeated. Oldhall his natural ally, was condemned for treason though he was once

---

<sup>55</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

<sup>56</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

<sup>57</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-7.

<sup>58</sup> Lord Cobham was nominated very lately in 1483 by Sir John Ascheley and Sir Thomas Montgomery. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 217-20.

<sup>59</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 135.

nominated to the Order by the duke of York himself.<sup>60</sup> In the Parliament that met on 6 March 1453, which established confidence, “a complaint house enrolled of formal condemnation of all criticisms that had been made of the court in 1450-1, Oldhall was attained”.<sup>61</sup> Thus just like being a member of the Order does not provide any kind of official security, being nominated to the Order does not prevent one being accused of treason.

The deficiency of Henry VI in political affairs can also be seen in the fact that no Garter companion ever nominated his personal favourites: in 1452, for example Henry VI promoted his half brothers, Edmund and Jasper Tudor, to the earldoms of Richmond<sup>62</sup> and Pembroke.<sup>63</sup> Neither was ever nominated to the fraternity even in Henry’s lifetime. A later Earl of Pembroke was nominated lately in 1475 by Lord Ferrers only in a number of consecutive sessions.<sup>64</sup>

One individual but otherwise important detail is that although the dispute between the family of Nevilles and the Percys for the political dominance in Yorkshire is well investigated by historians, also important but little-known dispute between the Earl of Warwick and Edmund Beaufort Duke of Somerset, over Warwick’s right to occupy the Despenser lordship of Glamorgan and Morgannwg<sup>65</sup> (which is seen by some historians as crucial in explaining the Nevilles’ inclination to support Richard, Duke of York, in 1453.)<sup>66</sup> has not been properly assessed. One thing

---

<sup>60</sup> He was nominated: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; by duke of York; expectedly and pp. 166-67, by Lord Dudley.

<sup>61</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 137.

<sup>62</sup> There is a Lord Richmond nominated by Lord Berners in Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-7. (not chosen.)

<sup>63</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 136.

<sup>64</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 190-1; pp. 193-4; pp. 194-6; pp. 196-99. (not chosen.)

<sup>65</sup> Griffiths, ‘Local Rivalries and National Politics: The Percies, the Nevilles and the Duke of Exeter, 1452-55’, *Speculum*, 43/4 1968, p. 589-623; T. B. Pugh, ‘the Marcher Lords of Glamorgan and Morgannwg 1317-1485’ in T. B. Pugh (ed.), *Glamorgan County History*, 3 (Cardiff, 1971), pp. 194-7. Cited in S. J. Payling, ‘The Amptill Dispute’, p. 881.

<sup>66</sup> S. J. Payling, ‘The Amptill Dispute’, p. 881.



that can facilitate our understanding of the Garter history is that probably because of this dispute Edmund Beaufort did not nominate Richard Neville in 1453, while he was nominated by Viscount Bouchier at this session.<sup>67</sup>

Consider for example the dispute between Sir Edward Hull and Sir John Fastolf. Edward Hull<sup>68</sup> was already close to courtier cycles. He was a son of two courtiers. His father John Hull, was king's esquire, and Eleanor, daughter and heir of Sir John Malet of Enmore in Somerset, servant to Queen Joan the consort of Henry IV.<sup>69</sup>

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	Y
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	Y

Born somewhere in a decade after the beginning of the fifteenth century, he married Mergery Lovell before 1441.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

<sup>68</sup> He has been first nominated by duke of Somerset and Lord Beauchamp in 1448, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61, and then in 1453 by Duke of Buckingham, Earl of Salisbury, Viscount Boucher, Viscount Beaumont, Lord Beauchamp and Duke of Somerset (John de la Pole who has not entered to political conflicts). Anstis, *Register*, p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67. This time he is chosen. Possibly after the death of Sir John Fastolf. So was Edward Hull a knight *sans Reproche*?

<sup>69</sup> John Hull was called Henry V's esquire as early as 1415 *CCR*. 1413-19, 212. His wife again was in Queen Joan's service at least by 1416 *CPR*. 1416-22, 304; cited in P. S. Lewis, 'Sir Fastolf's Lawsuit over Titchwell 1448-55', *The Historical Journal*, 1/1 (1958), p. 3.

<sup>70</sup> The first reference to Margery and Edward Hull together is in November 1441 *CCR*. 1441-45, 9-10, cited in P. S. Lewis, 'Sir Fastolf's Lawsuit', p. 3.

Since he was in a favoured position, he acquired many gifts. Apart from some pensions and grants, he was also appointed as sheriff of Somerset and Dorset, and to commissions in the West Country. He was also used in foreign missions. In October 1442, he was made ambassador with Sir Robert Roos, who is somewhat possibly related with Lord Roos (another Garter nominee) to the count of Armagnac. Two years later in 1444 he became a knight of the body. Another gift came from the Queen as by 1448 he was chosen to one of the queen's carvers. For all these reasons he was really prominent.<sup>71</sup> He thus attacked to Sir John Fastolf's property. Edward Hull had a decided advantage over Fastolf because Hull was influential at the court. Hence the thesis that "Garter's continued value as an instrument of patronage"<sup>72</sup> should not be exaggerated. Sir John Fastolf was already a member of the Order. Therefore it is probable to assume that he had also the means in order to be influential at the court. But he could not achieve it. Consider his nominations:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Grey Ruff.	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Boucer	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Robert Roos	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ro. Hungerford	1	N

---

<sup>71</sup> See Ibid. p. 4.

<sup>72</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, p. 154.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Albro	2	Y
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Hoo	3	?
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	1	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir John Montgomery	3	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Henry Herbert	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Will. Bonevyle	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Rob. Hungerford	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Clyfford	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Arundel	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Say	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Ryvers	3	Y
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Bromiswych	3	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Cyfford	1	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	1	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Cromwell	2	N

Although his inclination in nominations was mostly Yorkist (almost ninety percent of his nominations were also regularly repeated by the Yorkists), there are some men who were opposed of the York's regime: for example, the Duke of Exeter. Lord Cromwell was nominated by him they were close in age, so perhaps it was a demonstration of an old friendship. John Fastolf was suspended from the membership of the Order because of the accusations of cowardice made by John Lord Talbot, later Earl of Shrewsbury, following his retreat from Patay in 1429.<sup>73</sup> Fastolf was reinstated by Bedford. Sir John Fastolf died in November 1459.<sup>74</sup> This suspension and reinstallation may have been done by a council composed of Garter companions and lawyers specially appointed for that purpose which is 'an internal inquiry board of the Order'.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, p. 40.

<sup>74</sup> Daw Ben, p. 194.

<sup>75</sup> Jefferson, 'MS Arundel 48', p. 363.

Much has been said about the nature of the rivalry between Richard, Duke of York and Edmund Beauford, duke of Somerset between the years 1450-55, and their impact on the Wars of the Roses.<sup>76</sup> For example Pollard claimed that: Richard of York's quarrel with Edmund Beauford 'began as a matter of chivalric honour because of the manner in which Somerset had surrendered Rouen and other properties held by York'. The tension is further severed by the autumn of 1450 when he saw that Somerset had already won the King's confidence in politics and that York was already excluded from favour.<sup>77</sup> Although there is a clear opposition between them some of the names they nominated to the Order are common, leading one to conclude that perhaps they were agreeing on in a degree about the chivalric honour.

They were both already members of the Order at about 1447-48. The first implication of this fact is that being member to the Order failed to give their members a basis of patronage either on the part of Henry VI or anyone. They disagreed on almost anything in politics but they were the members of the same Order. On the other hand, they agreed on four names in Garter elections: Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Burchier and Lord Audley.<sup>78</sup> York participated in only one session in 1447, (there is another Duke of York in 1476). On the other hand, Somerset participated to two sessions in 1448 and 1453. Consider the table showing the nominations of the duke of York:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
------	----------	--------	------	---------	-------	---------

---

<sup>76</sup> Michael K. Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', *English Historical Review* (1989), pp. 285-307.

<sup>77</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 133.

<sup>78</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 132.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	3	Sir William Bonevyle	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	3	Sir William Ooldale	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Baron Carew	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Lord Awdley	2	N

If one compares this table with what Somerset nominated a great parallelism can be ascertained. Somerset nominated both of Viscount Burchier and Lord Audley in each two sessions, he nominated Duke of Norfolk in his last session. Perhaps there is one more name nominated by both. Sir William Bonneville in York, and Lord Bonneville in Somerset's second. Moreover, Sir Andrew Ogard in York and Sir Robert Odar in Somerset first may have some connection.

The most interesting point is that for the sake of their alliance, Edmund nominated in his second session Duke of Exeter and Earl of Northumberland.<sup>79</sup> Somerset consistently nominated Richard Harrington and Sir Thomas Rempston, Viscount Burchier and Lord Audley in both sessions. In 1452 York was not content with the Somerset's dominance over the king<sup>80</sup> and it is worth to discuss how far this dominance affected the Garter elections. Sir Edward Hull, Duke of Brunswick, and

---

<sup>79</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p.632.

<sup>80</sup> Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', p. 286.

King of Aragon were all Somerset's candidates and they were consistently chosen.<sup>81</sup>

Duke of Brunswick and King of Aragon in 1448, and Sir Edward Hull in 1453. Their "Aristocratic Duel"<sup>82</sup> was thus reflected to a large extent in their Garter nominations.

Furthermore the alliance is apparent consider who nominated the Duke of Exeter:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N

Henry Holland Duke of Exeter: (d.1471) Sir John Holland<sup>83</sup> was Henry Holland's distant cousin. Henry inherited some land from him.<sup>84</sup> Duke of Exeter John

---

<sup>81</sup> Anstis *Registers*, p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

<sup>82</sup> Cited in Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', p. 286: A, Tuck, *Crown and Nobility 1272-1461* (London, 1985), pp. 299-300.

<sup>83</sup> Sir John Holland was nominated only once by Duke of Exeter himself in the first scrutiny: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8 *FR.*, p. 51. Possibly this duke of Exeter is the father of Henry Holland since he died in 1471.

<sup>84</sup> Payling, 'The Ampthill Dispute', p. 884.

Holland (d. 1447) father of Henry Holland (d. 1471) who was depicted as ‘fierce and Cruel’<sup>85</sup> was already a member of the Order in 1445. Later however his son Henry (another *Duke* of Exeter thus) was nominated. Father John Holland was a noted soldier who was in need of improving the prospects of his family by a degree of royal patronage and by a series of marriages to wealthy widows. This however did not help him much according to Payling.<sup>86</sup>

Henry Duke of Exeter has been nominated by both neutral figures and sometimes his future rivals: Sir John Fastolf, a lifetime neutral figure for him, Sir John Beauchamp a later rival name from Neville household, Lord Beauchamp and Earl of Salisbury two other later rival names from the same family, the duke of Somerset his natural ally, the duke of Buckingham, important ally of Somerset, Viscount Beaumont, Earl of Shrewsbury, and Lord Sudeley, other clear allies of Somerset.<sup>87</sup>

Exeter wanted Lord Greystoke, however he was not nominated by any member in Henry’s time. Probably later he supported Edward as he has been accordingly nominated by Sir John Ascheley in 1474.<sup>88</sup> This is his only nomination. Lord Roos who has been occasionally nominated by he members of both factions was also close to the alliance.

The duke of Exeter was nominated between 1448-53 in three sessions by the following names: a relatively neutral figure Duke of Buckingham, (two times) his ally Duke of Somerset (two times), Earl of Shrewsbury, Sir John Fastolf (three

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid. p. 883.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid. p. 883.

<sup>87</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp.127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61. Payling, ‘The Ampthill Dispute’, pp. 881-907.

<sup>88</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 193-4.



times), Sir John Beauchamp, Lord Beauchamp (two times), Lord Sudeley, Earl of Salisbury, Viscount Beaumont. Alliance is apparent in Garter scrutiny lists.<sup>89</sup>

The Duke of Suffolk helped Somerset in his aim for achieving the governorship of Normandy from York.<sup>90</sup> The Marquis Suffolk nominated the following names in 1447: The King of Portugal, Earl of Devonshire, Earl of Northumberland Lord Saye, Sir Richard Woodville Sir Robert Roos, Sir Andrew Ogard. One year later in 1448, The Duke of Somerset nominated Duke of Exeter, Duke of Norfolk, Lord Bonneville, Sir Edward Hull, Sir Richard Harrington, Lord Audley, Viscount Bouchier, earl of Northumberland, and Sir Thomas Rempston. Therefore, excluding the Earl of Northumberland, no other similarity exists between the votes of each companion. Thus although they were allies, they did not work together in Garter nominations. The Duke of Suffolk was already a member of the Order in 1445, his title was Marquess of Suffolk.<sup>91</sup> The critical political change is the year of Somerset's replacement of York as king's lieutenant-general and governor in France. In September 1445 the duke of York was in England again after returning from France after serving there for five years.<sup>92</sup> York resented both Somerset and Suffolk over this incident.<sup>93</sup> Thus this is the beginning of the process which would lead York to separate from Suffolk and Somerset. It is also important to note that the Duke of Suffolk nominated the Duke of Norfolk (before York), and Earl of Northumberland who were also close names to the alliance.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

<sup>90</sup> Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', p. 290.

<sup>91</sup> For a discussion of his title see: 'John de la Pole Duke of Suffolk', *Speculum*, (1986).

<sup>92</sup> Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', p. 291.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.* p. 290.

<sup>94</sup> Suffolk nominated Norfolk twice, the former being before York's nomination of him. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-28; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; Suffolk nominated the Earl of Northumberland, p. 132-33;

Another important family which was occasionally nominated in Garter list was the Hungerford family. The Hungerfords were initially of modest origin later achieved great wealth and high social status as a consequence of the Hundred Years Wars. They made good service to the Lancaster Family, or Ralph Stafford the Duke of Buckingham.<sup>95</sup> The interplay between the Hungerford family's sense of dynasty and that of piety is discussed by Professor Hicks.<sup>96</sup> Since the family was influential and very close to royal circles at least in the first half of Henry VI's, the members of the family were occasionally nominated to the Order usually by politically relatively less active figures. Sir Edward Hungerford for instance took a total of 5 votes in a total of 3 sessions.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	1	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N

He was nominated by first in 1445 by Lord Scales, then in 1448, by Sir John Fastolf and Viscount Beaumont and lastly by Duke of Buckingham, and Viscount Beaumont in 1453<sup>97</sup> but he was not chosen. Note that Viscount Beaumont nominated him twice. Following him, another member of the same family Sir

---

*FR.*, p. 53-4; possibly Duke of Norfolk was a person who went both sides through time. Or both of the parts needed his support and accordingly, they tried to get him on their side.

<sup>95</sup> M. M. Postan, 'The Costs of the Hundred Years' War', *Past and Present*, No. 27. (Apr., 1964), pp. 34-53; p. 52.

<sup>96</sup> M. A. Hicks, *Piety and Lineage in the Wars of the Roses: The Hungerford Experience* in Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherborne *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages* ed. (New York, 1986), pp. 90-108.

<sup>97</sup> *Anstis, Register*, p. 127-28; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

Richard Hungerford was once nominated by Lord Beauchamp, not chosen.<sup>98</sup> Then the nomination of Sir Robert Hungerford followed the sequence: he is nominated by Sir John Fastolf in 1445,<sup>99</sup> and again in 1447.<sup>100</sup> However the head of the family Lord Hungerford was only nominated by Lord Dudley in 1460.<sup>101</sup> Thus Sir John Fastolf nominated three times different members of the Hungerford family: Robert Hungerford twice and Edward Hungerford once. However there is no any clue as to what sort of connection he may have with Hungerford family.

The reason behind the nomination of the last lord Hungerford is also very clear Robert, Lord Moleyns (1444), Lord Hungerford (1459) (ex. 1464) was a committed political supporter of Henry VI against the Yorkists in June 1460. Following the battle of Northampton, which gave the Yorkists control of both king and government, Moleyns secured a pardon for his life though he again fought in to the battle of Towton on 29 March 1461.<sup>102</sup> He did not change sides when Edward IV took the throne and thus was executed in 1464.<sup>103</sup> Once a family goes out of favour, it was sometimes difficult to regain that royal favour: the relatives of Moleyns sought their approval by good service. Probably they became close to earl of Warwick, as Thomas Hungerford served under his command against the Northern rebels,<sup>104</sup> but as far as the surviving records are concerned, Thomas was not even nominated to the Order at all and was executed in 1469.<sup>105</sup> Another intriguing point about this family is that the son of Robert (Lord Moleyns 1444 and Lord Hungerford 1459), Thomas,

---

<sup>98</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p.150; *FR.*, p. 67..

<sup>99</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 127-28; *FR.*, p. 51.

<sup>100</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4.

<sup>101</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-67.

<sup>102</sup> R.C. Hoare, *A history of Modern Wiltshire* (6 vols., 1822-40) I (2), pp. 100-1; cited in Hicks, *The Hungerford Experience*, p. 95..

<sup>103</sup> Hicks, *The Hungerford Experience*, pp. 93-4.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* p. 94.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.* p. 95.

married Anne Percy: and Anne Percy remarried Sir Lawrence Reynford who was nominated different times,<sup>106</sup> first in 1479 by Sir John Ascheley, again in 1482 by him, and in 1483 third time by Sir John Ascheley and Sir Thomas Montgomery.

After the Hungerford estates were confiscated a new favourite John, afterwards Lord Stourton, was rewarded with their lands in 1462.<sup>107</sup> This was probably the start of his brilliant career under the service of the Yorkist regime. He was both nominated during Edward's first reign once and He was a regular nominee in most of the election sessions in Edward IV's second reign. He was nominated 14 times in five different sessions, but was never chosen. In 1460, by Viscount Bouchier, Lord Wells, Duke of Norfolk, Lord Dudley; In 1472, by Lord Hastings, Duke of Gloucester, Earl of Essex, Duke of Clarence; In 1475, Duke of Gloucester, Lord Dudley, Earl Douglas, Lord Duras; in 1476, Duke of Buckingham; In the same year but different session, Lord Dudley (note that Lord Dudley nominated him twice).<sup>108</sup> It is also interesting to note that Edward IV placed Eleanor, Lady Moleyns her inheritance, in the custody of Lord Wenlock who was nominated once in 1461 and immediately chosen.<sup>109</sup> Thus John Wenlock's election may not be explained solely on the basis of his military achievements. Though John Wenlock became the chamberlain of Queen Margaret of Anjou, but in 1455 he became Yorkist. He was attainted by the Coventry Parliament. He was in exile in Calais with the other earls. He fought at Towton. He served to Edward as Ambassador between 1461 and 1470 as well as royal councilor. By September 1461 he was created baron, and was

---

<sup>106</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 206-7; pp. 211-12; pp. 217-20. Sir Laurence Amsord pp. 194-96.

<sup>107</sup> Hicks, *The Hungerford Experience*, p. 95.

<sup>108</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-67; pp. 187-88; pp. 190-91; pp. 193-94; pp.194-96. Sir 'Ro. Hungerford', pp. 127-28 *FR.*, p. 51.

<sup>109</sup> John Wenlock was nominated once and chosen in 1460, by Lord Rivers, Lord Beauchamp, Lord Wells, Earl of Salisbury, Lord Dudley. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-67. in the same nomination Sir Thomas Wenlock was also nominated by the Duke of Norfolk but not chosen.

granted lands from forfeited Lancastrian estates, especially those of John Fortescue.<sup>110</sup>

It is also interesting to note that the brilliant career of John Denham, later Lord Denham, may have started with the same event. On 12 August 1463 the manors in Devon, Somerset, and Oxfordshire which had been formerly to Moleyn's use were forfeited and given under the custody of Lord Denham who was both regularly nominated and then elected to the Order in Edward IV's time (see next chapter).<sup>111</sup> It is probable that Denham was already influential at court because Margaret granted him 100 marks as an annuity to assuage royal displeasure and to prevent Denham from causing trouble at court.<sup>112</sup> It is also possible to explain Lord Roos's nomination within the context of Hungerford Family. Margaret Roos was somewhat connected to the Hungerfords by marriage (whose another marriage is a much more interesting name: Sir Thomas Burgh for his influence in Edward's court and nominations see the next chapter). Accordingly Lord Roos was close to the alliance of Lancasters below discussed. He was nominated by the Earl of Salisbury and Viscount Boucher in two separate sessions in 1446 and 1453.<sup>113</sup> Additionally William Lord Hastings (d. 1483), was also connected to the Hungerford family. He was soon to be elected to the Order in Edward IV's time. He participated in five nomination sessions and nominated in accordance with the major opinion.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> J. S. Roskell, 'John, Lord Wenlock of Someries', *Bedfordshire Historical Record Society Publications*, 38 (1957), 12-48; cited in Ross *Edward IV*, pp. 80-1.

<sup>111</sup> Hicks *The Hungerford Experience*, p. 95.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 95-6.

<sup>113</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics: The Percies, the Nevilles and the Duke of Exeter, 1452-55', *Speculum*, 43/4 1968, p. 600.

Anstis, *Register*, p. 130; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67.

<sup>114</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 187-88; pp. 193-94; pp. 194-96; pp. 196-99; pp. 206-7.

Ralph Griffiths has defined the Wars of the Roses as a quarrel between great Marcher lords in order to overthrow the Lancastrian government.<sup>115</sup> A closer look to this battle may make the political situation between 1453-5 clearer: the whole story began in 1448, with a land dispute between the Percy family which was headed by the Duke of Northumberland, and their rivals Richard, the Duke of York, and Neville, Earl of Salisbury. Although in essence the origin of this dispute between Percy family and the Nevilles went back to 1420s the conflict was not as intense as those which happened after 1453<sup>116</sup> when Sir Thomas Neville,<sup>117</sup> who has been probably nominated in some occasions married to Maud Stanhope, the widow of Robert Lord Willoughby of Eresby who was elected to the membership of the Order long before his death (d. July 1452).<sup>118</sup> Consider Lord Willoughby's nominations:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Laware	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbrook	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir John Montgomery	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N

<sup>115</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 589.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid. p. 592.

<sup>117</sup> Sir Thomas Neville was nominated to the companionship in 1460/1 by the Duke of Norfolk, and Lord Rivers. His brother John Neville on the other hand was nominated by his relatives the Earl of Salisbury, and Lord Beauchamp as well as two other names Lord Dudley and Viscount Bouchier in 1461 when the new head of the family the Earl of Warwick took the control of the throne. However, note that there is a doubt about the authenticity of the date of the scrutiny while they are denoted as the same in both of the Registers of the Order. Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-67. However, there is also another relatively less probable possibility that the above-mentioned Sir Thomas Neville may be Sir Thomas Neville of Brancepeth (Durham), brother of Earl of Westmorland.

<sup>118</sup> One striking name in his nomination lists is that he nominated the Duke of Warwick. the rest of his nominations do not signify any political connection: He nominated usual names nominated by other companions: Earl of Oxford, Duke of Norfolk Lord Laware, Lord Lovell, Lord Wells, Sir Robert Stotesbrook, Sir John Montgomery, Sir Thomas Kiriell. In 1445, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-8.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Wells	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Lovell	2	N

Thomas Neville's marriage to the widow of Lord Willoughby does not seem to be accidental. Because the names he nominated are mostly related to the Beauchamp affinity. Maud Stanhope was also co-heiress of Ralph, Lord Cromwell.<sup>119</sup> Thus the Nevilles and the Cromwells grew closer, and that was probably one reason in Lord Cromwell's nomination by Neville family.

Later Sir Henry Fitzhugh and Sir Henry Le Scope of Bolton politically adhered to the Nevilles and became loyal to the family thereafter.<sup>120</sup> Both of them were thus nominated to the Order (but not necessarily exclusively by the members of the Neville Family). In October 1453, after seeing that the Percy faction was becoming stronger, Salisbury and Warwick decided to support Richard Duke of York while Margaret of Anjou and the Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, showed their challenge by trying to remove him from the council meeting, which was to happen in the same October. However York attended to the council anyway.<sup>121</sup> Thus, a number of magnates had to change sides willingly or unwillingly. By 1454 the factions and alliances were clear: Warwick, Salisbury, Lord Cromwell and the Duke of York

---

<sup>119</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 593. However this Cromwell was nominated in 1448 by Sir John Fastolf who was not directly connected to the alliance: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3.

<sup>120</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 595; Sir Henry Le Scope of Bolton later became Lord Scrope and was already a member of the Order by 1463 in Warwick's heyday: Anstis, *Register*, p. 177. It is however interesting to note that Bolton did not participate to any election session. Thus there is no evidence to decide whether he was willing to nominate names to the fraternity in accordance with his political allies. In 1466 he participated in one session in which no election occurred. Lord Fitzhugh's nomination on the other hand is a very late phenomenon. He was nominated by the earl of Arundel and Sir John Ascheley in 1483 in Richard III's time. It is also important to note that the heir Lord Scrope was again nominated in the same session.

<sup>121</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 605.

made an alliance on the one hand; and Queen Margaret and Edmund Beaufort, their allies Clifford and John Viscount Beaumont (even if he was the brother-in-law of Salisbury) sided with the Percies and Henry Holland, the duke of Exeter soon participated to the alliance in Percy's side.<sup>122</sup> Probably because of the fact that Exeter had had a previous conflict with Lord Cromwell, he chose the opposing alliance. Edmund, Lord Grey of Ruthin supported Lord Cromwell and in a way he became allied to York's side.<sup>123</sup> The war had to soon break.

How one can follow the traces in Garter Nominations of the 'escalation of private feuds' which led to the fall of the house of Lancaster?<sup>124</sup> Evidence supporting the traces of the local rivalries (traces of alliances) can *partly* be observed in Garter scrutinies. Some of the votes are in accordance with the alliances but some are in complete contrast. Even five years before the war broke, the Duke of Somerset nominated both the Duke of Exeter and Lord Clifford, his future allies in 1448.<sup>125</sup> Expectedly, Both the Duke of Somerset and John Viscount Beaumont had nominated Henry Holland, the duke of Exeter in a scrutiny which occurred one year before (in 1453). The most striking fact in the nomination lists is that Henry Percy, the earl of Northumberland the future enemy of many Garter companions was nominated by the duke of Somerset in 1448 and it was *only* the duke of Somerset who nominated him in this year! One year before however, he was also nominated by Marquess Suffolk<sup>126</sup> and these two votes are his only votes thought there is an earl of

---

<sup>122</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 606.

<sup>123</sup> On the other hand, both Henry Holland, Duke of Exeter and Edmund, Lord Grey of Ruthin were grandsons of Elizabeth of Lancaster, so they had a blood connection: Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 607.

<sup>124</sup> The concept is cited in S. J. Payling, 'The Ampthill Dispute', p. 881; the conception is from: R. L. Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster* (London, 1966), p. 27.

<sup>125</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 141.

<sup>126</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-3.



Northumberland in 1466 who was a member of the Order. Here a probable covered message from Somerset to his rivals may well be the aim of Somerset. The reflection of this political alliance from the Royal side in the Garter scrutiny lists is clear. However, it is striking to observe that Lord Beauchamp nominated both the duke of Exeter and Lord Clifford in both the same scrutiny (two members of the rival faction) and in the previous scrutiny occurred in 1448. Consider the total votes of Lord Beauchamp:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Norhtfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	L. Sayntmondes	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Ric. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Seyntuland	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Grey Ruthin	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	3	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir John Wenlock	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Fitzwarren	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir John Neville	1	N

He nominated both the names he made a political alliance and those who were openly opposing him. It is also surprising to note that the duke of Exeter was also nominated by the earl of Salisbury another apparent York adherent and a kinsmen of Lord Beauchamp.<sup>127</sup> Thus Neville's alienation from Exeter was relatively a later phenomenon if one believes to the testimony of the scrutiny lists. On the other hand, Expectedly, Lord Beauchamp had nominated Lord Grey of Ruthin, Sir John Neville in 1460.<sup>128</sup> Thus although the Nevilles were very active in the Garter nominations they did not always use it for their advantage at least between the years 1445-53. John, Lord Sudeley was a politically neutral figure and a member of the Order who was enrolled in justices of Common Pleas in 1452.<sup>129</sup> It is also important to stress

---

<sup>127</sup> Duke of Exeter was also nominated by a politically neutral figure the Duke of Buckingham. Anstis, *Register*, p. 150. There is furthermore another scrutiny taken in 1448, in which year Both Sir John Beauchamp and Lord Beauchamp nominated the Duke of Exeter and Lord Clifford. Anstis, *Register*, p. 141.

<sup>128</sup> He was also nominated by Lord Rivers in the same session: Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-7.

<sup>129</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 607.

that many of the members of the Neville household were already members of the Order and they usually acted together in the men they nominated.

The Earl of Northumberland (Percy) was not a Garter knight but interestingly was nominated by the men of the alliance before<sup>130</sup> in the apex of the disputes between Percies and Nevilles in 1453, probably because he was already an influential person no matter what the political situation was. He was nominated by a number of knights. These included Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset who was an ally of Margaret, since the Percies also supported Margaret it is very natural, and was in accordance with the real politics of the time. In addition he was nominated by the Marquess of Suffolk, in later times his son was also nominated by other Edward's supporters: in 1473 (possibly) Lord Hastings, in 1475 (possibly) Lord Duras, Lord Ferreys, Sir John Ascheley, Lord Dudley. So the family gradually became much more powerful in national politics and Garter nomination lists reflect this change of fortune. Here is the complete list of the nominations of the earls of Northumberland both the father and his son:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Earl of Northumb.	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Earl of Northumb.	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	Y
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	Y

---

<sup>130</sup> Expectedly by Marquess of Southfolk, in 1447, and Duke of Somerset in 1448, Anstis, pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61;. Here is another evidence for the correlation between alliance and Garter nominations.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Earl of Northumberland	2	Y

It is also important to note that the father took only two votes in two different sessions and was elected to the Order though his election scrutiny is missing. His son was nominated in two occasions and elected to the Order. He took one vote from Lord Duras in one occasion and was not chosen. On the other hand even if he received only three votes in 1475 and the companions who nominated him were relatively inefficient figures he was chosen by Edward IV himself.

One year later, in 1454, John, Viscount Beaumont approached to the alliance. He was already a member of the Order, but the scrutiny for his election is missing. His nomination strategy is usually in accordance with the preferences of the other members of the alliance though there are some interesting names difficult to explain:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Northfolk	3	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Bromiswych	2	Y
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	3	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Rich. Haryngdon	3	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Ryvers	2	Y
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Viscount Lyle	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	The Emperor	1	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	1	N

For instance he nominated Sir Richard Harrington. This nomination is difficult to explain because Sir Richard was a firm follower of the Duke of York. On the other hand, there is nothing unusual in his nomination of the Duke of Exeter, since he was his clear political ally. Some other names such as The Emperor, Lord Lovell and Lord Rivers were the preferences of his political allies, thus he was perhaps simply repeating those names acknowledged by his close associates.

The rival alliance was composed of firstly the Earl of Salisbury who was apparently a Neville and a member of the Beauchamp affinity. Consider his nominations:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	1	Y
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Roos	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir John Beauchamp	3	?
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Audley	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Albro	2	Y
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	Y
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	2	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Fitzwarren	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir John Neville	1	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir John Wenlock	2	Y
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Thomas Kiriel	3	Y
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Grey Ruthin	2	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y

He was the only Garter knight who regularly nominated his kinsmen: the Duke of Warwick, the Earl of Warwick, Sir John Neville, and Sir John Beauchamp. He nominated the names who he made political alliance the most striking example is Lord Grey Ruthin (See below). He also nominated great magnates whose political support was needed: the Earl of Oxford, and the Duke of Norfolk. He was also regularly nominating important war leaders such as Lord Lovell, Lord Bonneville Sir

Thomas Kiriell, Sir John Wenlock, Sir Andrew Ogard, and Sir Thomas Hoo. It is however interesting to note that he also nominated the Duke of Exeter. He also nominated Lord Audley, Lord Roos, Lord Albro, Sir Thomas Stanley, Sir Edward Hull, Sir Richard Harrington, Lord Audley, who were close to the Nevilles, not necessarily politically. His nominations of the Earl of Wilshire, Earl of March, and Lord Fitzwarren however need further study.

Edmund Lord Grey of Ruthin was another member of the alliance. Although he was relatively a minor name, he has been occasionally nominated: by Sir John Fastolf, Lord Grey Ruff, the Earl of Salisbury, Viscount Bouchier, Lord Rivers, Lord Beauchamp, Duke of Norfolk. One can easily see that there is nothing unusual in these nominations as all of these names were either close friends or political allies. He was however not chosen to the Order until his death. However Sir John Fastolf's nomination of him implies that Fastolf himself was close to the alliance at that time, though there is no other historical information to support this claim.

Ralph Lord Cromwell, (d. 1456) was a very loyal and firm supporter of the Lancastrian royal house.<sup>131</sup> In the 1450's his main concern was to retain possession of a Bedfordshire estate in Ampthill and his rival was Henry Holland (d. 1475), duke of Exeter. Lord Cromwell resigned from the office of Lord Treasurer in July 1443. This was the beginning of the decline of his court career. His influence at court began a steady decline. On the other hand the court began to be dominated by William de la Pole (d. 1450), earl of Suffolk.<sup>132</sup> This decrease of influence is apparent in Garter nominations. He has been only nominated by Sir John Fastolf and

---

<sup>131</sup> Payling, 'The Ampthill Dispute, p. 882.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid. p. 885.

not chosen.<sup>133</sup> Thus, after his fall from political power he suddenly disappeared from the Garter lists.

The reason of the constant nominations of two lesser gentry families is also quite clear: by the years 1453-4, two distinct members of the major gentry families Sir Thomas Stanley and Sir Thomas Harrington appeared as local political forces. Sir Thomas Stanley was at the beginning of his career. He was the duchy of Lancaster's receiver in Lancashire and Cheshire.<sup>134</sup> He had a clear antipathy towards Richard Duke of York, though he may not have been eager to side with Margaret and Exeter by 1454. Accordingly perhaps because of this resentment he was appointed as the King's chamberlain by York after the Battle of St Albans in 1455.<sup>135</sup> Sir Thomas Harrington was another duchy servant and one of Salisbury's retainers,<sup>136</sup> Griffiths has shown that both were used in preventing local revolts especially in Lancashire. Part of their rewards was their constant nomination to the fraternity. Additionally, just like Sir Thomas Burgh, Stanleys, and Harringtons were influencing courtiers. Thus, there is a tendency in Garter nominations to fill the *not to be chosen* parts with influential courtier gentlemen.

Two members of the Lovell Family John and Francis, Lord Lovell were also nominated to the Order. They descended from Philip Lovell was son of John, eight

---

<sup>133</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

<sup>134</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 127-28; *FR.*, p. 51; pp. 132-33; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67; Sir William Stanley: pp. 187-88; pp. 190-91; pp. 206-7; pp. 211-12; (not chosen); Lord Stanley: pp. 187-88; pp. 190-91; pp. 193-94; pp. 194-96; pp. 196-99; pp. 206-7; pp. 211-12; pp. 217-20. (not Chosen).

<sup>135</sup> Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics', p. 611; Wegwood, *History of Parliament, Biographies*, p. 800. for Harrington who died in 1460, in the Yorkist interest, see Coles, 'Lordship of Middleham', p. 277; Wedgwood, *History of Parliament* p. 426-27; Somerville, *Duchy of Lancaster*, I/ 499-500.

<sup>136</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 166-67; pp. 206-7; Sir Richard Harrington, p. 141; *FR.*, p. 60; pp. 142-43; *FR.*, p. 61; p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67: (not chosen); Sir James Harrington, pp. 190-91; pp. 196-99; pp. 206-7; pp. 211-12; pp. 217-20; (not chosen) Sir Thomas Harrington is a "staunch Yorkist" in Patricia Jalland, 'The Influence of the Aristocracy on Shire Elections in the North of England, 1450-70', *Speculum* 47/3 (Jul., 1972), 483-507. p. 489. a discussion is available in p. 490.



Baron Lovell of Tichmarsh. Northants. An adherent of Henry VI by his wife Joanne, daughter of John first Viscount Beaumont.<sup>137</sup> Both of them, especially Francis were nominated regularly by many companions.<sup>138</sup> Consider his regular nominations:

Year	Anstis p	Knights	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1446	130	Lord Scales	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	2	Lord Lovell	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Lovell	1	N

<sup>137</sup> *Dictionary of National Biographies*.

<sup>138</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp.127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Lovell	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Lovell	2	X

John Lovell was a loyal servant of Henry VI and this closeness of this family to the kingdom continued as a family tradition until the end of Henry VI's reign. Francis Lovell was thus nominated in a number of occasions by a number of members in almost each election sessions. In Edward IV's time however, any member of the Lovell family was not nominated to the Order at all. However, when Richard III took the throne Lovell again appears in the scrutiny list.

Sir John Popham,<sup>139</sup> was another important war commander nominated to the ranks of the Order. He died c. 1463, and was the speaker-elect of the House of Commons, was son of Sir John Popham, a younger son of the ancient Hampshire family of Popham of Popham between Basingstoke and Winchester.<sup>140</sup> In 1415 Popham became the constable of Southampton Castle, and had the custody of the earl of Cambridge and others who had been included in the conspiracy discovered there just before the king set sail for France. He took part in that expedition as a minor commander. By 1417, he was one of Henry's most prominent followers in the conquest of Normandy. Henry VI gave him for as a reward for his good and loyal service the constablenesship of the castle of Snith for life. Continuing in the French wars under the Duke of Bedford, Popham became chancellor of Anjou and Maine. He was

---

<sup>139</sup> Nominated by Duke of Buckingham and Lord Sudeley, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4. This is possibly his only nomination. Not chosen. Again he may be nominated just for the sake of the honour of being nominated. Since he seems not to be active in politics.

<sup>140</sup> *Dictionary of National Biographies*.

sometimes described as “chancellor of the regent” After the Duke of Bedford’s death we see him on the duke of York’s council in Normandy, but for reasons unknown he returned by the end of the year. The duke of York in 1440 requested his assistance in his affairs in France as a member of his council. In the parliament of November 1449, he was chosen as speaker. He requested his excuse from the parliament on the ground that he was an old soldier and his age was very old. His request was accepted.<sup>141</sup> It is thus possible to suggest that as an acknowledgment of his past services (just like for courtesy they wanted him to be the speaker) he was nominated to the Order, as he was among Henry’s prominent men in terms of his military commandership. So the Order was not always a matter of alliance. He was nominated by the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Sudeley in 1447.<sup>142</sup> After all “such men as Sir John Popham, Sir John Fastolf, Sir William Oldhall, and Sir Andrew Ogard were notable ‘warrior councilors’ who in many ways served as representatives of the English government itself”.<sup>143</sup> The other peculiarity of them is that they were all Garter nominees, although only Sir John Fastolf was chosen and installed.

In September 1427, Sir William Mountford was elected a knight of the shire of Warwickshire.<sup>144</sup> What kind of political motivation may be in the nomination of Sir William Mountford<sup>145</sup> by John Beauchamp and the Duke of Buckingham? The answer is he was simply their retainer. It is probable that it was a mere demonstration

---

<sup>141</sup> *Dictionary of National Biographies*.

<sup>142</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4.

<sup>143</sup> Carole Rawcliffe and Susan Flower, ‘English Noblemen and Their Advisers: Consultation and Collaboration in the Later Middle Ages’, *The Journal of British Studies*, 25/2 (apr., 1986), 157-77, p. 158.

<sup>144</sup> Christine Carpenter, ‘Beauchamp Affinity: A study of Bastard Feudalism at Work’, *The English Historical Review*, 195/376 (Jul., 1980), p. 528. Sir William Mountford made patronage in Stourbridge Fair and although it was very remote for him, bought from London luxury goods. He was powerful and influential. For the buying practices of the Mountford family see: Christopher Dyer, ‘The Consumer and the Market in the Later Middle Ages’, *The Economic History Review*, New Series, 1/42, 3 (August 1989), pp. 313-15.

<sup>145</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 141 *FR.*, p. 60; Carpenter, ‘Beauchamp Affinity’, p. 514-532.

of their 'good lordship'. The Beauchamps did not usually pay large amounts to their retainers. Sir William Mountfort's annual income of 258 pounds included 26 pounds 13 solidi 4 denari.<sup>146</sup> On the other hand, "royal patronage, often considered the main benefit that a lord could confer on his follower".<sup>147</sup> Therefore it is probable that he has been nominated to the Order because John Beauchamp may have been trying to procure for his servant royal patronage by means of the Garter. Sir William Mountfort was one of the important or perhaps the most important men of the Warwickshire.<sup>148</sup> Since he was the leading man of the gentry of the shire, perhaps he merited it the most. Moreover, Mountfort may have been a man in quest of political strength: the household of Beauchamp's men were the main point of focus for the existence of the affinity, as a study has shown.<sup>149</sup> On the other hand, while he was so renown by a number of other magnates, he was only nominated by his immediate lords. The support of Mountfort to the Nevilles and Mountfort's quest for political power may be a family tradition as the son of Sir Thomas Mountfort was also a Neville supporter and involved in the Percy-Neville dispute in 1453.<sup>150</sup>

Beauchamp had also political alliance between great magnates and he relied particularly on the Dukes of Norfolk in the east of the county, and Lord Ferrers of Chartley in the North and North-west.<sup>151</sup> John, Lord Beauchamp, Lord Sudeley, and the earl of Wiltshire formed an alliance in Warwickshire politics. This explains the nomination of the Earl of Wiltshire by the Earl of Salisbury. Accordingly the above mentioned figures regularly nominated members of the Beauchamp affinity to the

---

<sup>146</sup> Ibid. p. 519.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid. p. 519.

<sup>148</sup> Carpenter, 'Beauchamp Affinity', p. 515.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., p. 523. Unfortunately there is no reference about the surviving book here.

<sup>150</sup> Jalland, 'The Influence of the Aristocracy', pp. 491-2

<sup>151</sup> Carpenter, 'Beauchamp Affinity', p. 517.

Order.<sup>152</sup> Also consider that Sir John Neville (the son of Neville) was nominated (but not chosen) by Lord Beauchamp, Lord Dudley, and the Earl of Salisbury though the nomination of earl of Salisbury must be a mistake. Additionally Sir Thomas Neville (probably the second son) was nominated (but not chosen) by the Duke of Norfolk, and Lord Rivers.<sup>153</sup>

The Order of the Garter was not completely rendered to a political institution by the time of Henry VI. The Garter Statutes in ‘The Shrewsbury Book’ of John Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury given to Margaret of Anjou demonstrate that interest to the chivalry *per se* and chivalric literature indeed was not entirely lacking in the upper class of the society. It could be claimed that Talbot, as a member of the Order was naturally interested in chivalry and warfare. John Talbot gave her a book the content of which is dubious to be suitable for a lady.<sup>154</sup> In accordance with the general pattern that the relatives of a great magnate were occasionally nominated to the companionship, John Talbot’s kinsmen, Sir Henry Talbot and Sir Humphrey Talbot, appear in the nomination lists.<sup>155</sup> John, Lord Talbot was also one of the few knights who cared about the honour of the Order: for example John Fastolf was suspended from the Order because of the accusations of cowardice made by Lord Talbot, following his retreat from Patay in 1429.<sup>156</sup> Fastolf was reinstated by Bedford. Sir John Fastolf died in November 1459.<sup>157</sup> This suspension and reinstatement may have been done by a council composed of Garter companions and

---

<sup>152</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp.127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4; pp. 142-3; *FR.*, p. 61; , p. 150; *FR.*, p. 67..

<sup>153</sup> Anstis, *Register*, pp.127-8; *FR.*, p. 51; p. 130; pp. 132-3; *FR.*, p. 53-4.

<sup>154</sup> Cited in Diana Dunn: Pollard, *John Talbot*, p. 123; Reynolds, ‘The Shrewsbury Book’, in *Medieval Art*, pp. 109-14.

<sup>155</sup> Sir Humphrey Talbot by Lord Hastings, Anstis, *Register*, pp. 194-6; Sir Henry Talbot again by Lord Hastings in the elections of Anstis, *Register*, pp. 196-99.

<sup>156</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, p. 40.

<sup>157</sup> Daw Ben, p. 194.

lawyers specially appointed for that purpose which is ‘an internal inquiry board of the Order’.<sup>158</sup>

It is indeed apparent that a number of factors influenced who was to be nominated and elected to the Order. The politics of the period was the most important factor influencing both elections and nominations of the fraternity. During the political dominance of the Duke of Suffolk, his favourites and allies were regularly nominated and elected to the Order as a substantial reward apart from their worldly grants. He was also keen on using the Garter to establish new alliances, such as that with the duke of Norfolk. Then after the political situation worsened following the interference of the duke of York, the companionship did not function as properly as before: no Garter election meeting occurred throughout York’s supremacy except once in 1453. Newer national alliances are shaped by means of local rivalries. The traces of these alliances can also be seen partly in Garter nomination lists. Another consideration for Garter nominations and elections was rewarding important war commanders. Men like Sir John Wenlock, Sir John Popham and Sir Thomas Kiriell were not ignored: Wenlock and Kiriell were not only nominated but also elected to the Order, but immediately before his installation Kiriell was beheaded by Margaret of Anjou on a charge of treason. Thus, again politics surpassed the sublime Garter ideal. Political alliances as well as the parental connections played a major role in the nominations of the Hungerford family. Garter connections alone were not enough to solve important land disputes in the companion’s favour. Although Sir John Fastolf was an old member of the fraternity, he was unable to use his court influence over Edward Hull, who was also active in politics and was nominated in a number of

---

<sup>158</sup> Jefferson, MS Arundel 48, 363.

occasions by different members of the Order of the Garter. In some rare occasions individual members nominated their personal local influential servants such as Sir William Mountford nominated by Beauchamp. Those patterns discussed above did not change immediately in Edward IV's first reign. Warwick's influence on Edward was enormous and warlike figures were still nominated and elected to the Order for at least until the end of Edward -Warwick alliance. However, as I hope to demonstrate in the next chapter, Edward's second reign witnessed important changes in Garter nomination patterns. Warlike figures were usually replaced by more courtier based gentlemen probably mainly due to the Woodville influence on Edward IV and on other Garter knights.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **THE ELECTIONS AND NOMINATIONS DURING THE REIGN OF EDWARD IV**

#### **IV.1 Introduction**

This chapter deals with the elections and nominations to the Order of the Garter during the reign of Edward IV. There is only one surviving scrutiny for Edward's first reign, which dates to the beginning of his kingdom in 1461. However, there are a number of elections for which scrutiny lists do not survive, and which will be discussed separately. The first part of this chapter then deals with the elections of the particular knights of which no scrutiny survived. The second part deals with the analysis of the remaining scrutines. However, seven more scrutiny lists survive for Edward IV's second reign. They date respectively 1472, 1475, two scrutiny lists for 1476, 1477, 1479 and 1482. The nominations in these scrutiny lists will be discussed together since there are a number of instances where certain men are repeatedly nominated. It will be shown that in Edward IV's first reign the predominant pattern for the nominations was that warrior figures were constantly nominated and some were elected to the Order. However in his second reign the patterns of nomination and election became much more complicated. For example, the nominees included the king's councilors who were at the same time his close allies in his struggle



against Lancasterians, Elizabeth Woodville's relatives who were regarded as the 'new comers' to the aristocratic scene, and some of king's personal friends and relatives who were not related to the political area as well as some old warriors.

Edward officially ruled nine years for his first reign (1461-70). He was by no means alone in his political decisions. Richard Neville, the earl of Warwick, was his major councilor until 1466. Then there was a one and half year of gap when Henry VI became the king of England again. Edward re-took the throne in 1472 and governed England until his death in 1483. His first reign was politically more unstable than his second reign. In his first reign he had to deal with the Lancastrian resistance in the North-East and in Wales. Henry and Margaret of Anjou were still important enemies to him. In his second reign his primary political concern was not to solve the aristocratic lawlessness within the kingdom but to deal the threat of France. However, the so-called Northern problem and his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville played a major role in his decisions both in Garter elections and other political matters.

#### **IV.2 The First Reign of Edward IV**

It is possible to divide Edward's first reign into two equal time periods in terms of the nature of political developments. The first period is 1461-6: That is, Edward's rule before his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville under the influence of the earl of Warwick and the second period is 1466-71 which represents the king's emancipation from Warwick's influence and his rule under that of Woodvilles. The first period was therefore marked by the alliance of Edward IV with the most powerful noble of the realm Richard Neville, the earl of Warwick, the 'Kingmaker'. Most of the decisions in most of the major political issues were taken with the

approval of Warwick. One may include among those decisions the nominations and elections of particular knights to the Order of the Garter. However, as stated above, our information about this political period is scarce in terms of nominations as there is only one surviving scrutiny list belonging to the whole period of Edward IV's first reign.

It is a well-known fact that Richard Neville extended his influence and built up a large body of retainers from among the northern gentry at the expense of the Percies.<sup>1</sup> These Northerners and the acquisition of their loyalty by means of the Garter is thus one aspect of his policy concerning the elections to the Order. Hugh Collins has already stressed this fact in his study.<sup>2</sup> It is also apparent that Warwick favoured his own affinity throughout his period of supremacy. There are four Neville associates nominated in this sole scrutiny list of Warwick's period. Two important names are John, Lord Neville, full-brother of the earl of Westmorland and half brother of the earl of Salisbury, and the other one is the earl of Salisbury himself.<sup>3</sup> Since the actual political power was in Warwick's hand, there was a good degree of coherence both in the nominations and elections to the Order in the first half of Edward's first reign. The reasons are apparent. The first reason is that the political authority was concentrated in one hand, and all of the knight companions participating in the election sessions were either already Warwick's men or those who would agree to decide in accordance with his wishes. A similar homogenous picture was also attained in the late years of Edward's second reign. After the French war, Edward was able to retain complete control of his household and nobility, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Weiss, 'Communications A power in the North?', p. 503.

<sup>2</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, pp. 176-85.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed analysis of the function of these two names in Warwick's supremacy see: Weiss, 'Communications A power in the North?', p. 504.

since the Woodville influence was not so striking, his decisions were usually welcomed by the knight companions.<sup>4</sup> He probably usually preferred the nomination of his own close friends and his wishes were accomplished by the members.

The alliance of Edward and Warwick was short lived. Five years after the beginning of his reign in 1466, when Edward IV signed the renewal of the non-aggression pact with Burgundy, it became apparent for Warwick that he would no longer be able to go together with Edward IV. Warwick simply hated the idea and accordingly 1466 is a key date as it marks the end of Edward IV-Warwick alliance and gives way to another period when Warwick approached the Lancasterians. From this period onwards it is by no means clear who was the most influential figure in the Garter elections. First, the real focus of power in Garter elections is not so apparent; second the characters of the new members do not give any real clues in determining the real power behind the elections. The nomination and election of the international knights such as the Count of Urbino, the King of Portugal, the Marquis Ferrera, and the King of Castille Leon occurred during this period. Since their nominations were not directly dependent on the will of one particular political authority, this evidence do not help whether Warwick or Edward was more influential in the Garter. Other figures such as the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Kent were either politically not active at that time or were the allies of both of these great magnates of the realm. At least for the case of the duke of Buckingham, it was clear that he was the political supporter of both Edward and Warwick.

Warwick and Edward used the Garter for their own purposes. The reason is apparent. The beginning of Edward's reign was a period of instability for the

---

<sup>4</sup> See below.

monarchy and for Edward's quest to secure and legitimise his new regime with Warwick.<sup>5</sup> Between 1461-4 and even until 1468 we still frequently see quarrels either from within or from without the kingdom. Lancastrian resistance in the north of England, especially Northumberland, and North Wales was still alive and Scottish and French intervention was also complicating the situation. The survival of the regime was strictly dependent on the fragile moves of the king and we also know that Edward feared a possible Scottish invasion and was thus willing to negotiate with the Lancastrian rebels in 1462. Harlech, the most important place in Wales, was acquired in 1468, and still, the deposed Henry VI and later his son Edward Prince of Wales remained in exile in France waiting an opportunity to re-capture the throne. In such an unstable condition, Edward IV was as dependent as Henry VI on the support of the notable nobles and his lesser allies (in this case Warwick and his allies) and thus needed to reconcile and find new support.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, if the Order of the Garter played any role before Edward, in accordance with the political situation, it is not unwise to expect that it was still very much in use in Edward IV's early years. How did Edward manage the above-mentioned difficulties considering that the regime had little committed support? He needed the help of his allies either in terms of the diplomacy, as Edward's major strategy was to isolate the Lancastrians diplomatically or in terms of local affinities as Warwick, the chief man of the king and a Garter Knight, raided Scotland after their siege of Norham. On the other hand, the majority of Yorkist peers continued to oppose him after the battle of Towton. One thing to note from the scrutiny list of 1461 is that all

---

<sup>5</sup> See Collins for the related period, though there is no direct reference in his work that Edward used Garter for this specific purpose. Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, pp. 182-6.

<sup>6</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 267.

of the knights nominated were ostensibly Warwick's associates who supported his aid to Edward in securing him the English throne. Thus Warwick rewarded his allies with Garter nominations.

Although Warwick was removed from political power in the second half of Edward's first reign, old Neville associates continued to be regularly nominated to the Order. One reason for this is that some of these old Neville associates were the new trustees of Edward, even later in his second reign: for example, Henry Bouchier, Earl of Essex, perhaps the most trusted servant of Edward throughout his second reign, his brothers William Lord FitzWaurin, and John Lord Berners and younger son Humprey Lord Cromwell were his kinsmen. Some other men, such as John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester, and lesser peers such as Rivers, Audley, Denham, Greystoke, FitzHugh, Ogle and Scrope of Bolton may well have been nominated to the Order just because they had parental relationship with the other Nevilles who were already the member of the Order.<sup>7</sup> Thus Edward relied on the Nevilles and while on the one and he became generous in terms of granting titles and lands to the groups below the ranks of peerage after the removal of Warwick, on the other hand, he raised some of these above figures to the Garter ranks. Expectedly old associates occasionally nominated their old close friends to the Order.

Each member elected to the Order will be discussed in more detail below. Between the years 1461-66 Warwick and his followers were gradually raised to the ranks of the Order. Accordingly, the first member elected in 1461 was Richard Neville himself.<sup>8</sup> The reason for his election was simple. He was the chief supporter of Edward himself. The second member was William first Lord Bonville, a well-

---

<sup>7</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, pp. 272-3.

<sup>8</sup> Anstis, p. 161; *FR.*, p. 62.

known Warwick associate knighted with the army in France, possibly for his achievements in the wars with France. Since he continued in his loyalty to Warwick he was executed after the second battle of St. Albans.<sup>9</sup> Here, we probably see a mixture of international affairs and political affairs within England in the reason(s) for the election of this particular knight due to the Wars of the Roses. It was again in this period that important war leaders who were not directly involved in the high politics were elected to the Order.

Since the Kingmaker was actually a man of war, martial qualities were still considered to be important in Garter elections during his period of dominance. At least three figures were elected to the Order in Warwick's supremacy primarily because of their martial qualities. Thus was Sir Thomas Kiriell was the first instance of this pattern as being elected as the third member.<sup>10</sup> Unlike the other members of the Order, he was not as active in high politics in his early years but he was a well-known war leader, who made heroic victories in the wars with France and he was knighted probably because of this reason. On the other hand Kiriell became involved in active politics in his late career and was beheaded due to his treasonous act (probably on Margaret of Anjou's insistence) immediately before he was installed. His execution is a good example showing the political volatility of the period. Fortunes of people might have changed in a relatively short period of time.

The fourth member elected was also an important war leader, John Wenlock.<sup>11</sup> Like Sir Thomas Kiriell, he was not directly engaged in the politics but helped Warwick's cause in occasional battles in establishing Edward IV as king. He

---

<sup>9</sup> Anstis, p. 161; *FR.*, p. 62.

<sup>10</sup> Anstis, p. 161; *FR.*, p. 62.

<sup>11</sup> Anstis, p. 161; *FR.*, p. 62.

was killed at the battle of Tewkesbury, fighting for the Lancasterians. The next elected member was again a military commander, William Chamberlaine.<sup>12</sup> The possible reason for his election was his distinguished achievements in the French wars under the command of the Duke of Bedford. Thus the election of these three war commanders is in accordance with Collins' thesis that there was a revival in the martial ethos of the Order after the beginning of Edward IV's reign.<sup>13</sup> Although Warwick was the supreme authority, he was also continuing the old traditions. For example, as the tradition of the Order dictated, the brother of Edward, George, Duke of Clarence was knighted immediately after Edward's coronation, although he was a minor and had neither heroic achievement nor any direct political cause behind his election. It is interesting that he was not degraded even when he was within the rebellion with Warwick against his brother.

John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, and Constable of England was raised to the Order in the same year, possibly for his support to Edward IV. However, after the restoration of Henry VI, he was executed for high treason in 1470. John Neville, a kinsman of the earl of Warwick, was also raised to the ranks possibly because of his close familial relationship with the Kingmaker. Moreover, it is also a well known fact that he was Warwick's chief helpers in his wars against the Lancasterians. Similarly William, Lord Herbert, who was a strong Yorkist political supporter from the beginning of Edward IV's reign was elected to the Order the same year. He was thus probably awarded for his diligent support of Edward.

The only person who was not directly related to the Yorkist camp was Sir John Astley. Since he was not among the peers, it is probable that he was one of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Anstis, p. 163; *FR.*, p. 63.

<sup>13</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, p. 190.

important war leaders helping Yorkist cause but as far as I am aware there is no any direct connection of him with the Yorkists. (ie. no record of him as a war leader, or political ally is available). All these elections happened in 1461. In the following year, William first lord Hastings was raised to the Order for his command of the battle of Barnet.<sup>14</sup> His (as well as the other's) reward was postponed one year simply because the membership to the Order was limited to twenty-six companions. He accordingly needed to wait a year until a stall became empty by a death of a companion. His election may also show how much importance was given to the Battle of Barnet by the great magnates.

John the Fifth Lord Scrope of Bolton was also chosen in the same year possibly for his support of the Yorkist cause and as a reward for his service in the wars with France and Scotland.<sup>15</sup> James, ninth earl of Douglas seems to be rewarded for his support of Yorkist cause as his service for the Scottish wars.<sup>16</sup> Another member elected to the Order was Sir Robert Harcourt another war leader who was killed in a fight for the Lancastrian cause in 1470.<sup>17</sup> Again, since all these figures were primarily war commanders rather than active political figures, it is possible to support Collins' claim that Warwick revived the martial ethos of the Order.<sup>18</sup>

In 1463, no Englishman but only two international nobles were elected: Ferdinand I, king of Sicily and Naples, and Francesco Sforza, duke of Milan.<sup>19</sup> The details of their nomination and their political implications still requires further research. Remember that they may not reflect the immediate picture of the politics of

---

<sup>14</sup> Anstis, p. 163; *FR.*, p. 63.

<sup>15</sup> Anstis, p. 164; *FR.*, p. 64.

<sup>16</sup> Anstis, p. 164; *FR.*, p. 64.

<sup>17</sup> Anstis, p. 164; *FR.*, p. 64.

<sup>18</sup> Collins, *The Order of the Garter*, p. 190.

<sup>19</sup> Anstis, p. 165; *FR.*, p. 65.



the time as some later knights may be raised to the Order for their past services. It appears that the Garter history and the political developments of the first half of Edward's first reign went in accord.

As it has been already stressed, by 1464, the Edward IV-Warwick alliance was broken. There were a number of reasons why Warwick broke his alliance with Edward IV. One possible reason is that he disliked Elizabeth Woodville because she was becoming stronger within the court through her influence over the king. Her five sisters married men of the ranks of the established peerage: the Duke of Buckingham, the heirs of the earls of Arundel, Essex, Kent, and Lord Herbert and his son was married to 65 year old dowager duchess of Norfolk. The other reason appears to be much more personal as he resented the “highly chivalric court style” Edward introduced to the court following his marriage with Elizabeth Woodville probably again with her influence, Lord Stanley seems to be the man increasing in influence in the court politics. As we shall see he was regularly nominated to the Order more than fifty times by all of the companions throughout Edward’s second reign. The third reason seems to be their disagreement in the international politics. By 1466, international affairs were very much influenced by the factions within the court politics. Warwick with Lord Wenlock, was trying to establish a French alliance. However, Rivers was seeking a Burgundian alliance because he had kinship ties with Charles of Charolais and Edward signed a secret non-aggression pact with Charles. It is indeed possible to suggest that some sort of a crisis was about to start in Garter nominations and elections by that time. Accordingly in 1464 no knight was elected to the companionship. In 1465, only Richard Plantagenet, duke of Gloucester,

was raised to the ranks.<sup>20</sup> He was the brother of Edward and no party would doubt about the legitimacy of his election. In accordance with the presumption that by the second half of Edward's first reign Woodville's influence over Edward was decisive, and her implicit aim of acquiring stronger position in the court politics, we see in 1467 only one new member, Antony Woodville, second Lord Scales and Elizabeth's brother.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, Garter companionship did not prevent him from being executed at Pomfret Castle by Richard III. By these dates the influence of Warwick came to an end and Elizabeth Woodville's influence started to become gradually apparent. In 1467, Inigo d'Avalos, Conte di Monteodesirio, was invited to the Order, but as far as the evidence is concerned it is not apparent whether he was installed or not as a legitimate member.<sup>22</sup> Again the cause(s) of his election have to be explored in further Garter studies.

Edward having separated his way with Warwick expectedly developed a policy of 'conciliation' towards the sons and brothers of his former opponents after 1464, even though some of them were still opposing Edward anyway. Thus, Edward's generosity to such peers as Thomas Hungerford, an occasional Garter nominee in Henry's time, and John de Vere, Earl of Oxford whose nomination and election was much more problematical can be explained in terms of this reconciliation policy.<sup>23</sup> Especially John de Vere was important to note because he was a man "who was allowed to succeed to his title and lands in 1464 only two years after the execution of his father". Moreover, the main actor in this policy was Henry

---

<sup>20</sup> Anstis, p. 167; *FR.*, p. 68.

<sup>21</sup> Anstis, p. 169; *FR.*, p. 70.

<sup>22</sup> Anstis, p. 170; *FR.*, p. 70.

<sup>23</sup> Anstis, p. 161-191; *FR.*, p. 61-101.

Beauford, Duke of Somerset. In fact the roots of this particular relationship goes back to 1462.

International affairs were also problematic during Edward's first years. The head of the house of Lancaster, the deposed Henry VI was with Margaret of Anjou to profit from any advantage to re-take the throne once he saw any weakness in the Yorkist house. France, Scotland and Burgundy tried to exploit this circumstance. Again Warwick's intervention was clearly available. He took the lead in the negotiations with Scotland and France, and used his Scottish agent William Money penny in order to establish a direct line with Louis XI. Although there was a tendency of using Garter companions in international politics, Sir William Money penny was not a Garter knight nor was he nominated as far as the surviving records is concerned. There is accordingly no international knight nominated in the only surviving scrutiny of Edward IV's first reign.

### **IV.3 Edward's Second Reign**

Until 1472 there is no scrutiny in Garter history. The Yorkist regime was re-established by the summer of 1471. The King's brother the Duke of Clarence, supported by the Earl of Shrewsbury another Garter knight, was established in the midlands and the south-west; and Gloucester was in the north expected to work with the pardoned Earl of Northumberland and Lord Stanley. In the East Anglia, the Duke of Norfolk, the Duke of Suffolk, and Lord Howard all of whom at least occasionally appeared in the Garter records were responsible for the establishment of the royal

authority. William Herbert, second Earl of Pembroke was responsible in the marches and Wales. The earl of Shrewsbury was made Justiciar of North Wales.<sup>24</sup>

International knights started to be nominated during this period. As far as the records are concerned there was neither nomination nor election of an international monarch in Edward's first reign. Once Edward re-secured his throne within the country, he started to use Garter in the international affairs. For example, the Count of Urbin was nominated by Richard of Gloucester in 1472, and then in 1475 and a number of companions nominated him in two sessions. Neutral names such as Lord Dudley, Lord Duras and the Duke of Buckingham followed Richard in his preference and nominated the Count of Urbin. In the first session he received only four votes while in the second session in 1475 he was elected to the Order by receiving seven votes.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Count of Urbin	1	Y
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y

---

<sup>24</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, p. 297.

The Duke of Brittany on the other hand, was nominated on a number of occasions by different members of the fraternity throughout Edward IV's second reign. Although he received substantially more votes than Urbin he was never elected to the Order.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1477	196-99	Marquis Dorset	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Duke of Britany	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1482	211-12	Marquis Dorset	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N

I would argue that these two examples related to the international knights illustrate that the last word about the election to the Order was said by the king himself. On the other hand, it is also important to note that the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Dudley, and Lord Duras followed in both of the instances the preference of Richard the duke of Gloucester.

Edward after establishing his supreme authority in his second reign, his closest friends were several men who had been long-time servants of Edward IV, members of his council, and indebted for office, land or title to his patronage, such as John, Lord Denham, Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers of Chartley and John, Lord Audley and William Lord Hastings.<sup>25</sup> One thing, which is common in all these names, was that they were the members of the ‘old nobility’ and all hated Woodviles, as they considered them the ‘newcomers’. Accordingly it is not an oversimplification to suggest that the elections and nominations to the Order of the Garter in Edward’s second reign were composed of the preferences (and sometimes overt conflicts) of the above mentioned figures and the Woodvilles. On the other hand, there are a

---

<sup>25</sup> All of them were already Yorkists before Towton, and Dinham (1467) and Ferrers of Chartley (1461) For their rewards see Ross, *Edward IV*, 80-1, 137. Dinham was in actual command of Calais (vice Lord Hastings) when Richard assumed the throne in June 1483.....others in the Calais Command (e.g Mountjoy) readily took service under Richard III. Ferrers of Chartley, however had strong connections with the Herberts and Vaughans, and therefore, with the earl of Huntingdon.

number of evidences that these members of the ‘old nobility’ acted in accordance with the ‘newcomers’.

Edward Neville the son of George Neville, Lord Abergavenny the heir male of Isabel Despenser, countess of Warwick’s first marriage inherited the title Lord Abergavenny in the first reign of Edward IV. Somewhere in 1460, he was among the men who fought for Yorkist cause with Viscount Bouchier, Audley, Say and Scrope of Boulton.<sup>26</sup> He was accordingly nominated by the men of the alliance after the victory of Yorkists.<sup>27</sup>

Between 1472 and 1483 Richard of Gloucester tried to establish good relationships both with the court and the central government. He accordingly provided the largest private army for Edward’s invasion of France in 1475. He possessed estates in the southern as well as Northern counties, in Essex, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Suffolk, Kent, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Cornwall, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. He needed to reward his servants accordingly one would expect he used Garter nominations for his own purpose. Nevertheless the surviving evidence supports the opposite view. Richard’s nomination pattern was in complete accordance with the other members of the Order. He thus did not use Garter as a way of rewarding his allies before he became King.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	2	N

---

<sup>26</sup>Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 31-2; Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 26.

<sup>27</sup>Anstis, p. 161; *FR.*, p. 62.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Marquis of Ferrara	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Dacres of Gillesla	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Burgh	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir James Haryngton	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Harington	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Grey	1	N



Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Burgh	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Beauchamp	3	N

He nominated frequent names such as Sir Thomas Burgh, Sir James Harrington, members of the Stanley family, and Lord Denham. He also nominated the international knights who were nominated by other members of the fraternity probably because of the King Edward's wish. The only exception in this picture is his nominations of Lord Dacres of Gillesla and Lord Dacres of Sussex. These two men were only nominated by him. It is possible that there had been some sort of personal relationship between them. It is also important to note that the members of certain families which were by no means related to the Royal house by means of marriage were nominated to the Order both in Henry VI's and Edward IV's time. The Fiennes family is the best example to illustrate this point. The political significance of the family starts with Sir Roger Fiennes who had become a knight of Henry V and later the treasurer of Henry VI's household. His brother James was an esquire of the body and later chamberlain Henry VI, later becoming the baron Saye. As this study already discussed he was nominated to the Order in Henry VI's time. However because he was a close supporter of the king, he was murdered in Jack Cade's rebellion in 1450, while the family's relationship with the royal magnates continued at least until the end of Edward IV's time. The brother of James Roger also died at that time and one of his sons Richard became Lord Dacre of the South

and supported Yorkists in 1462 probably with Lord Hastings. He later became the chamberlain of Elizabeth Woodville. He was nominated in two occasions by Richard of Gloucester in Edward IV's time. The explanation of this nomination is quite straightforward: We know that Lord Dacre had build some relationships with Richard, duke of Gloucester by 1470s as he was settled to Suffolk where he had common interests with Richard and in 1484 he was household knight of Richard III.<sup>28</sup>

The relationship between Richard and his brother the Duke of Clarence is also important. Clarence married Isabel, the daughter of Warwick, and supported the readoption of Henry VI in the 1470. After the battle of Barnet and the restoration of Edward IV, Clarence expected rewards both from Edward and Warwick's inheritance. On the other hand, Richard's aim was to marry Anne, another daughter of Warwick possibly for the reason of increasing the amount of his estates. Because of this conflict, Richard and Clarence fought for two years. However, the scrutinies they presented do not reflect any meaningful discrepancy reflecting the quarrel between these two brothers.<sup>29</sup>

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Buckingham	2	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y

---

<sup>28</sup> For further reference about their connections see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 264.

<sup>29</sup> Anstis., pp. 194-6; *FR.*, pp. 94-5.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Burgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Marquis Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N

There are a number of names in common, such as the Stanleys, the Parrs and Sir Thomas Burgh. They agreed on some names. There are three significant names, which deserve special attention: the Earl of Pembroke, the Marquis of Dorset and Richard, the Queen's son. None of them however were politically opposing to Richard in the period the scrutinies were submitted. Thus the quarrel between these two brothers cannot be observed in the scrutiny lists they submitted.

It is true that Edward preferred "to rule wherever possible through trusted individuals rather than to develop new institutions",<sup>30</sup> and these trusted servants were perhaps the core of the nomination lists. Sometimes, Garter companionship was a loyalty, which went beyond political considerations and cannot be simply explained solely in terms of sovereigns' quest for political affinity. The nominations of William

---

<sup>30</sup> Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), p. 199.

Berkeley, Lord Berkeley, Walter Devereux, Lord Ferrers of Chartley Grey, Thomas, esquire of the body Greystoke, Ralph Lord are good examples of this principle.<sup>31</sup>

The fact that Edward IV used the Order for his political ends has been partly discussed elsewhere.<sup>32</sup> An analysis of nominations however is missing. The distinction within the nobility in Edward's later years as 'Country Nobility' and 'Court Nobility' has been discussed by historians. Possibly, the Garter election lists reflect the fact that Court nobility dominated both elections and nominations. Moreover, quarrels between local as well as national nobles were not missing in Edward IV's years neither. The quest for Northern support for Edward and Richard is another important point to note.

There are various views about Edward's handling of the nobility. These are outlined in Charles Ross's biography of the king: Accordingly, E. F. Jacob believed that until the end of his reign, Edward was dependent on a powerful faction within the nobility (the Woodvilles). This was however rejected by S.B. Chrimes, who argued that Edward successfully eliminated over-mighty subjects by 1480. J. R. Lander on the other hand claimed that Edward partly curbed the baronial power. Ross on the other hand argued that Edward's effort to decrease the power of aristocracy was very limited.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, although nobility, which are excluded from the Garter elections and nominations and they were doing outside, whatever they were doing, the Order of the Garter acquired at least partly a degree of unity and coherence in itself especially after Clarence's death. One interesting important difference in the Garter nomination pattern between Henry VI and Edward IV's

---

<sup>31</sup> Anstis., pp. 194-6; *FR.*, pp. 94-5.

<sup>32</sup> Daw Ben 'Elections to the Order of the Garter'.

<sup>33</sup> Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), p. 331; for his own discussion about Edward's handling of the nobility, pp. 332-41.

reigns is that in Edward IV's second reign, (as opposed to Henry VI's reign), we do not observe warrior councillors repeatedly nominated to the Order even in the period immediately before or after the war with France.

After 1471 the Edward IV's policy of creating new noble titles changed both in terms of his criteria for electing the new members of the aristocracy and he scarcely promoted new members. The new elections were almost entirely confined to members of the royal family. Thirty two new people were raised to the peerage. The most important of them were: Edward's second son, Richard who became Duke of York and Norfolk; Thomas Grey Earl of Huntington and then Marquis Dorset; Clarence's son, Edward who was recognized as the Earl of Salisbury, normally he was not chosen to the Order two new Viscounts Berkeley and Lovell and three new barons.<sup>34</sup>

When Edward was at last able to get his throne, he was both generous with pardons, and with rewards. For example The young Clerk, William Dudley,<sup>35</sup> the kinsman of Lord Dudley who was soon to become a Garter knight and who was one of the first to help Edward in March 1471, was promoted to a better office, became the dean of the Chapel royal and dean of Windsor, and chancellor to Queen Elizabeth Woodville, and was later additionally promoted to the important see of Durham in 1476. Another figure was one of the few remaining members of the Neville affinity, Sir Richard Beauchamp who helped Gloucester in the Tewkesbury campaign, received an annuity of 40 marks, and other men were also rewarded such as Sir

---

<sup>34</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 333; also see T. B. Pugh, 'Magnates, Knights and Gentry', in *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509*, ed. S. B. Chrimes, C.D. Ross and R. A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972).

<sup>35</sup> His nomination is missing but he nominated enormously many men.

William Parr of Kendal, and Sir William Stanley.<sup>36</sup> The important consideration in the above picture is that all the helpers of the king, and their close relative were awarded for a long period of time, perhaps until the end of their lives: all these names were later frequently nominated and two of them elected to the Order.

The king's resentment of a noble did not necessarily result in the degradation of a knight from the Order. For instance Earl Rivers wished to go abroad to fight the Saracens in 1474, and Lord Hastings took over his office of lieutenant of Calais. The king eventually hated this wish of Rivers's when, in his view so much remained to be done at home.<sup>37</sup> However, the situation did not stay unchanged and he participated again in another nomination session in a later date in 1479. He nominated in accordance with the rest of the public opinion.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Stanely	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir Thomas Sellinger	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Denham	2	N

King's friends served Edward IV at the center of government. First and the most important member was Henry Bouchier, Viscount Bouchier. Uncle by

---

<sup>36</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 185.

<sup>37</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 181.

marriage to Edward himself and brother of Thomas Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, Henry was an experienced soldier and statesman, who had already acted as treasurer of England in the Yorkist administration of 1455-6. Raised to the earldom of Essex in June 1461, he was Edward's first treasurer (until April 1462), steward of the royal household from 1467 to 1471 and then treasurer again until his death in 1483. He was therefore constantly about the King's person and was a leading member of the royal council. Bouchier was also important as head of a family which had early declared for the House of York and remained consistently royal to it. His two brothers William, Lord Fitzwarin,<sup>38</sup> and John, Lord Berners,<sup>39</sup> and his younger son Humphrey, created Lord Cromwell in 1461, had all married baronial heiresses. Fitzwarin was a useful supporter of the Crown in the West Country, as was his son, Fulk Bouchier; and both Lord Cromwell and Berner's son, Humphrey were later to die fighting for Edward at the battle of Barnet.<sup>40</sup> Bouchier participated in almost all of the nomination sessions in Edward's second reign. The men he nominated were usually emulated by the rest of the fraternity unless there was a specific case to the contrary. Additionally, the brothers of Bouchier were also nominated by other Yorkists, probably to express their kindness and appreciation to him and one of them was chosen. Thus familial relationship was somewhat important both in the nomination and election of a knight to the companionship.

It appears that Edward partly used the Garter for political purposes especially in his second reign. Political polarization was not lacking in Woodvilles' time. Between 1478 and 1483, the regime shared the power with men who were very

---

<sup>38</sup> Lord Fitzwarren was nominated in 1461 by Lord Beauchamp, Lord Rivers, Earl of Salisbury: Anstis, pp. 166-7.

<sup>39</sup> Lord Berners was already a member of the Order by 1460 or around and he participated to the nomination session in which his brother Lord Witzwarren was nominated. Anstis, pp. 166-7.

<sup>40</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 79.

dependent on the king and who were not so friendly with each other. For example Lord Hastings and Dorset, one Garter companion and one nominee were apparently rivals for the captaincy of Calais. Richard the duke of Gloucester distanced himself from the Woodvilles after 1478. Although he never completely isolated himself from the Court, which was the case for Warwick, the events of 1483 reveal that he was unrestrained by affection for Lord Rivers and ready to exploit the rivalry between Hastings and Dorset.<sup>41</sup> Lord Hastings was a regular participant to the election sessions. Consider his nominations:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir William Parre	2	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bouchier	1	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir john Parre	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	3	N

---

<sup>41</sup> Pollard, *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*, pp. 313-4.



Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Humphrey Talbot	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of York	3	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Henry Talbot	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Dakars	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir John Donne	3	N

He regularly nominated the frequent men such as Stanleys, Parrs, Lord Denham, Lord Audley and Sir Thomas Burgh. He was under the influence of Woodvilles as he nominated Richard, the Queen's son and Lord Grey. However it is also interesting to note that later Lord Hastings and Dorset might well become close friends because Hastings nominated Dorset in 1476. The other men he nominated were usually in accordance with the rest of the other Garter companions. Also note that he always nominated the knight who was to be chosen in any nomination session. King of Spain, the Duke of Ferrara, the Duke of York, Marquis Dorset, Sir Thomas Montgomery, and the Prince of England were all chosen in his sessions and they were all nominated by him. This is perhaps the only instance in all of the scrutiny lists this study covers.

One historian noted that the four greatest nobles of the realm, Buckingham, Norfolk, Northumberland and Stanleys, were perhaps the most important magnates in especially in Edward IV's second reign.<sup>42</sup> They were accordingly nominated but a clearer analysis of the exact patterns of the nominations may make the picture clearer. However first and most clear line of nomination pattern was not the repeating nomination of these four great magnates but the Woodville associates. Much has been said about the Woodville's influence on Edward IV.<sup>43</sup> "The

---

<sup>42</sup> See Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 163-7.

<sup>43</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p 314.

Woodvilles were the courtier group *par excellence* in Edward's later years".<sup>44</sup> It is not surprising then, that they regularly appeared in scrutiny lists both as nominees and as nominators. The Queen's eldest brother Lord Scales, his two other relatives the Marquis of Dorset and the Marquis of Suffolk became members of the Order and participated in all of the election sessions. Richard, the Queen's son, Grey, Edward Woodville were regularly nominated by a number of members throughout Edward's second reign. For example consider Richard the Queen's son:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	2	Richard the Queen's son	1	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	2	Richard the Queen's son	1	N

Richard the Queen's son was nominated by the Duke of Clarence, Lord Mantravers, Lord Hastings (two times), Marquis Dorset (two times), Earl of Norfolk, Earl Douglas.<sup>45</sup> Note that Marquis Dorset was his brother and Marquis Suffolk is his close relative, Lord Hastings although in quarrel with Dorset has also interestingly nominated him.

---

<sup>44</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 315.

<sup>45</sup> Precisely: Duke of Clarence, Lord Hastings, Anstis, pp. 194-6; *FR.*, 99-101. Earl of Norfolk, Lord Mantravers, Lord Hastings, Anstis, pp. 196-99; *FR.*, 101-3. Marquess Dorset, Anstis, pp. 206-7; *FR.*, 109-10; Marquess Dorset, Earl Douglas, Anstis, pp. 211-12; there is also 'Richard Lord Grey', who is nominated by Lord Howard, Lord Dudley, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Anstis, pp. 206-7; *FR.*, 99-101.

The King's stepson Thomas Grey, Marquis Dorset was nominated before he was elected by his nomination of the earl of Essex and Sir John Ascheley.<sup>46</sup> In the session he has been elected he was nominated by the Duke of Clarence, the Duke of Suffolk, the Duke of York, Lord Duras, Lord Hastings, Lord Dudley, Earl of Essex, Earl Douglas, Lord Ferrers, Sir William Parr.<sup>47</sup> Thus, he has been unanimously voted by every present knight companions.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	1	Marquess Dorset	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	1	Marquess Dorset	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	194-96	Duke of York	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y

The King's stepson Thomas Grey after a number of nominations was awarded the Garter in 1476. Grey came to political prominence after 1471 and it is by that time that he began to be nominated by the companions. For example, he fought at Tewkesury, under the command of Lord Hastings. It has been also

---

<sup>46</sup> Anstis, pp. 193-4; *FR.*, 98-9.

<sup>47</sup> Anstis, pp. 194-6; *FR.*, 99-101.

suggested that it was in fact Edward himself who supported him to raise to prominence probably under Elizabeth Woodville's influence.<sup>48</sup> He was made earl of Huntingdon on 14 August 1471, and later Marquis of Dorset on 18 April 1475.<sup>49</sup>

Lord Grey was nominated by a number of companions, for example, by Sir William Stanley, Lord Hastings, (three times) Lord Ferrers, (three times, one in Richard III's scrutiny) Lord Duras, Earl of Northumberland, Sir John Ascheley, the Duke of Suffolk, the Earl of Surrey, Sir William Parr, the Duke of Clarence, the Duke of York, Lord Lovell, Earl Douglas, Lord Dudley, Lord Mantravers, the Duke of Gloucester, the Earl Rivers, the Duke of Suffolk, the Earl of Essex,<sup>50</sup> and Sir Richard Radcliff (in Richard III's scrutiny). Although Lord Hasting's nomination of him was something quite understandable since they were very close in war, it is at the same time difficult to understand complain about the decrease in his influence over the King, (see below) he himself nominated a Woodville. (He also nominated other Woodvilles: three times for Lord Grey, and twice for Richard, the Queen's son, for example). If we add to them Richard Lord Grey then there is three more nominations.<sup>51</sup>

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Grey	3	N

---

<sup>48</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 336-37.

<sup>49</sup> Daw, 'Elections to the Order of the Garter', pp. 209-10; *FR.*, 109-110.

<sup>50</sup> Precisely: Duke of Clarence, Duke of York, Duke of Suffolk, Lord Duras, Sir William Parr, Lord Hastings, Lord Ferrers in Anstis, pp. 194-96; (This entry is not available in *FR*); Lord Hastings, Lord Dudley, Anstis, pp. 196-99. *FR.*, pp. 97-8; Duke of Gloucester, Duke of Suffolk, Earl Rivers, Earl of Essex, Earl Douglas, Lord Ferrers, Lord Hastings, Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, pp. 206-7; *FR.*, pp.107-9. Including Richard III's scrutiny: Earl of Surrey, Earl of Northumberland, Lord Ferrers, Lord Mautravers, Sir William Stanley, Sir Richard Radcliff, Anstis, pp. 217-20. Note that he is sometimes more popular when compared to other elections.

<sup>51</sup> Lord Howard, Lord Dudley, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Anstis, pp. 206-7; Sir Thomas Montgomery's nomination is not available in *FR.*, pp.107-9. .

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	2	Lord Grey	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Glouchester	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	2	Lord Gre	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	2	Lord Grey	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	2	Lord Grey	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Grey	2	X

Edward Woodville's nomination happened later, since he was a minor in the early years of Edward IV's second reign. He was nominated again by his relatives

the Duke of Suffolk and Marquis of Dorset, and other people close to Woodvilles: Earl Douglas, Lord Ferrers, Sir Thomas Montgomery, and Sir John Ascheley.<sup>52</sup> Still later is the nomination of Sir Richard Grey by Lord Ferrers Lord Dudley, Sir Thomas Montgomery and Sir John Ascheley.<sup>53</sup> The Woodville influence of the court did not start with Elizabeth's marriage to Edward: There is also John Montgomery who was nominated earlier in Henry VI's reign by Lord Willoughby and Sir John Fastolf,<sup>54</sup> and there is Richard Woodville nominated roughly at that time by the Marquis of Suffolk, and Lord Scales.<sup>55</sup> If one considers that the father of Elizabeth Woodville fought for the Lancastrian cause, these nominations are not surprising at all. The Duke of Norfolk was the cousin of Edward IV<sup>56</sup> and the duke of Suffolk was his brother-in-law. They were both elected to the Order (the duke of Norfolk was also chosen later),<sup>57</sup> though their influence was limited to their election as they were never councilors of him.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Edward Woodville	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Edward Woodville	1	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Edward Woodville	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Edward Woodville	3	N

---

<sup>52</sup> Duke of Suffolk, Anstis, p. 206-7; *FR.*, pp.107-9. Marquess Dorset, Earl Douglas, Lord Ferrers, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, pp. 211-12. On the other hand, in Henry VI's time there is another Woodville, Richard Woodville who is nominated by Duke of Suffolk, in Anstis, 127-8; Lord Scales, Anstis, p. 130; and then Marquess Suffolk again, Anstis, pp. 132-3.

<sup>53</sup> Anstis, pp. 211-2; *FR.*, pp.114-5. .

<sup>54</sup> Anstis, pp. 127-8; p. 130.

<sup>55</sup> By Marquis Suffolk, Anstis, p. 127-8; by Lord Scales, Anstis, p. 130; again by Marquis Suffolk, pp. 132-3.

<sup>56</sup> The Duke of Norfolk was somewhere chosen, but his scrutiny is missing, so we do not know who nominated him. On the other hand, he nominated in Richard III's scrutiny: King of Portugal, Duke of Austria, Earl of Lincoln, Lord Stanley, Lord Lovell, Lord Gr. Codenore, Sir James Harrington, Sir Richard Thunstall, Sir Thomas Burgh. Anstis, pp. 217-20. Moreover, there is another duke of Norfolk who for example nominated in Henry's last scrutiny.

<sup>57</sup> He appears in many nomination sessions.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Edward Woodville	3	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Edward Woodville(?)	3	N

If one adds the people who were connected to Woodvilles by marriage then the list becomes even bigger: it was perhaps the Woodville's main strategy to increase their political power by means of marriages as a chronicler hostile to the Woodvilles called them *Maritagium Diabolicum*. According to Ross, the writer of the chronicle was right:

In October 1464 Margaret, the Queen's next sister, was betrothed to Thomas, Lord Maltravers, son and heir of Earl of Arundel, and a nephew of Warwick.....Katherine Woodville married Henry Stafford, grandson and heir of the duke of Buckingham; Anne [the daughter of Richard Woodville, 1st earl Rivers, Anne's second marriage is with George, earl of Kent (d. 1503)] became the wife of William, Viscount Bouchier, eldest son and heir of the earl of Kent. Then in September 1466, Mary Woodville was betrothed to William Herbert, son of William, Lord Herbert, and the young men was allowed to assume the style of Lord Dudster. Finally, in October 1466, the queen paid 4000 marks to Edward's sister, Anne, duchess of Exeter, for the marriage of her elder son, Thomas Grey, to the duchess's daughter and heiress, Anne Holland, who was already betrothed to Warwick's nephew, George Nevill, son and heir of John Nevill, earl of Northumberland.<sup>58</sup>

The striking point in the above passage is that all of the male names mentioned were either nominated and some elected to the Order at some point in Edward's second reign after the Woodvilles became powerful in the court politics. Add to them Catherine, another daughter of Richard, who married Henry, the Duke of Buckingham, (ex. 1483), although her two other marriages are not available in the scrutiny lists: Jasper Tudor, duke of Bedford (d. 1495). Mary, again another daughter of Richard married William, 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Pembroke (d. 1491), Eleanor married Antony, Lord Grey of Ruthin (d. 1480). The son of father Richard, John married

---

<sup>58</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 93.



Catherine Neville, duchess of Norfolk, there was also another Richard, Earl Rivers (d. 1491) who was the son of Richard 1<sup>st</sup> ear Rivers. The son Richard did not marry anyone.<sup>59</sup> Those male names were all nominated or elected to the Order at some point in Edward IV's second reign though their exact time of nomination or election makes little or no difference. It is also important to note that close Woodville associates worked together in some other affairs: for example Henry Tudor, earl of Pembroke in 1471, was commissioned to deal with the rebels to William Herbert second earl of Pembroke, the earl of Shrewsbury, and Lord Ferrers.<sup>60</sup> Thus marriage connection to Woodvilles or to individuals preferred by Woodvilles may well be one reason in explaining one of the major causes for the nomination (and sometimes election) of the knights to the Order during this period. However on the other hand, the opposite explanation is also possible: they were nominated for their political power, and because of this political power, the Woodvilles preferred them to marry their relatives. Earl of Pembroke was occasionally nominated to the Order:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N

---

<sup>59</sup> See the table 5 in Ross, *Richard III* See all the scrutiny lists available in both Anstis and *FR* for the Second reign of Edward IV.

<sup>60</sup> Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1974), p. 182.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N

The father of Elizabeth, Richard Woodville, Lord Rivers 1<sup>st</sup> earl Rivers and her brother Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl Rivers fought with Margaret of Anjou and were pardoned by Edward IV. The first husband of Elizabeth Woodville Sir John Grey of Groby was related to the Greys of Ruthin and by marriage to the Berkeleys, the Bouchiers, and the Mowbrays.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, Sir Richard Woodville, Sir Edward Woodville, and Sir Loinell Woodville were the brothers of Queen Elizabeth. Additionally though none of them were nominated to the Order during Edward IV's time since they were minors, the heirs of the earls of Essex, Pembroke and Kent all married different members of the Woodvilles.<sup>62</sup> Interestingly the Earl of Kent was only nominated twice in one session by Lord Duras and Lord Ferrers.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Kent	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Kent	3	N

---

<sup>61</sup> Ross, Edward IV, p. 89.

<sup>62</sup> Ross, Edward I, p. 83.

The second important Garter nomination pattern is that the King's councilors who were regularly nominated and elected to the Order of the Garter. Though some great magnates, were excluded from being King's councilors, some lesser nobles were regular members of the King's council all of which were the king's most influential people. The main reason for this fact is that Edward IV willingly ennobled his most trusted servants especially in the early years of his reign. Accordingly many of those important men in the council between 1461 and 1470 had been also promoted to the nobility. Important names were Hastings,<sup>63</sup> Herbert, Ferrers,<sup>64</sup> Denham<sup>65</sup> Mountjoy,<sup>66</sup> and Humphrey Stafford.<sup>67</sup> All of these names accordingly were either elected or regularly nominated to the ranks of the Order. Lord Dudley, Lord Denham and the earl of Wiltshire<sup>68</sup> may well be politically minded men, because in Warwick's taking the control in 1470 (although he was trying to get the support of Yorkist nobles), they were not summoned to the parliament.<sup>69</sup> Thus

---

<sup>63</sup> The exact date of his election is unknown and the nomination list related to his election is missing but it is certain that he was elected to the Order relatively earlier as far as he records are concerned.

<sup>64</sup> The same ambiguity for Ferrers is also valid. The exact date of his election is unknown and the nomination list related to his election is missing, it is also certain that he was elected to the Order relatively earlier.

<sup>65</sup> He was elected by the end of Edward's second reign though he was regularly nominated by notable nobles early in about the beginning of Edward's second reign: Ear of Essex, Earl Douglas, Lord Dudley, Anstis, pp. 194-6; Later different names also nominated him. By the time passed he appears to become more popular in court cycles as the number of knight companions who nominated him increased substantially: Duke of Gloucester, Marquis Dorset, Earl of Norfolk, Earl of Essex, Lord Mautravers, Lord Howard, Lord Dudley, Anstis, pp. 196-99; Later more or less the same names also nominated him: Duke of Gloucester, Duke of Suffolk, Marquis Dorset, Earl Rivers, Earl of Essex, Earl Douglas, Lord Ferrers, Lord Dudley, Lord Hastings, Lord Howard, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Anstis, pp. 206-7; At last he was elected after the nomination of Lord Dudley, Lord Ferrers, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, pp. 211-12. it is also important to note that some of his nominators are his old friends from the king's council.

<sup>66</sup> Montjoy was chosen but the nomination list is missing so we do not know who nominated him. He participated to one nomination session. He nominated King of Portugal, Duke of Buckingham, Duke of Brittany, Lord Mantravers, Lord Stanley, Lord Dacers of the North, Sir William Parr, Sir John Donne, Sir Maurice Berkley, Anstis, p. 187-8.

<sup>67</sup> Anstis, p. 187-8.

<sup>68</sup> Note that in Henry VI's time another Earl of Wiltshire was nominated by Lord Sudeley. Thus, this early earl of Wiltshire may be son of him and the politics of the time ostensibly changed.

<sup>69</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 155.

perhaps, that is why they are regularly nominated to the Order. Lord Denham was a regular nominee:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Denham	2	N

It is interesting to note that he received votes from the members of both old and new nobilities. Woodville associates regularly nominated him. John, Lord Denham the Devonshire Esquire

had come to Edward's attention when he gave refuge to the young earl of March and his Nevill Kinsmen after the Rout of Ludford, and engineered tier escape to France. Although active in the royal service in Devon and Cornwall, his advancement was relatively slow. He was a councilor as early as 1462, but was not created a baron until 1467, ad he becomes really prominent only after the fall of Humprey Stafford.<sup>70</sup>

In Edward's second reign he was the person who was nominated frequently by almost every Garter knight participated to the election sessions. The table above shows that any knight companion might potentially nominate him whenever there was an empty space in his scrutiny list. This I presume shows that he was a well-trusted servant of Edward and he had no political quarrel with great magnates especially the knights of the Garter. Denham was also available in the army of 1475: Audley was captain of Breton force, and Denham was supporting him at sea. Two eldest sons of peers (Dacre of the South and Grey of Wilton) also served.<sup>71</sup> Note that all of these three names were nominated and Audley was chosen to the ranks of the Order.

However, even if many formerly committed Lancastrians were rewarded as councilors such as in 1471, Sir Richard Tunstall "the brave and Stubborn defender of Harlech, who had been master of the mint in 1470", their nomination did not take place immediately after they received their rewards.<sup>72</sup> Only Richard Thunstall who has been nominated to the Order appears in the scrutiny list of Richard III's in 1483 with two exceptions in 1476 by Lord Dudley and Sir William Parr.

---

<sup>70</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 79.

<sup>71</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 221.

<sup>72</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 184.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	3	Sir Richard Thunstal	2	N
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	3	X
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	2	N
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X

The father of another councilor John Tuchet, James Tuchet, Lord Audley was a Lancastrian thus possibly the Lord Audley that is nominated frequently in Henry VI's time.

The Queen's party in turn endeavoured to forestall this hostile concentration. Marching south from Middleham Salisbury was intercepted at Ilore Heath in Shropshire by a royalist force from Cheshire under Lord Audley. In the decisive battle which followed (23 September 1459), Audley was killed and Salisbury's younger sons, Thomas and John Nevill, were taken prisoners.<sup>73</sup>

His son John Tuchet, Lord Audley, however took the Yorkist side. John Lord Audley, had been taken prisoner in Calais in 1460. He then became one of Edward's

---

<sup>73</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 21.

most active supporters in the localities such as Somerset, Hampshire and Wiltshire. One reason for this may be the fact that his estates were situated in these regions. One historian has suggested that “although denounced by the rebels in 1469 as one of the king’s favourites, his rewards had in fact been quite modest”.<sup>74</sup> Thus perhaps king and nobles tried to compensate this unfair situation by regularly nominating him to the Order. Thus both Audleys, James, 5<sup>th</sup> Baron Audley, (d. 1459), and John Tuchet, 6<sup>th</sup> Baron Audley (d. 1490) were nominated to the Order:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Audley	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Audley	1	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N

---

<sup>74</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 80.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Lord Scales	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Awdley	2	N



Year	Anstis p	Knights	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	2	Lord Awdley	2	N

Note that the first Audley was the loyal servant of Henry VI and accordingly was nominated in his reign while his son decided to become a loyal servant of Edward IV and was nominated in his reign.

William, Lord Hastings was a prominent councilor, and was the king's chamberlain,<sup>75</sup> and although he lost his influence in the later years of Edward's reign, he was active (or non-active, in some situations) in the Garter elections. However here again one may observe the overwhelming Woodville influence in diminishing the role of old concillors and increasing the influence of their own relatives.

In accordance of the Woodville's influence Anthony, Lord Scales, John, Lord Howard<sup>76</sup> in 1475 also became councilors of Edward IV. After that date he immediately became very active in Garter nomination sessions though he had never participated in one before:

Year	Anstis p	Knights	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Awdley	2	N

---

<sup>75</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 314.

<sup>76</sup> Lord Howard's election scrutiny is also missing. However he participated in a number of sessions three of which was election meetings.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	Duke of York	2	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir John Doone	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Dacres of the South	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Richard Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Sellinger	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y

He was also the name who always nominated the nominee who was to be elected in that particular session. Consider the above table. The Duke of Ferrara, The King of Spain, Sir Thomas Montgomery, The Duke of York, and The Prince of England were all elected and nominated by him.

Earl Rivers<sup>77</sup> was the treasurer. Henry Bouchier, afterwards Viscount Bouchier the earl of Essex<sup>78</sup>, the council's president at the absence of the King.<sup>79</sup> As the council's most prominent man and trustee of the King, he was particularly important in Garter elections and he participated in almost all of the nomination sessions. One striking fact is that his son Sir Thomas Bouchier was nominated by 'earl of Essex' who was of course Henry Bouchier himself, and by Lord Hastings who was possibly a close friend. Sir Thomas Bouchier's nomination is a good example of the practice of nominating close family members of the knight companions. Sometimes since the person who was to be elected to the Order was well determined before the nominations would take place and accordingly some companions may have well nominated some names closer to them just because of honorary purposes without considering the political significance. This nomination may well be an example of this fact. He may well have nominated his son for either a honorary purpose or for simply filling an empty space. The nomination took place in only one session.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Earl River's election scrutiny is missing. Unlike Lord Howard, he participated to only one nomination session, there is nothing unusual in his nomination pattern, his opinions were in accordance with the general opinions of the other members of the fraternity. He accordingly nominated King of Spain, King of Hungary, Duke of Ferrera, Lord Stanley, Lord Grey, Lord Dinham (although it may appear that Lord Dinham's nomination may mean a possible example of conspiracy between councilors, It is in fact not so easy to conclude as Lord Dinham was nominated in a number of other occasions by other members of the companionship) Sir James Harrington. Sir Thomas Sellinger, Sir William Stanley, Anstis, pp. 206-7.

<sup>78</sup> The scrutiny related to his election is also missing, however he was an active participant to especially election meetings: he participated five nomination sessions: Anstis, pp. 187-8; pp. 193-4; pp. 194-6; pp. 196-99; pp. 206-7. it is certainly interesting that he did not participate to the last session of Edward IV. If he did not die before that time, this may be a good example supporting the Woodville and Queens influence and Essex's dislike of the situation. "the Woodvilles were the courtier group *par excellence* in Edward's later years". Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 315. For his treasurership and some other nominees of the order see: J. L. Kirby, 'The Rise of the Under-Treasurer of the Exchequer', *English Historical Review*, vol. 72, no 285 (Oct. 1957), pp. 666-677; esp . p. 674-5, for other treasurers, for example, Lord Say and Sele, see,

<sup>79</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 314.

<sup>80</sup>.Anstis, pp. 187-8.

An interesting pattern is however that there is a great change in companion's nominations before and after they make political conflict within the members of the fraternity. Members who were not in conflict usually nominated the same men to the Order before they start to their quarrel. For instance, before Richard, Duke of Gloucester and the Duke of Clarence quarreled in Edward's second reign, the people they voted in their nominations are in great parallelism at least in their first nomination lists. Consider Richard's nominations:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Marquess of Ferrara	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Dacres of Gillesla	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir James Haryngton	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Harington	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Beauchamp	3	N

Gloucester and Clarence participated the same nominations session and they both nominated the Duke of Buckingham, the Duke of Brittany, the Count of Urbin, Lord Mantravers, Lord Stanley, Lord Stourton, Sir William Parr and Sir John Parr. They agreed on eight names out of nine. The only difference is that Gloucester nominated William Stanley but in his place Clarence nominated Sir Thomas Montgomery. Although this similarity may well be simply because their age. They were minor and open to other's suggestions.

Among other men Gloucester nominated were Lord Dacres of the North<sup>81</sup> who were Wardens of the Anglo-Scottish marches were among the decent and disreputable family.<sup>82</sup> Richard Duke of Gloucester and some other men nominated them. The reason may well be the fact that Richard was trying to develop his northern ties. As Ross stated:

The Fitzhughs were also linked by marriage with the barons Greystoke, who had lands in Yorkshire and Cumberland, and with the Lords of Dacre of Gilsland in Cumberland .... Both Greystokes and Dacres had ties by marriage with each other and with the other baronial family of Scrope, that of Masham (near Middleham).<sup>83</sup>

Richard's political relationship with a number of Northern lords increased his authority in the region. Before the beginning of Edward's second reign the majority of the northern lords established important political connections with Richard. The connections were obviously reciprocal Richard also profited from these connections when establishing his regime later in 1483. The most important of them was Ralph, Lord Greystoke.<sup>84</sup> It is however interesting to note that he was not nominated by Richard himself but by Sir John Ascheley.<sup>85</sup> Humphrey, Lord Dacre of Gilsland another occasional Garter nominee, once by Richard himself was a member of the

---

<sup>81</sup> Lord Dacres of the North was nominated by Lord Montjoy, Anstis, pp. 187-8; Lord Dacres is nominated by earl of Essex, Anstis, pp. 196-9; Lord Dacres North is nominated by Marquess Dorset, Anstis, pp. 196-99; then by Earl Douglas, and Lord Dudley, Anstis, pp. 217-20; Lord Dacres of Gillesla was nominated by Duke of Gloucester! Anstis, pp. 190-1; Lord Dacres of Sussex was nominated by Duke of Gloucester, Duke of Buckingham, Earl Douglas, Lord Ferreys, Lord Duras, Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, 190-1; Lord Dacres of the South is nominated by Lord Howard Anstis, pp. 196-99. However in some instances there are some discrepancies when the information available in the *French Register* is concerned: See *FR.*, pp. 88-9; 97-8.

<sup>82</sup> His rise in the politics continued after the end of the House of York. For his career in the Early Tudor Especially Henry VIII period see: Steven G. Ellis, 'A Border Baron and the Tudor State: The Rise and Fall of Lord Dacre of the North', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 2. (Jun., 1992), pp. 253-277.

<sup>83</sup> Ross, *Richard III*, p. 49.

<sup>84</sup> He was nominated only by Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, pp. 193-4;

<sup>85</sup> For a detailed account of the important offices Greystoke took, see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 65.

Richard's council and "acted as Gloucester's deputy on the West March".<sup>86</sup> For Ross, he became through the end of Edward's reign he became the most important local lord of the Cumberland.<sup>87</sup>

In their second nomination lists there is something, which deserves special attention. This was Clarence's last scrutiny. He nominated the Marquis Dorset, the Earl of Pembroke, Richard, the queen's son Lord Grey, Lord Stanley Lord Awdley, Sir Thomas Burgh, Sir Thomas Montgomery and Sir Ralph Hastings. First evidence about their quarrel is that Richard did not participate to this election session. The other thing is that in his later nomination sessions he never nominated those names the Marquis Dorset, the Earl of Pembroke, Richard Queen's son Lord Awdley and Sir Ralph Hastings, although he nominated Lord Grey, Lord Stanley and Sir Thomas Burgh. Perhaps this may be an example about their conflict or this nomination is simply an accidental case, which does not have any meaning. Or perhaps they were simply reflecting someone else's decisions. Moreover, perhaps we are exaggerating the meaning of nominations. Earl of Pembroke was a special character in the end of Richard's authority in Wales. The second earl of Pembroke entered his father's office in 1471 and this according to Horrox ended Richard's authority.<sup>88</sup> Consider Clarence's nomination of the Earl of Pembroke to the Order. Therefore Clarence's nomination of Pembroke may well have had a political meaning. It is also important to note that as one historian noted "Richard III must always have been aware of the risks involved in trusting Stanley, as his eleventh-hour action, on the eve of

---

<sup>86</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 65.

<sup>87</sup> For a detailed account of his career and his influence see: Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 160.

<sup>88</sup> Rosemary Horrox, *Richard III: A Study in Service* (Cambridge; New York, 1991), p. 39.

Bosworth, in seizing Lord Strange<sup>89</sup>, Stanley's eldest son and heir, sufficiently indicates".<sup>90</sup> Consider the nomination list of the Duke of Clarence:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Buckingham	2	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N

---

<sup>89</sup> Though he started to be influential in court cycles near the end of Edward IV's second reign, his nomination took place relatively later after the end of Edward IV's reign: Lord Strange is nominated by Earl of Northumberland in Richard III's scrutiny. However, there is another Lord Strange of Knockin (d. 1479) who is married Jaquetta, who is the daughter of Richard Woodville, 1<sup>st</sup> earl Rivers and Jaquetta of Luxembourg. Though his nomination appears to be improbable in Richard III's reign. See Table 5 in Ross, *Richard III*, there is no page number it is at the end. This Lord Strange of Knockin cannot be Stanley's son since he died in 1479. Also note that the only surviving scrutiny of Richard III is only available in *Liber Niger* but not in the *French Register*. See Chapter 2 below.

<sup>90</sup> Ross, *Richard III*, p. 166.



Another interesting point to note is of course that although the Harringtons and Stanleys quarreled very much, they both appear in scrutiny lists both in Henry VI's and Edward IV's reigns. The Stanley-Harrington dispute has been studied by M. K. Jones.<sup>91</sup> In accordance with the Herbert family interests, Richard of Gloucester found himself at the centre of an already existing connection, which the parties would not want him to intervene. His attitude towards other servants in Wales, like John Donne,<sup>92</sup> who was nominated some five times in Edward IV's second reign, may have been the same. He seems to have been an active adherent of Henry VII.<sup>93</sup> John Donne was associated with the Duke on a commission of 6 January 1470 to inquire into rebellion in south Wales. Bennett suggested that such men like John Donne would inevitably develop links with Gloucester but they were primarily the King's servants rather than the dukes'. This thesis is also supported by Garter nomination lists as he was nominated by people who were close to the king.<sup>94</sup>

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	3	Sir John Donne	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Donne	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	3	Sir John Donne	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir John Doone	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir John Donne	3	N

---

<sup>91</sup> M. K. Jones, 'Sir William Stanley of Holt: Politics and Family Allegiance in the late Fifteenth Century', *Welsh History Review*, 14, 1-22.

<sup>92</sup> John Donne was nominated by Lord Montjoy, Anstis, pp. 187-8; Duke of Buckingham, Anstis, pp. 190-1; Sir William Parr, Anstis, pp. 194-6; Lord Howard, Anstis, pp. 196-9; Lord Hastings, pp. 206-7. but not by Gloucester himself. So he was really a royal servant. French Register also supports the information provided by the *Liber Niger*.

<sup>93</sup> Michael J. Bennett, 'Henry VII and the Northern Rising of 1489', *The English Historical Review*, 105/414. (Jan., 1990), pp. 34-59.

<sup>94</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 35.

Donne was also steward of Kidwelly and an esquire of the King's body. He was one of the people who gave continuity to royal activity in Wales.<sup>95</sup> Thus perhaps for this reason he was nominated to the Order. He gave continuity to royal activity in Wales and there was no question of him being superseded. What we know about him is that he was associated with Richard the Duke of Gloucester when he was dealing with the affairs of the North, especially Stanley-Harrington dispute on a commission of 6 January 1470 to inquire into rebellion in South Wales. According to Horrox, although John Donne had personal links with Richard, he was after all the king's servant.<sup>96</sup> He was also one of the main figures who "gave continuity to royal activity in Wales and there was no question of their being superseded".<sup>97</sup> Donne was the major local lord who was entitled to give continuity to royal activity in Wales and there was no question of him being superseded. There is also another minor figure who was nominated only once in Order's history: Sir Henry Herbert who was nominated by Sir John Fastolf one year ago may well be a relative of executed earl of Pembroke.<sup>98</sup>

The county palatine of Lancaster in the reign of Edward IV was the scene of a violent dispute between two important families, the Stanleys and the Harringtons. The Harringtons were a strongly Yorkist family. They were accordingly nominated to the Order before Edward's time, but not after he took the throne. Consider for example Sir Richard Harrington's nomination pattern:

---

<sup>95</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 35.

<sup>96</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 35. M. K. Jones, 1986a 'Richard III and the Stanleys' in Horrox 1986a pp. 27-50. 1986b 'Richard III and Lady Margaret Beauford a re-assessment', in Hammond 1986, pp. 25-37. Rosemary Horrox, (ed.) *Richard III and the North*, (Hull University, 1986a) M. K. Jones, 'Sir William Stanley of Holt: Politics and Family Allegiance in the late Fifteenth Century', *Welsh History Review*, 14, 1-22.

<sup>97</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 35. R. A. Griffiths, *The Principality of Wales in the Later Middle Ages I: South Wales, 1277-1536*, Cardiff 1972, pp. 156-7.

<sup>98</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 32-5.

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Rich Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Rich. Haryngdon	3	N
1448	141	Lord Scales	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	2	N

Sir Thomas and his eldest son, John supported Richard the duke of York and died for his cause. One of their awards was Sir Richard Harrington's nomination to the Order though he was not elected. Their wardship and marriage was made by means of the king, who in 1461 married Anne, the daughter of Thomas Harrington to Geoffrey Middleton. Note that there was another Middleton who was a probable relative of Geoffrey Middleton in the scrutiny lists. Sir Thomas's other younger son, James<sup>99</sup> was also nominated. In 1468, the king's attorney sued both James and his brother Robert in the chancery to answer the charges against them, and this instance can be an example of the fact that Harringtons were trying a 'Noble Lord' who would support them in their court proceedings. By this means these lords may have nominated them to the Order, but their quest for support did not help them much as both were placed in prison.

The situation became much more complicated when the king gave the wardship and marriages of the girls to Thomas, Lord Stanley, who was the person most nominated to the Order during Edward IV's reign. The king therefore gave the wardship to one of his most trusted servants. The situation became even more

---

<sup>99</sup> He has been nominated.

complicated with the intervention of the Earl of Warwick and Richard of Gloucester later Richard III. Richard Neville, the Earl of Warwick, a Garter knight from the beginning of Edward's reign also played a major role in this dispute but his attempts did not result in success. Richard and the Harringtons held a castle by force against Stanley at this time Richard of Gloucester was also in dispute with Stanley.<sup>100</sup> However, it is also interesting to note that later Gloucester nominated both Lord Stanley (Thomas Stanley) and another Stanley of the same family.<sup>101</sup> The Stanleys were all time favourites for the nominations consider the below table:

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir William Stanley	1	N

<sup>100</sup> Cited in Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 409: "For this, and what follows on the feud, *CPR*, 1467-77, 426-7; *CCR*, 1468-76, 36, 71 244, 3151 Rymer, *Feodera*, XI, 699; Whitaker, *History of Richmondshire*, II, 261; *Proceedings in Chancery in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth I, Calendars* (Record Commission, 1827), I, ixxxvi, for the Stanley Gloucester feud see *CCR*, 1468-76, 138".

<sup>101</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 408-9; Anstis, pp. 194-6; *FR.*, 94-5.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knights</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N

Sir William Stanley was an occasional nominee by almost all of the companions.

Add to this to the fact that Lord Stanley was even a much more stronger nominee:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knights</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	2	Lord Stanley	3	N

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	2	Lord Stanley	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	2	Lord Stanley	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Stanley	2	X

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	2	Lord Stanley	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	2	Lord Stanley	3	X

The dispute continued unresolved until April 1472, and after that time the magnates probably because of the King's interest started to intervene. According to Ross "the king was taking a personal interest in the affair".<sup>102</sup> The decision was against the Harringtons, but the family did not end the quarrel at this moment. Another commission was gathered. The interesting point is in the people commissioned in this commission was that the prominent men of the commission were composed of Garter companions: Gloucester, Northumberland, Shrewsbury and Hastings. One possible reason from all these knights to nominate these two opposing parties may well be that they dealt with the matter personally in order to get a reconciliation between these two families. After a number of further disputes the Harringtons acceded to act in accordance with the King's wish. No punishment took place against them, and they continued to serve to the King. Sir James for example participated to the French expedition in 1475, and was elected a knight of the body to Edward by 1475 (not a Garter knight), and additionally his brother Robert, was member of the Parliament for Lancashire in the 1472-5.<sup>103</sup> The reason for their tender treatment was clear: both were trusted Yorkist servants with a long outstanding

---

<sup>102</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 409.

<sup>103</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 409.

service.<sup>104</sup> Ross argued that the King was unwilling to alienate such loyal and long-standing servants. Thus while it was already clear that long-standing service was somewhat a key element in the election of a knight to the Order, it was perhaps also important for the nomination of the knights to the Order.

Early in his career Gloucester nominated Sir Thomas Stanley, and the latter's brother Lord Stanley was also another regular Garter nominee. Lord Stanley was the most important local lord of the county of Lancaster and Richard of Gloucester's position in the area was not as clear as the other parts of the Northern regions. Who was the ultimate focus of power? Stanley's influence over local subjects was greater and this continued to be the case until the decision of a commission, which clarified Richard's superiority over Lord Stanley in the region.<sup>105</sup> The nomination of Sir Thomas Stanley by the duke of Gloucester therefore is something difficult to explain. One possible explanation is that Richard nominated Stanley well before this latent conflict took place. The second possible explanation on the other hand is that this nomination is a simple scribal mistake because the name of Sir Thomas Stanley (as well as 'Lord Stanley' who is clearly the same person) occurs more than fifty occasions in all of the scrutinies of Edward IV.

Horrox has argued that the affirmation of Richard of Gloucester's authority in the North of England was something significant ie. "a major achievement" because this union was not achieved since the end of the previous century. Horrox also added that the undisputed supremacy of Richard ended the political division within the Neville family and the old dispute between Percies and Nevilles came also to an end. According to Horrox then, Edward's achievement in accordance with his regional

---

<sup>104</sup> Examples supporting this view is available in Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 409.

<sup>105</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 67.



policy was not only uniting the North under one *authority* but uniting the northerners under the *King's* authority.<sup>106</sup> It is possible to partly object to this view. As this study has demonstrated in the previous chapter, the Duke of Suffolk in 1440s probably already achieved the union of the North under his *authority*. Moreover, Garter nomination patterns clearly support this argument. It is true that Suffolk was the *de facto* ruler but not the official *King*, and in this respect, the second part of the thesis may well be valid ie. Edward may have managed to unite the North under the *King* but this union was by no means the first political union achieved after the end of the previous century. On the other hand It is true that Edward's policy ended the old Neville-Percy dispute though the traces of this may only be observed in the scrutiny lists of the later period after the deposition of Richard III in 1485.

Another important pattern which can be observed in the Garter nomination lists is that successful war commanders who especially helped Edward IV in defeating Warwick were rewarded by both elections and nominations. To briefly mention the story of the period, Edward defeated Warwick at the battle of Barnet and then the Lancastrian army at Tewkesbury. Gloucester having fought in both battles endowed prayers for those who had died there in his service. Among them was two northerners one Thomas Parr whose two sons were, another frequent Garter nominees<sup>107</sup> and later a member, the brother of the king's servants and William and John. Consider how often they were nominated. Sir John Parr for example was nominated by various members of the fraternity including Gloucester himself.

---

<sup>106</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 65-6.

<sup>107</sup> "Parr had already, in Dec., '67 been granted 1100 acres from the Estates of Henry Bellingham. On 7 May '70, he was appointed lieutenant of Carlisle castle and of the west marches towards Scotland (Warwick had been captain and warden respectively since 1465). Subsequently, his assistance to Edward IV during the invasion of spring 1471 received special mention in the Arrival". Cited in P. Holland 'The Lincolnshire Rebellion of March 1470', *English Historical Review*, vol. 103, no. 409 (Oct. 1988), 849-69, p. 859.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir john Parre	3	N

Similarly his other relative William was also occasionally nominated by less number of companions, since he was immediately elected in that election meeting. However, it is also important to note that the Duke of Gloucester also nominated him

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	3	Sir William Parre	2	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir William Parre	2	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y

1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
------	--------	--------------------	---	-------------------	---	---

The other was Thomas Huddleston, younger son of Sir John of Millom. The family was associated with Richard of Gloucester in the 1470s but in the 1460s they were clearly associated to the Nevilles and Thomas and his brother William were forfeited in 1470 for their support of Warwick and Clarence. Thomas may have later allied to the opposing party by 1471.<sup>108</sup> Later one of them, John was nominated to the Order in three different sessions by Sir John Ascheley.<sup>109</sup> Another interesting name appeared in the scrutiny lists was the chief of the family John Huddleston (Huddlestons of Millom on the Duddon estuary) who was to serve both lords Warwick and Gloucester. Sir John was related by marriage to Warwick's allies the Fitzhughs of Ravensqorth, and two of his sons married Neville wives. Thus Huddleston was also nominated to the Order probably because of his good service and his marriage relationship with the daughters of the great magnates.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore Richard was also relying on Huddleston as he appointed Sir John Huddleston as sheriff of Cumberland as his own deputy in 1475.<sup>111</sup>

Again another striking fact is that though the Huddlestons were active supporters of Richard of Gloucester in Cumbria, they had a land dispute with the family of Harrington in North Lancashire.<sup>112</sup> Thus this case is again a good example showing that the members of the families who had disputes with each other were

---

<sup>108</sup> *CPR*, 1467-77, p. 218, *CPR*, 1476-85, p. 34 cited in Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 38.

<sup>109</sup> All of the nominations are from Sir John Ascheley though I am unable to establish any particular connection between these two figures: Sir John Huddreston by Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, p. 190-1; Sir Jo. Huddelenston by Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, pp. 206-7; Sir John Huddleston again by Sir John Ascheley, Anstis, pp. 211-12.

<sup>110</sup> For a detailed analysis of the family's role and their exact marriage relationships see Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 52.

<sup>111</sup> Though Huddleston was not among the politically prominent men of the realm at least for Edward IV's time, he was one of Richard's favorites see Horrox, *Richard III*, p.54-60.

<sup>112</sup> For a detailed analysis of their land dispute and further evidence see: Horrox, *Richard III*, p.58.

*both* nominated to the Order. It is also important to note that the land dispute between these two families made them closer to Richard of Gloucester and gave him a chance of political contact with other important York families such as Wentworths.<sup>113</sup> It is also possible to suggest that given the interrelationship of medieval service and patronage relationship, perhaps by means of these contracts that these local families found courtier friends who nominated them to the Order.

Additionally in 1475, Edward IV tried to invade France. Soldiers were supplied by this invasion by Richard and Percy and the only other northerner peer, John Lord Scope of Bolton who was nominated before 22 April 1463 (died in 1498) and two other northern gentries William Parr,<sup>114</sup> and Sir James Harrington.<sup>115</sup> The number of knights and soldiers they brought to the king do not “represent the total military resources of these men but rather the relative ability of each to muster a force for a foreign adventure. After all, Parr and Harrington had been able to raise more than double the contingent when Edward landed in 1471”.<sup>116</sup> So Edward and some Northern prominent men were consequently in a trouble: Edward may have wanted the support of Northern dukes and gentry accordingly, and he may have used Garter elections for this purpose.

Sir James Harrington and his brother Sir Richard Harrington were also associated with Richard of Gloucester. The family is marked with a long tradition of service to the House of York itself. Sir James held lands in Hornby in Lancashire, and his family also had lands in Yorkshire. Moreover he was close to the court cycles from about the beginning of Edward IV’s reign as he and his family had a long

---

<sup>113</sup> Note that Henry Wentworth was also nominated once in a nomination list. Anstis, p. 196; *FR.*, p. 95. Also see: Horrox, *Richard III*, p.59.

<sup>114</sup> Anstis, p. 196-201; *FR.*, pp. 95-103.

<sup>115</sup> Anstis, p. 196-201; *FR.*, pp. 95-103.

<sup>116</sup> Weiss, ‘Communications A power in the North?’, p. 508.

established relationship with Nevilles as he himself had been a loyal servant of Warwick and his father was also a servant of the father of Warwick, although Horrox claimed that he deserted Warwick in 1471, and moved into the royal household as a knight of the body. It is also important to stress that he also had political connections with Richard of Gloucester and it is probable that Gloucester may well helped him in his conflict with Lord Stanley, who was nominated more than fifty times in Edward's reign. The family's loyalty continued after Richard of Gloucester was established as Richard III. His brother Sir Richard Harrington, who was also nominated in Edward IV's time, was also made a banneret in Scotland by Richard in 1482. Richard also granted him some lands.<sup>117</sup>

Another frequent Garter nominee who was nominated more than fifty times in Edward times (like Lord Stanley), was Sir Thomas Burgh of Gainsborough of Lincolnshire. His career was very significant and successful. He was formerly Edward's master of the horse, and a former knight of the body, steward of the Duchy of Lancaster honour of Bollingbroke, constable of Lincoln Castle, and beneficiary of the forfeited lands of William Tailboys of Kyme.<sup>118</sup> He already the knight of the body and steward of the lordship of Epworth Katherine, dowager duchess of Norfolk,

---

<sup>117</sup> For a detailed analysis of the their relationship there are a number of sources such as J. C. Wedgwood, *History of the Parliament, 1439-1509, Biographies*, 423-7; G. M. Coles, 'The Lordship of Middleham, especially in Yorkist and Earl Tudor Times', (unpublished M.A. thesis, Liverpool University, 1961). For a detailed account of this story see Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 51-2.

<sup>118</sup> R. L. Storey, 'Lincolnshire and the Wars of the Roses', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, xiv (1970), 64-82 cited in Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 138.

in 1477.<sup>119</sup> Sir Thomas Burgh had also the offices of constable and baillif of Lincoln.<sup>120</sup>

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Bourght	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Glouchester	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N

<sup>119</sup> Lancashire RO, DDK/1746/15 m. 2 dorse. Cited in Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 20. Additionally, for Burgh's carrer as a knight see: D. A. L. Morgan, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', *Transactions of the Royal Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., xxiii (1973), 7, 10, 15. see also R. L. Storey, 'Lincolnshire in the Wars of the Roses' cited in P. Holland 'The Lincolnshire Rebellion of March 1470', *English Historical Review*, vol. 103, no. 409 (Oct. 1988), 849-69, p. 854.

<sup>120</sup> PRO, prob 11/10 fo. 24IV. Cited in Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 256.

1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Glouchester	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	X

1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
------	--------	----------------	---	-------------------	---	---

He was also elected as Member of Parliament for Lincolnshire in 1467-8. Burgh lived at Gainsborough only a few miles from Epworth. After a few nominations in the beginning of the second half of Edward IV's second reign, he was then nominated regularly by almost all of the companions and this pattern continued almost unchanged until the end of Edward IV's reign. This Lincolnshire based courtier was first nominated by only two companions in 1475 both of whom were politically relatively inactive figures. The Duke of Buckingham and Lord Duras, then in 1476, his popularity suddenly increased and he was nominated by six companions: Lord Hastings, Lord Howard, the Earl of Essex, the Duke of Buckingham (again), Sir John Ascheley, and Lord Duras (again); in the second election meeting of the same year new names also added him to their lists of nominations: the Duke of Clarence, Lord Ferrers, Lord Dudeley, the Duke of Suffolk, Lord Hastings, (again) the Duke of York, the Earl Douglas, the Earl of Essex (again), Lord Duras (third time), In 1477, he was again repeatedly nominated by the Earl of Norfolk, the Earl of Essex, the Marquis Dorset, Lord Dudeley (again), even Richard the Duke of Gloucester, Lord Howard, Lord Mautravers, Lord Hastings; in 1479, the Marquis Dorset, the Duke of Southfolk, the Earl of Essex, the Duke of Gloucester, Lord Ferrers, Sir John Ascheley, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Lord Dudeley, the Earl Douglas, Lord Hastings, Lord Howard, in 1482, Sir Thomas Montgomery, the Marquis Dorset, the Earl Douglas, Lord Dudeley, in 1483, Lord Mautravers, Lord Ferrers, Sir William Stanley, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Sir John Ascheley, Sir Richard Radcliff, the Earl



of Arundel, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Surrey, and the Earl Douglas.<sup>121</sup> He was at last elected by the end of Edward's reign. Thus apparently he was a very welcomed courtier.

He was also the major actor in the Lincolnshire rising. In fact this rising emerged due to a private discussion between Sir Thomas Burgh and Richard Lord Welles. Note that another Lord Welles in Henry VI's time had been commander of Calais and chosen to the Order, and this Lord Welles was also nominated once.<sup>122</sup> Willoughby, Welles, and his relatives "attacked and destroyed Burgh's manor house, carried off his goods and chattels, and drove him from the shire"<sup>123</sup> It has been suggested that the Lincolnshire rising of 1470 "arose originally from the resentment felt by older established families in the shire for the rise of the 'Yorkist Parvenu', Sir Thomas Burgh".<sup>124</sup> He was thus already an influential figure in Lincolnshire area. Add to them the fact that he has been nominated to the Order by some fifty times by almost every knight companions. Thus possibly his influence was not coming simply from king but he was at the same time equally favoured by almost all of the magnates. Or he managed to acquire the active support of the court cycles. There is also a third alternative since in the years Burgh was nominated King Edward was dominating the political area with Woodvilles, King and Woodvilles also dominated the nominations. The nominations of Burgh also support the view that the Lincolnshire rebellion occurred as a consequence of resentment against him among other local lords, because, if one is to believe to the repetitive pattern in the nominations, Burgh's influence was enormous.

---

<sup>121</sup> Anstis, *Register*, p. 190-91; *FR.*, p. 92; p. 193-94; *FR.*, p. 94; p. 194-96; *FR.*, p. 97; p. 196-99; *FR.*, p. 100; p. 206-7; *FR.*, 108; p. 211-12; p. 217-20. Sir John Bourgh, pp. 217-20.

<sup>122</sup> By Duke of Suffolk, Anstis, pp. 206-7; Lord Ferrers Anstis, pp. 211-12

<sup>123</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 138.

<sup>124</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 442.

Burgh's influence also continued after the end of Edward IV's reign. In Richard III's reign for example, Sir Thomas Burgh "received an annuity and office together worth around 100 pounds coupled with land worth 200 pounds". Additionally, Sir James Tyrell whose first nomination resembles to the only surviving scrutiny of Richard III, was rewarded stewardships and other local office in Wales and the south west of England. Although he first appeared in Richard III's scrutiny, he was already awarded late in Edward IV's reign as:

he was receiving fees of 100 pounds from office with the duke's own Welsh land, and the office he added within the crown lands after 1483 probably doubled this. Rewards of this magnitude, although always in the minority were at least within the reach of the average household man. Within each generation, however, there were also a few close associates of the king whose rewards were quite exceptional. Tyrell was one of them, and the offices mentioned above were only part of his gains. He accumulated three wardships, two before Gloucester's accession valued at over 299 pounds p. a. and a third, the wardship of Robert Arundel of Trerice (Corn.), in 1484. He was also a chamberlain of the exchequer and from early in 1485, lieutenant of Guisnes. His closeness to Richard brought him grants from men and institutions anxious to have his lord's goodwill. His income from all these sources was probably of the order of 1000 pounds p.a. In 1488 he assessed his losses in Wales as a result of Richard's defeat at Bosworth, as 3000 pounds.<sup>125</sup>

Another example showing the fact that companionship to the same Order and nomination of an important magnate to the Order did not necessarily create an unbreakable solidarity between members and nominees. For example, Richard of Gloucester probably took an active role in the trial of treason of Henry Courtenay and Thomas Hungerford who was already occasionally nominated to the Order probably because of his loyal service to the crown.<sup>126</sup> Garter nomination did not prevent him from being condemned. Moreover, household men drawn from Stanley (who was continually nominated to the Order more than fifty times in Edward IV's

---

<sup>125</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 258-59.

<sup>126</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 28. Ross 1981, pp. 7, 10-11, 14. (Ross is cited in Horrox).

reign, and this includes the fact that he was also nominated by the Duke of Gloucester himself) connection fought against Richard III at Bosworth.<sup>127</sup> The lands, which were mainly in Somerset and Wiltshire that were given to Richard of Gloucester was a direct threat to the existing interests of Stanley family. This, according to Horrox, created an open rivalry between these two important magnates and Edward IV had to intervene to the quarrel.<sup>128</sup>

Sometimes great national magnates nominated their local servants. Sir Thomas Mountford's nomination is a good example of this practice. The only significance of Thomas Mountford was that he was the retainer of the Neville family and his kinsman John was the chaplain of Richard of Gloucester. Another family, which was initially insignificant though able to rise to power late by the second half of Edward IV's reign was the Tunstall family. In fact Tunstall was nominated in Richard III's scrutiny and the probable reason for this nomination may well be the fact that Richard also profited from the services of the Tunstalls of Thurland Lancashire. The Tunstall family members were also Warwick retainers,

...although the first formal record of a fee is apparently that granted by Gloucester to Thomas Tunstall in autumn 1471. Thomas had received a royal pardon in the previous April, just one week after Barnet, which implies a Neville connection. So, probably does the fact that his concubine of several years' standing, whom he subsequently married, was the legitimate daughter of archbishop George Neville.. His two brothers, Richard and William, followed him into Gloucester's service. Sir Richard, the eldest, was probably the 'master Tunstall' who was one of the duke's councilors and William was one of Gloucester's feoffees.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 20.

<sup>128</sup> Rosemary Horrox, *Richard III: A Study in Service* (Cambridge; New York, 1991), pp. 28-30.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.* p. 50.

The lands confiscated from old nominees were sometimes given to the new nominees. For example, Clifford's<sup>130</sup> lands were given to Richard and Thomas Stanley.<sup>131</sup> Duke Clarence took a part of the land after the forfeiture of the lands of Thomas lord Roos.<sup>132</sup> Horrox argued that Fitzwilliam's brothers-in-law *appears*<sup>133</sup> to have had ducal connections, though there was little evidence to prove it with certainty. Richard headed the feoffes of one. Richard Wentworth of Bretton in 1476.<sup>134</sup> In fact this relationship appears to be much more certain as Wentworth was nominated only in Richard III's scrutiny.

The nominations of some other knights in Richard III's only surviving scrutiny can be explained if one looks back a couple of years before Richard of Gloucester became Richard III. It is a well-known fact that the royal magnates usually sought for the political support of regional elites and this in turn reflected in Richard scrutiny as a nomination to the Order. For example the nomination of Thomas Lord Scrope of Masham and Upsale, Lord Lovel and Lord Fitzhugh took place just because they were formerly close to Richard of Gloucester before he became Richard III in 1483. There is a clear connection between Richard the Duke of Gloucester and Lord Scrope as an indenture dated January 1476 stated that Gloucester promised to be the lord of Thomas and his mother. Accordingly, all the

---

<sup>130</sup> Note that lord Clifford was nominated in Henry VI's time by Lord Scales Anstis, pp. 127-8; Earl of Shrewsbury and Lord Scales, Sir John Fastolf Anstis, pp. 130; John Fastolf, Anstis, pp. 132-3; Duke of Sommerset, Sir John Beauchamp, Lord Scales Anstis, p. 141; Viscount Bouchier, Lord Beauchamp p. 150;

<sup>131</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 55.

<sup>132</sup> Note that Lord Roos was nominated in Henry VI's time, by Earl of Salisbury, Anstis, p. 130; Viscount Bouchier, Anstis, p. 150; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 57.

<sup>133</sup> My Italics.

<sup>134</sup> There is a probable connection between Sir Richard Wentforh and Sir Henry Wentforth who was nominated by Duke of Suffolk in Richard III's only surviving scrutiny, Anstis, pp. 217- 20; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 60.

servants, tenants and inhabitances of the Scrope estates were directly connected to Richard.

The important point here is that unlike many other indentures, according to this contract the servants of Lord Scrope were *directly* connected to Richard. This may not be accidental as this practice was also found in Richard's relationship with the Lovell/Fitzhugh<sup>135</sup> contract. Though all of these three names were nominated to the Order, none of them were nominated by Richard himself. One possible explanation is that they were also connected to other members of the Order, or Richard had some sort of influence to the nominations in the last years of Edward IV. It is also important to note that The Fitzhughs of Rvensworth were a North Riding family also linked with the Nevilles though their impact on the Garter nomination was no more possible when Fitzhugh was nominated and Richard Fitzhugh did not become politically active until after 1483. Fitzhugh was the brother-in-law of another Gloucester's close associates, Francis lord Lovell, who had been also a Neville associate in the first years of Edward IV's first reign.<sup>136</sup>

The same pattern can also be applied to explaining the sudden nomination of Sir James Tyrell in Richard III's scrutiny. Richard III did not show interest in rebuilding old connections with the important lesser nobility in the process of the reassertion of royal authority. For example Although John, Lord Denham, he had been one of Edward's key supporters in is council, and although Richard himself worked with him occasionally Denham's role as the king's agent decreased probably

---

<sup>135</sup> Both of them are nominated in 1483: Fytzhugh, by Sir John Ascheley and Earl of Arundel, Anstis, pp. 217-20; Lovell first by Earl Douglas, Lord Dudley, Anstis, pp. 211-12; and then by Duke of Suffolk, Duke of Norfolk, Anstis, pp. 217-20; if lord Lyell and lovell are the same then there are four more nominations in p. 217-20. There is also another Lord Lovell who is frequently nominated earlier in Henry VI's time.

<sup>136</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 64.

because he was a loyal servant of Edward IV. By March 1484 Sir James Tyrell who was nominated only in Richard's scrutiny had replaced Denham as steward of the duchy.<sup>137</sup>

Apart from the political considerations, marriage ties must also be taken into consideration in establishing Garter nomination relationships. Because at least for the northern nobility and gentry we know that they were closely linked by blood and marriage.<sup>138</sup> As Pollard has outlined: in north Yorkshire, Richard Lord Fitzhugh, an important figure who was occasionally nominated to the Order by the Nevilles, was in fact a cousin of Duke Richard of Gloucester. His nomination by the Nevilles is explained by the fact that his mother Alice Neville, was daughter to Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury, who in turn was the elder of Richard of Gloucester's own mother, Cecily Neville.<sup>139</sup> Furthermore, Lord Fitzhugh, had a marriage relationship with a daughter of Edward IV's master of the horse, Sir Thomas Burgh of Gainsborough in Lincolnshire, who was he person most nominated in the Edward's second reign. This fact may also help to explain why Burgh who was very loyal to Edward and his loyalty was constantly rewarded by means of Garter nomination for almost every election session became in turn a supporter of Richard III in his usurpation.<sup>140</sup> It is also striking to note that while he was nominated more than fifty times in Edward's time, his actual election took place in Richard III's time in 1484.

---

<sup>137</sup> Anstis, pp. 217-20; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 203.

<sup>138</sup> R. L. Storey, 'The North of England', in *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509*, ed Chrimes,, Ross, and Griffiths, 129-44. Cited in Ross, *Richard III*, p. 48.

<sup>139</sup> A. J. Pollard, 'The Northern retainers if Richard Nevill, Earl of Salisbury', *Northern History*, xi (1976 for 1975), 52-69; 'Richard Clerveaux of Croft: A North Riding Squire in the Fifteenth Century', *Yorkshire Archeological Journal*, L (1978), 151-69; cited in Charles Derek Ross, *Richard III* (London: Methuen, 1992), p. 48.

<sup>140</sup> Ross, *Richard III*, p. 48.

Another striking aspect of the Garter elections of the later years of Edward IV is that no English subject was chosen to the Order. That is perhaps why elections in the Edward IV's later years were always international knights but not denizens. The Woodvilles may have disliked any potential rival group to become powerful in the court. So they may have not reward them by electing them to the Garter.

Substantial difference of opinion between Richard of Gloucester and Woodvilles belong to the last five years of Edward's second reign and evidence coming from the Garter scrutiny lists partly confirms this trouble. When Gloucester participated in the election sessions, he gave votes, which were mostly in accordance with others. Since he appeared less in the court, he did not participate in Garter elections either. Thus one cannot know anything about his intentions about the other garter knights and nominees.<sup>141</sup>

Grey, Edmund, Lord Grey of Ruthyn, and Earl of Kent, who was also another occasional nominee was to become Treasurer of England. Although he though he did not acquire what he really deserved as his reward for his help at Nortampton in the establishment of Yorkist regime in the first reign of Edward. It is true that he was not nominated in Edward's first reign but he was occasionally nominated in Edward's second reign. Similarly, Richard Fiennes, Lord Dacres of the South, the son of the Roger Fiennes received little reward for his military service, even though in 1462. Richard of Gloucester was probably the only person to nominate him to the Order. In Anstis's edition of the *Liber Niger* he appears to have been nominated though this evidence is not supported by the testimony of *the French Register*. The king's cousin, William Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, and his brother-in-law, John de la Pole,

---

<sup>141</sup> For a discussion of Richard's relationship with the court see: Charles Derek Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 24-43.

Duke of Suffolk, likewise received virtually nothing from their royal kinsman.<sup>142</sup> Nevertheless they were both nominated and elected to the Order.<sup>143</sup>

Henry, Grey, Lord Grey of Codnor, was another person who was occasionally nominated to the Order. It is thus probable that their relationship went back to Richard's early years, because we know that he was in fact rewarded for his loyalty to him when Richard of Gloucester became Richard III.<sup>144</sup> It is also important to note that Lord Codnor was favoured by Edward IV in his own reign. For example in 1467, in Derbyshire a dispute between Henry Lord Grey of Codnor, and Henry Vernon, esquire (who was supported by the earl of Shrewsbury), concluded to the murder of one of the Vernons. One year later a commission of oyer and terminer was appointed, headed by the duke of Clarence, Lord Rivers and Lord Hastings, to deal with this problem. But peace was not easily achieved until 1468 where "Shrewsbury, Grey and Vernon all had to be bound over in large sums not to do violence towards jurors –local Derbyshire esquires- who had been directed to investigate the facts and report to the commission". The dispute was important because of the fact that on the one hand Clarence was said to favour Vernon since he was one of his retainers while 'the king's men' favoured Lord Grey.<sup>145</sup> Later in 1471, Henry, Lord Grey played the major role in another dispute as the mayor of Nottingham tried to act against the rioters who, the mayor believed, had been supported by Lord Grey. King Edward IV accordingly questioned him in the Star Chamber, 'in plain council', Edward's

---

<sup>142</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 69.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid. p. 72.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.,p. 161.

<sup>145</sup> Annales, 788-9; CPR, 1467-77, 55; CCR, 1468-76 (for the bonds, which show lords Mountjoy and Dudley standing surety for Shrewsbury, and Hastings for Lord Grey). Cited in Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 119.



decision about the rioters was ambiguous: “he should not support or favour any persons within the town of Nottingham”.<sup>146</sup>

Sir Walter Blount, of Evaston in Derbyshire Lord Mountjoy was elected to the Order relatively earlier in Edward IV’s reign and participated to one nomination session.<sup>147</sup> He occasionally participated to other regular sessions. He was in fact a loyal servant of Duke Richard of York, before Edward IV took the throne and in 1459-60 was probably in Calais, and on 24 November 1461 he was appointed treasurer of England. Then in 1465 he was created Lord Montjoy.<sup>148</sup> He also waited long for any other reward for his services, he had no grant of any substance until August 1467, it is also important to note that his election to the Order may well be due to the fact that he became a relative of Edward by means of marriage: somewhere in 1467 he married Anne dowager duchess of Buckingham, when he was given some of Courtenay lands in Devon and Hampshire. He accordingly nominated the duke in the session of 1472 where the duke was elected. It is also important to note that Montjoy did not prefer to nominate any other English subject within the first rank but two foreigners, the duke of Brittany and the King of Portugal.<sup>149</sup> His local influence did not increase suddenly in Derbyshire but he was clearly a member of the inner circle at court, more particularly after his marriage.<sup>150</sup> It is clear that his marriage connection served him a lot: he became more acquainted within the court due to his marriage and he has been chosen to the Order after his marriage.

---

<sup>146</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 303.

<sup>147</sup> Anstis, pp. 177-8.

<sup>148</sup> For his loans see, Ross *Edward IV*, p. 379, Wedgwood he is supposed to be an associate of Earl of Warwick but this may not be correct see, Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 81n.

<sup>149</sup> Anstis, pp. 177-8.

<sup>150</sup> *CPR*. 1467-77, 24-5 (For the Courtenay Lands). He was with Edward to relive George Nevill of the Great Seal in June 1467, and he was in some minor commissions *CCR*, 1461-8, 456; *CPR*, 1461-7, 490, 554; 1467-77, 102, 171, 207) but possibly another important point in his career is that after he received rebels into the King’s grace on 25 April 1470, Edward became closer to him.

John, Lord Denham, was also another frequent Garter nominee throughout Edward IV's reign. He was nominated more than thirty times in eight election sessions: his career started early in Edward's reign he was first the deputy of Lord Hastings as captain of Calais although never himself promoted to this office, he remained the effective resident commander of this major strategic fortress. He later remained loyal to Richard III. He was the head of a family, which owed its entire advancement from the squirearchy to the patronage of Edward IV. His support was of value to Richard III, for his principal estates lay in the far west of England, an area where the king was politically weak. In February 1484 John was appointed to the office of chief steward of the Duchy of Cornwall, although apparently superseded in this position by another Garter nominee of Richard III's time Sir James Tyrell in August 1484.<sup>151</sup>

William Herbert, 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Pembroke and later Earl of Huntingdon, was also an occasional nominee. The reason for his nomination may be due to the fact that Edward's concern in Wales and the Marches was in the assertion of political control. Somewhere around 1471, Edward turned to the youthful William Herbert. He was soon allowed on 27 August 1471, "to enter upon the offices of justiciar and chamberlain of South Wales, and a series of other offices in Wales and the Marches, which had been granted in tail male to his father in 1466". Four years later he was first nominated to the Order by Lord Ferrers. The office of justiciar in North Wales was so important that it was later given on 11 September to another young magnate,

---

<sup>151</sup>Ibid. p. 161.

John Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, who was already a member of the Order at the time and whose own landed interests lay in the English border counties.<sup>152</sup>

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N

However after this event Herbert's political influence in South and West Wales gradually declined, and in 1479 William Herbert was even "compelled to surrender his earldom of Pembroke to the prince of Wales, receiving only slender compensation in the title of earl of Huntingdon and a few manors in Somerset and

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid. p. 195.

Dorset”.<sup>153</sup> The Problem in Marcher Lords persisted until the abolition of Marcher privileges by Henry VIII.<sup>154</sup> It is important to note that the nominations of the earl of Pembroke occurred between 1475 and 1477. 1476 was his golden year. He was never ever nominated after 1477. Once he was out of favour or once he was not of great use in politics he was not nominated to the Order again. There is a great parallelism between his political importance and the frequency of his nomination to the Order.

One particular point to note is that one cannot see any Irish noble in none of the nomination lists of the Order of the Garter. The reason is simple and perhaps shows why election to the companionship was highly political:

Late medieval Ireland was if anything even more perennially lawless and disturbed than either Wales or the north of England. Edward IV, however, was one of those few fortunate rulers of England for whom Ireland presented no serious political problems. Immunity from an ‘Irish problem’ was bought at the price of virtual surrender of effective royal control.<sup>155</sup>

It is therefore hardly ever surprising that no any Irish noble was nominated to the ranks of the order though in the previous decades there were examples. There was no any political need to behave otherwise. The Yorkist victory in England led to the overthrow of one of the great Irish families, the Butlers, represented by James, 5<sup>th</sup> earl of Ormond and earl of Wiltshire, who was already a member of the Order of the Garter elected in Henry VI’s time. Earl of Wiltshire with his brothers, John and Thomas was attainted in Edward IV’s first parliament.<sup>156</sup> Thus the ‘Irish problem’ was not reflected in Garter scrutiny lists at any rate, and Irish people were not

---

<sup>153</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 195.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.* p. 198.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.* p. 203.

<sup>156</sup> Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 203.

honoured in the companionship. On the other hand, most or even all the chief governors of Ireland are from among the Garter companionship.<sup>157</sup>

In order to understand the degree of politics played in the Garter elections and nominations in Edward IV's reign, one must also consider the influential men who were excluded from the scrutiny lists in particular periods. The earls of Oxford were among the most loyal to the Henry VI. Perhaps, partly because of their loyalty, the twelfth earl of Oxford,<sup>158</sup> who was regularly nominated to the Order of the Garter during Henry's reign and his eldest son were executed in 1462 for treason.<sup>159</sup> His second son, John de Vere, was allowed to succeed as thirteenth earl, but never nominated by any of the companions. Perhaps with a sense of vengeance he wanted the restoration of Henry VI in 1470, and was in his side when Henry was defeated in 1471, and continued his resistance to Edward IV thereafter, landing in 1473 successively in Essex and at St Michael's Mount in Cornwall. The above instance explains why the last date of an earl of Oxford's nomination is 1460. Thus, the case of Oxford is a good example showing that political considerations rather than chivalric ethos played still the major role in Garter elections and nominations.

Edward IV may well have been aware of the Garter's support to the political alliances or he may be recognized the political fragility of the era because he did not elect any English subjects in his last years. However the constant nominees were also his supporters with the war with France. In 1475, Edward tried to invade France. Richard and Percy and the only other northerner peer John Lord Scope of Bolton

---

<sup>157</sup> one must check *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. F. M. Powicke and E. B. Fryde, (2nd edition 1961) 154-5.

<sup>158</sup> Anstis, pp. 127-28; p. 130; pp. 132-33; pp. 142-3; p. 150; pp. 166-7. note that in some election sessions he was very popular but in some others he was nominated by only few people. He was not chosen.

<sup>159</sup> M. A. Hicks, 'The Last Days of Elizabeth Countess of Oxford', *English Historical Review*, vol. 103, no. 406 (Jan., 1988), p. 76.

nom. Before 22 April 1463 died in 1498 and two other northern gentries William Parr who was elected to the Order in 1472 by unanimous consent and Sir James Harrington whose nomination is discussed below brought soldiers for this invasion. They were also frequent Garter nominees. Thus Edward and prominent men of the North were in a trouble and, Edward may have wanted the support of Northern dukes and gentry accordingly, and also used Garter elections for this purpose. On the other hand, the outbreak of the French war may have also affected the rise in the chivalric ethos of the Order. Sir James Harrington was a good soldier. Consider for example Harrington's nomination table of Sir James:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	3	Sir James Haryngton	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir James Harryngton	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Glouchester	3	Sir James Haryngton	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir James Harington	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir James Harington	2	N
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	3	Sir James Harington	3	X

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	3	Sir James Harington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Harington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	3	Sir James Harington	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir James Harington	3	X

Note that the first nomination of Sir James Harington occurred in 1475 when the war with France broke. By then his popularity substantially increased and he was occasionally nominated by a number of companions in all of the following scrutinies. Each time the votes he received steadily increased. He was however never elected. It is also apparent that he was among the favourites when Richard III took the throne.

However, Edward's second reign was not completely lacking in disputes between the members of the Order. The execution of Clarence is a good example demonstrating that alliances within the Garter companionship were still available. The major events of 1476 were aimed at emphasizing the dynastic solidarity, because there was discussion about that. And the exhuming (in which there were many Garter knights) ceremony did not cure the distrust and suspicion between Edward IV and Clarence. Rumors were that Clarence was waiting for an opportunity to make himself king. On 18 February, Clarence was executed. The responsibility may not have been Richard's (duke of Gloucester) as Clarence was the victim of the queen's envy and her family's greed. It is true that the queen's relations were increasingly influential at court, had played a prominent role in the wedding of the King's younger son Richard

and Anne Mowbray, and had helped to ensure the return of a docile parliament. The queen herself, however, was not an active or influential political figure at court. If she spoke with the king, it is likely to have been on the promoting of her brother Earl Rivers or her eldest son the Marquis of Dorset, who had been much favoured by Edward since 1475. Of these two, Dorset gained from Clarence's fall for he was granted, only the day after Clarence's execution. He was to grow in influence over the remaining years of Edward's reign. Rather than to point to the Woodvilles in general or the queen in particular, it might be more fruitful to think of Dorset causing the Clarence's death. Thus since most of the above names are Garter Knights Collins argument about the recovery of the Order from political factions in Edward IV's reign is not plausible.

Lord Scrope was nominated by Lord Stanley, the tenant of Richard of Gloucester. The relationship is clear: after the death of fifth Lord Scrope of Masham and Upshall, Elizabeth Scrope entered her adolescent son Thomas in the service of Richard of Gloucester in January 1476.<sup>160</sup> Elizabeth made another contract with Richard in which she stated that she would pay Gloucester two hundred marks for each year. In return, the duke of Gloucester as the powerful warden of the West marches towards Scotland promised to protect her son's inheritance.<sup>161</sup> Richard (possibly Richard instead of Edward or both) not only protected the minor's inheritance. Garter companionship may have played some role in this circumstance. Also consider that Scrope family was in the loyal service of the crown for a long time.

---

<sup>160</sup> Attreed, 'An Indenture between Richard Duke of Gloucester, p. 1018.

<sup>161</sup> Attreed, p. 1019



Scopes had held land in England since the time of Edward the Confessor. The two branches, Bolton and Masham, emerged in the fourteenth century, and both contributed a large number of the realm's justices, exchequer officials, soldiers and ambassadors. Henry the third Lord Scrope of Masham momentarily treasured the family's position by an act of treason in 1415 (chronicled in Shakespeare's Henry V), but this brother John redeemed Scrope Honor when he inherited the title. John enjoyed a long career in service of the Lancastrian monarchy. The fourth lord Scrope acted in humble capacities as commissioner to raise loans in Yorkshire and in more exalted positions as council member, as ambassador to Pope Martin V, Alfonso V of Aragon, and Sigismund king of the Romans, and as Lord Treasurer of England".<sup>162</sup>

Similarly, John Scrope was also acting in peace treaties with France during the 1440s and died in 1455. Note however that not he but his relative was the member of the Order. So the diplomatic function of the order is dubious. That is to say, prominent men were acting in diplomatic functions not because they were the members of the order but because they were prominent men. Additionally, one can safely claim that being a relative of a member of the Order may bring him some advantages on the courtly cycles as was the case for John. His eldest sons died in childhood, so the title passed to Thomas, who was sent to Richard's protection by Elizabeth.<sup>163</sup>

The reasons for the nomination of Sir John Parr and Sir John Huddleston are also clear; both were loyal to the Earl of Warwick at the beginning of Edward IV's reign and they continued to be loyal to Edward in his supremacy. Sir John Parr was appointed keeper of the privy wardrobe by the Yorkist government in 1460 and joined the commission of array against the Lancastrians again in 1460. Accordingly he was first made squire of the body and then regularly nominated to the Order with his brother Thomas. His loyalty was so clear that he went into exile with Edward and

---

<sup>162</sup> Attreed, p. 1019.

<sup>163</sup> Attreed, p. 1020.

was knighted at Tewkesbury.<sup>164</sup> His reward was election to the Order of the Garter in Edward's second reign.

However, Sir John Huddleston retained his loyalty to the Earl of Warwick and accordingly he was never nominated in Edward's second reign. It is probable that he was with the Nevilles at Blore Heath since he received a pardon for his treason from the Lancastrians in December 1459. Accordingly he received a number of offices and land grants when Warwick was in power in the first half of Edward's first reign. At that time he was occasionally nominated to the Order. However, since he continued to be loyal to Warwick, he was clearly disfavoured in Edward's second reign.<sup>165</sup>

The election of John de la Pole Duke of Suffolk son of William de la Pole who once dominated the Garter elections in Henry VI's time shows that the elections to the Order were also used by the crown for a more specific purpose: to pull the politically inactive person into the political scene. Or at least the sole political aim of the king by choosing a man of influence (not necessarily political influence in John de la Pole's case the influence is because of his family name) to the rank may be valid. Although he came from a family, which was already active in politics, it appears that he did not deal with politics very much although there is evidence that he had some Yorkist sympathies from his youth.<sup>166</sup> John de la Pole was born on 27 September 1442, the son of Alice Chaucer, granddaughter of the poet.<sup>167</sup> However

---

<sup>164</sup> Storey, *End of the House of Lancaster*, p. 123; CPR., 1452-61, pp. 624, 651-652; Wedwood, *Biographies*, pp. 661-2.

<sup>165</sup> CPR. 1452-61, pp. 527, 631, 651-652 and 1461-67, pp. 66, 87, 154, 358, et passim; Wedgwood, *Biographies*, pp. 477-478. Patricia Jalland, 'The Influence of the Aristocracy on Shire Elections in the North of England, 1450-70', *Speculum* Vol, 47, no. 3 (Jul., 1972), 483-507. p. 496.

<sup>166</sup> J. A. F. Thomson, 'John de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk', *Speculum*, vol. 54, issue 3 (Jul. 1979), p. 528.

<sup>167</sup> Thomson, 'John de la Pole', p. 528.

his marriage may have some political implications designed by his father. John de la Pole married Margaret Beaufort, heiress to the duke of Somerset. The marriage was solemnized, and a papal dispensation was obtained from the two child partners to remain married despite their consanguinity. After the death of the powerful duke, other court figures supplanted the Suffolk hold on the Beaufort inheritance and in 1453, the marriage was dissolved, and the guardianship and marriage of Lady Margaret, with the custody of her father's lands, were granted on 34 March to Edmund, earl of Richmond, and Jasper Earl of Pembroke.<sup>168</sup> The person who arranged the marriage was Richard duke of York, and the dowager duchess Alice in February 1458.<sup>169</sup> Other Garter companions also intervened to this marriage agreement including William Hastings, Walter Devereux and Walter Blount. Apparently they were all known important followers of York.<sup>170</sup> In 1459, it is suggested in one chronicle that when the Yorkist lords were attainted, Duke John was degraded to the rank of earl because of his marriage to Elizabeth, but Thomson claims that this was not supported in other sources.<sup>171</sup> Possibly because of the political prominence of his family and their local influence on the area, John de la Pole at the age of not even fifteen was appointed “with Sir John Lovell to go with the sheriff of Oxfordshire and Berkshire and a posse of the county against persons guilty of congregations and unlawful gatherings against the king”, and was again appointed to the commission of peace in 1460 in Norfolk and Suffolk. On the other hand, Thompson suggested there might be some political reason for his not being

---

<sup>168</sup> Thompson, John de la Pole, pp. 528-9.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid. p. 529.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid. p. 529.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid. p. 529.

reappointed to that of Norfolk for the same year.<sup>172</sup> Although in his childhood his decisions may have been shaped by his mother, in 1461 Suffolk probably connected himself more certainly to the Yorkist side though he was not actively involved in the politics.<sup>173</sup> In the disputes between the Nevilles and Woodvilles, he does not seem to have played a significant political role additionally throughout his career he played only a small part in military matters he served to the crown rather to judicial matters.<sup>174</sup> It is also important to emphasize that unlike some major court magnates, he was not appointed to the commission of peace elsewhere.<sup>175</sup> During the struggles between Edward IV and Warwick between 1469 and 1471 again he seems to have been neutral. After Edward returned to London from captivity in 1469 Suffolk rode with him.<sup>176</sup> After Edward's flight and redeption, of Henry VI, he rapidly agreed with the new government although he may not be completely happy with the new government.<sup>177</sup> After Edward took back the throne, John de la Pole received from him both favors and responsibilities similar to those which he had had before the king's exile.<sup>178</sup> Thus, Edward liked him for a long time. Although he was not political, Edward may have chosen him to the Order for this reason. Unfortunately the nomination list of his election is missing, but we know he was elected by 1472.<sup>179</sup> But the people he nominated are known. Possibly we will see that he nominated in accordance with court.<sup>180</sup> In the reign of Richard III, he lost his post as constable of

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid. p. 530.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid. p. 530.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid. p. 532.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid. p. 533.

<sup>176</sup> Ibid. p. 533.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid. p. 533.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid. p. 534.

<sup>179</sup> E. H. Fellowes, *The Knights of the Garter, 1348-1939* (London, 1939), p. 5 cited in J. A. F. Thomson, 'John de la Pole', p. 535.

<sup>180</sup> He nominated his own son Earl of Lincoln! Anstis, pp. 217-20.

Wallingford and steward of the Chitern Hundreds to his former ward Francis Viscount Lovell (who was becoming popular and influential he has been nominated by many names) and he did not regret this states Thomson this may be true because John nominated lord Lovell in 1483.<sup>181</sup> John de la Pole Duke of Suffolk is available in three nomination lists and he nominated the following names: Duke of Brittany, mMarquisDorset, earl of Westmorland, Lord Awdley, Lord Stanley Lord Grey, Sir Thomas Burgh, Sir Thomas Montgomery, Sir Ralph Hastings.<sup>182</sup> The King of Spain, King of Hungary, Duke of Ferrera, Lord Grey Lord Denham Lord Wells, Sir Ed. Woodville, Sir Thomas Burgh, Sir William Stanley.<sup>183</sup> King of Portugal, duke of Austria, Earl of Lincoln, Lord Lovell, Lord Stanley, Lord Gr. Codenore, Sir Richard Thunstall, Sir Henry Wentworth (who is only nominated by him), Sir James Tyrell.<sup>184</sup> Note that he nominated Sir Thomas Burgh twice. Sir Henry Wentworth<sup>185</sup> was only nominated by him. He nominated his own son, and he expectedly nominated his ward Lord Lovell. Apart from these his nomination pattern is not different from the general tendency which may be because of the fact that he was not interested in politics.

The old Neville supporters usually became Edward IV's supporters and accordingly continued to be nominated to the Order. For example Sir Thomas Harrington and Sir James Strangeways were the most outstanding of the three

---

<sup>181</sup> Anstis, pp. 217-20; Thomson, John de la Pole, p. 536. If Thomson would bother to see the Register before writing his article he would see this! His father William de la Pole also nominated Lord Lovell, possibly the father of this one. Anstis, pp. 127-8; p. 130. Many names, who were opposing Duke of York nominated lord Lovell so the father Lovell may be clause to anti-Yorkist camp.

<sup>182</sup> Anstis, p. 195.

<sup>183</sup> Anstis, p. 206.

<sup>184</sup> Anstis, p. 217.

<sup>185</sup> M. J. Tucker, 'The Ladies in Skelton's 'Garland of Laurel'', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 4. (Winter, 1969), pp. 333-345. Henry Wentworth left his native East Anglia permanently. P. 345. Anne Say and Henry Wentworth married. They have a daughter Margery Wentworth who is the Countess of Surrey's niece. P. 336. this is the only think I would be able to find.

Neville supporters. The most striking point about Sir Thomas Harrington is that he was associated with Nevilles by birth, for his mother was the daughter of Sir Robert Neville of Hornby. It is also probable that he had close personal relationship with the earl of Salisbury, and he was one of his retainers. The roots of this association probably goes back to 1442 when Harrington became the Salisbury's deputy steward for a small village within the boundary of the duchy of Lancaster. This tie was also supported when Harrington held another office in the duchy in 1450 when Salisbury was chief steward. Also consider that:

There is little doubt that both branches of the Harrington family had become ardent supporters by the late 1450's especially as one of the older branch of the family married Warwick's sister. And in November 1458, Salisbury sent for Sir Thomas Harrington to take part in a Yorkist conference at Middleham castle, presumably to prepare for hostilities. When Harrington made his will shortly after this, the supervisors were Salisbury's wife and son –another indication of Harrington's attachment to the earl. He fought in Salisbury's force at the battle of Blore Heath and pursued the Lancastrians afterwards only to be captured next day.<sup>186</sup>

Thus, there is nothing unusual about his attainder by the Coventry parliament and after a brief restoration of his offices in 1460. He did not change sides and his end was soon as he was killed at Wakefield with York, Salisbury and his son John. He was active in state offices in York's protectorate as he became sheriff of Yorkshire during York's second protectorate. It is possible to claim that his office was ranted to him in consequence of his political support to York as he was accordingly removed from the bench in 1459 during the Lancastrian ascendancy. He was restored to the bench and appointed to several Yorkist commissions for maintenance of the order on the return of the Yorkists in 1460. The family's support

---

<sup>186</sup> Jalland, *The Influence of the Aristocracy*, pp. 490-1.

of the Yorkist side continued in Edward IV's time and they were accordingly rewarded in the Garter nomination lists.

Although Thomas Mountford was a Warwick retainer from the beginning to the end of his career, Garter nomination may have gained him at least a limited degree of court influence. Because we know that he later came to be connected to Richard as he acted as guarantor of arbitration by Gloucester and was rewarded with an annuity by Richard after he became king. Moreover his kinsman John was one of the duke's chaplains.<sup>187</sup> The same possibility also applies to the family of Tunstalls. Although they were not nominated to the Order before Richard III's scrutiny, Thomas and Richard were the two Tunstalls who were nominated most in the scrutiny of 1483. Richard profited from the services of the Tunstalls also formerly associated to Warwick. We know that at least by the autumn of 1471 Tunstalls were directly connected to Richard. His two brothers, Richard and William, followed him into Gloucester's service.<sup>188</sup>

Clifford's<sup>189</sup> lands were given to Richard and Thomas Stanley.<sup>190</sup> The remaining land had come to Clarence by the forfeiture of Thomas lord Roos.<sup>191</sup> Fitzwilliam's brothers-in-law also had connections with the duke.<sup>192</sup> The family of Parr was also close to the Richard through royal service. In fact their royal service goes back to their old Neville ties. The support of the Parr family was important in

---

<sup>187</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 28-30.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.* p. 50.

<sup>189</sup> Note that lord Clifford was nominated in Henry VI's time by Lord Scales Anstis, pp. 127-8; Earl of Shrewsbury and Lord Scales, Sir John Fastolf Anstis, pp. 130; John Fastolf, Anstis, pp. 132-3; Duke of Sommerset, Sir John Beauchamp, Lord Scales Anstis, p. 141; Viscount Bouchier, Lord Beauchamp p. 150;

<sup>190</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 55.

<sup>191</sup> Note that Lord Roos was nominated in Henry VI's time, by Earl of Salisbuy, Anstis, p. 130; Viscount Bouchier, Anstis, p. 150; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 57.

<sup>192</sup> Sir Henry Wentforth is nominated by Duke of Suffolk in Richard III's scrutiny, Anstis, pp. 217-20; Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 60.

his quest over the superiority against Westmorland.<sup>193</sup> Edward may have thought to balance the power of Richard in the north by choosing Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland to the order.<sup>194</sup>

Indeed Garter history in Edward IV's period is clearly divided into two intervals. It is important to note that close people to Edward affected both nominations and elections to the Order in both periods. The first part is marked by Warwick's dominance and the second part was usually shaped by Woodville. Especially in the first half of Edward's first reign almost all of the elected knights were installed to the Order with Richard Neville's consent. Although there is only one available scrutiny list for Edward's first reign, one can clearly conclude that all of the elected knights were somehow either associated to the Nevilles or it was probably in the Kingmaker's best interest to elect them to the Order. While Edward may have tried to take the control of Garter elections in his second reign, it is doubtful whether he entirely achieved in his goal. Woodville influence on the nominations was enormous. In all the nominations lists (without exception) Woodville associates appeared frequently. Moreover, they were nominated by almost all of the companions who participated in the election sessions in question. On the other hand, Edward's old friends, his councilors and notable northern gentlemen were regularly nominated and occasionally elected to the Order. In this respect Edward's preference to the Order was limited to his old friends. This fact is in accordance with the view that in his later years Edward was reluctant to create new members of the nobility. The other important element in Garter nominations is the nominations and elections of Northerner subjects. This is in accordance with Edward

---

<sup>193</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 60-1

<sup>194</sup> For a discussion see: *Ibid.*, pp. 60-2.



intentions of dealing with the so-called Northern question. Marriage connections of noble subjects with the royal household may have also played a role in at least the nominations of some individuals to the Order.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

Interest to the history of the Order of the Garter had never been lacking among antiquarians. The chronology of the Order's main events, and the complete list of the members of the Order had been the primary concern of the works of seventeenth, eighteen and nineteenth century scholars such as Elias Ashmole, John Anstis, George Frederick Beltz. The second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century were more concerned with the main history of the Garter by constructing its chronological events. For example, Sir Nicolas Harris Nicolas in 1842 in his work *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire* dealt with the Order's inner history.<sup>1</sup> Again In 1944, E. H. Fellowes wrote a brief account of British chivalry in *The Military Knights of Windsor, 1352-1944* with some special reference to the Order. Nevertheless, the last decade saw a switch in the subject matter of the studies of the history of the Order. Modern historians are concerned with more specific events such as the contemporary attitudes towards the Order, the diplomatic role of the Garter, and the politics behind the elections of the knights.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Sir N. H. Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire* (4 vols.; London, 1842).

<sup>2</sup> Hugh E. L. Collins, *The Order of the Garter, 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Ben Daw, 'Elections to the Order of the Garter in the reign of Edward IV, 1461-83', *Medieval Prosopography: History and*

This study aimed first at solving the problem of the discrepancy between the extant primary sources and then reconstructing the politics behind the nominations of individual knights by individual knight companions whether they were elected to the order or not.

The main problem in reconstructing the Order's history is the twofold nature of the Order's own primary sources. As it is already discussed in this study, there are two existing versions of the registers (The *Liber Niger* and the *MS Ashmole 1128*, the so-called *French Register*) and the ultimate challenge is to choose the correct information whenever these two registers disagree in any specific information they provide. This is a matter of concern not only of the textual history of these two manuscripts but of the Order's own history as well. In some other respects, the discrepancies in the scrutiny lists between these two versions are also important because the scrutiny lists are indispensable sources for reconstructing the so-called noble alliances of the late medieval England. Unfortunately these two versions are not always in agreement. For instance, in some critical instances it is impossible to identify the correct nominee at any rate and in one particular instance the nominator. There are also a number of discrepancies of various types such as discrepancies in the dates of the sessions, lists of the companions who are present or absent in a particular session and the particular texts attached to a particular session.

In some other respects the MS Ashmole 1128 gives some further information, particular records mostly related to the installations and elections of the new knights,

---

*Collective Biography*, 19 (1998), 187-213; Anne F. Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs, "Chevalerie...in som partie is worthi forto be comendid, and in some part to ben amendid": Chivalry and the Yorkist Kings', in *St. George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, ed Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Windsor, 2001), pp. 107-33; Diana Dunn, 'Margaret of Anjou, Chivalry and the Order of the Garter', in *St George's Chapel, Windsor in the Late Middle Ages*, ed by Richmond and Scarff, pp.39-56.

dates of the sessions, introduction of the new statutes, and other textual variations related to some specific but otherwise important details. Those miscellanea of information are completely lacking in the *Liber Niger*. Those discrepancies suggest that these two registers are probably two versions of the same register and *Liber Niger* is ultimately based on the original French Register. The overall evaluation of the discrepancies between these two surviving registers suggest that the MS Ashmole 1128, which is a copy of an older French Register is a much more original source and the information it contains is thus usually much more correct. Accordingly, this study suggests that the MS Ashmole 1128 must be the priority of the future Garter historians. It is highly interesting to note that although in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries both Ashmole and Anstis were regularly referring to this old French Register in their works, most of the modern Garter historians are amazingly silent about them.

Although probable causes of the elections of specific members to the fraternity have been in constant consideration by the historians, the politics behind the nominations of particular knights to the companionship have not been previously discussed in detail. As this study suggested, the political considerations of the noble factions played the major role in the nominations and elections of various candidates to the companionship. Henry VI's 'tractability, which allowed the process of law to be manipulated by and in favour of the ruling clique at court'<sup>3</sup> had similar impact on Garter nominations and elections. Court had probably manipulated the elections and nominations. Accordingly, in Henry VI's time, the Garter nominations lists have been directly affected from the switch in the political power from the previous

---

<sup>3</sup> Payling, *The Ampthill Dispute*, p. 881.

political group to the members of those new nobility who dominated the court politics under the leadership of William de la Pole Earl of Suffolk. Accordingly, we see, Sir James Lord Saye, his brother and Roger Fiennes, Sir Thomas Stanley, Sir Ralph Butler, later lord Sudeley, John Sutton later Lord Dudley, John, lord Beaumont who have been all known adherents of this new political side have been constantly (some of them unanimously) nominated to the Order by various members. This constant repetition of some names also showed that the Garter companionship was already under the political pressure of this new focus of power. Though membership to the order was closed to the prelates, if a religious man helped to a political faction, his help was not unrewarded: The kinsmen of Cardinal Beauford who were also politically significant (perhaps the key figure) in this transfer of power were also regularly nominated to the Garter. Thus we see Richard Neville, earl of Salisbury and Edmund Beaufort, earl of Dorset to be nominated and elected. Other significant political figures include, Gruffyd ap Nicholas<sup>4</sup> a deputy for royal justiciars and marcher lords, In south Wales, and Hungerfords, whose political support was always important were not neglected.

Although political considerations of the kings were of primary importance, proven military success and the reward of heroic achievement in the wars were not completely neglected: In accordance with the main aim of the foundation of the Order, important war commanders were again constantly nominated (if not all of them elected) to the Order. They include Sir Thomas Kiriell, Sir John Popham, Sir

---

<sup>4</sup> Possibly he is the father of: Ralph A. Griffiths, *Sir Rhys ap Thomas His Family: A Study in the Wars of the Roses and Early Tudor Politics*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1993), A book Review is available in *Medieval Prosopography* 1995 16/1, pp. 125-32. by Compton Reeves.: The fortune of Rhys up Thomas's family "were a touchstone of political, dynastic, and social developments in England and Wales during the Wars of the Roses and the Tudor century that followed". Ralph A. Griffiths, *Sir Rhys ap Thomas His Family: A Study in the Wars of the Roses and Early Tudor Politics*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1993), p. ix.

John Wenlock, and Sir Henry Norbury. Nevertheless it is also important to note that the nomination of these successful war leaders occurred in the later years of Henry VI's reigns where some of the above mentioned political figures were already elected to the fraternity.

Excluding the material mistakes, and the missing parts of the 'Black Book', from scrutinies, one can follow prominent men's current political popularity, and their possible alliances with respect to the changing political situations. In the latter part of the reign of Henry VI disputes between rivals for political influence led to alienating individual magnates and gentry from Lancastrian regime. This is true for the very latter part of his reign but not so clear in 1445-50. This was partly due to the fact that Suffolk was fairly capable of asserting royal power so necessary to the restraint of political conflict. He and his followers dominated the Garter nominations. After him, the political polarization between the rival factions is even clearer both in political climax and in the Garter nominations. But there are some popular names who are nominated repetitively in almost each session by the members of both parties. There were certainly some knights were nominated to the companionship just because of their chivalric qualities. Thus a chivalric ideal not dependent on political situation was still alive. On the other hand, one must not confuse it with the fact that some of the people who were nominated by both parties were also possibly the people who regularly changed sides. Unfortunately it is difficult to trace the political alliance of York by investigating the scrutinies alone because only one scrutiny list survived from his political dominance and it usually lacks to give further clue.

Being a member of the Order of the Garter did not prevent rival groups to take sides and make severe political conflict with each other. Consider for example the cases of in 21 November 1453, and Richard Duke of York and against Edmund

Beauford. It was even striking to observe that a conflict between a genuine member of the Order (Sir John Fastolf) and a frequent nominee, but never acquiring the membership of the companionship (Hull) occurred without considering the honour of the fraternity. Even more striking is the fact that it was Hull who ultimately won the battle but not a companion.

The political dynamics of the Wars of the Roses are apparent in the scrutinies though it was by no means the sole factor affecting the nomination choices of the companions. The older ethical values of the courtly love, the chivalric ethos of the high middle ages, and various romantic delineations of chivalric ideals, are replaced by the fifteenth century understanding of loyalty which is mostly situational and of noble valor which is mostly attributed in accordance of one's political valor in the eyes of the attributer. Here we encounter with a form of alienation: alienation from others through loyalty to an individual lord, and alienation from that particular lord by means of establishing new forms of alliances with others who were initial enemies.

If "Garter [was] a reflection of the personal favour of the King"<sup>5</sup>, then, any member's presentment of any knight to the Order of the Garter may well be in some occasions a reflection of the personal favour of that particular knight-companion to that particular knight. Thus, apart from international knights whose nominations are mostly political and in some cases traditional (the case of the kings of Portugal), Family relations played major role in Garter scrutinies. Give examples. Personal servants were also nominated. The case of Sir William Mountford of Beauchamp affinity.

---

<sup>5</sup> Daw, p. 212.

Important soldiers such as Kyriell as well as “warrior councilors” such as Popham were also nominated, for example. Others were influential court members. Therefore the following thesis cannot be sustained: “whilst the institutional state was to become increasingly confused during the last fifteen years of Henry VI’s rule, a period extending roughly from Suffolk’s rise to power in the mid-1440s until the ‘Yorkist’ chapter of September 1460, this did not herald a permanent change in the tone of the institution. Henry’s weakness as a king and his failure to appreciate fully the value of the order may well have led to the misapplication of the Garter’s patronal role but it did not preclude completely the election of the experienced soldiers; moreover, the period of actual crisis, which was only really reached in the late 1450’s, was far too brief to have caused lasting damage to the fabric of the society. Following the accession of Edward IV, the Garter returned rapidly to its traditional style of usage in monarchical policy to the nobility, with knightly endeavor, social exclusivity and political experience accommodated in equal measure in the investiture of companion knights.”<sup>6</sup>

Garter nomination lists support the view that northerners were also important in Edward’s dealing with the nobility. The household provided a focus, and a source of strength, for men whose primary function was still to act for the crown at local level. In his use of the household, Edward was aware of the power of regionalism in medieval society, but he was at the same time in need of not fragmenting his own central authority. By taking local gentry into his own royal household, and by further enhancing their power, Edward was using the power of influential local gentry (the very core of regionalism) to his own ends. The political ultimate aim, which resulted

---

<sup>6</sup> Collins, p. 284.



was Edward's answer to that perennial problem of medieval monarchy: what constituted the proper balance of central and local forces. It was a question with no single answer, but Edward's approach had its own merits.<sup>7</sup> This is the whole pattern behind the Garter nominations in Edward IV's time. One further addition may be that some of the Garter knights (who were of course men of Edward IV) collaborated with Edward by nominating them. Or perhaps Edward held the total control of the nominations. Or perhaps these nominees had further influence of the king on close friends.

---

<sup>7</sup> Horrox, *Richard III*, pp. 268-9.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources:

Amundesham, J., *Annales Monasterii S. Albani*, ed. H.T. Riley (2 vols. London, 1870-1).

*A Northern Chronicle, in English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1913), 279-91.

*Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*, ed. J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall, (3 vols. London, 1868).

*Calendars of Patent Rolls, Edward IV, 1467-77, Edward IV-Edward V-Richard III, 1476-85* (1899, 1901).

Capgrave, J., *The Chronicle of England*, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858).

Chastellain, G., *Oeuvres*, ed. Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove (8 vols. Brussels, 1863-5).

*Chronicles of London*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (1905, repr. Gloucester, 1977).

Commynes, *Memorires: The Reign of Louis XI 1461-83*, trans. M. Jones (London, 1972).

*Dispatches with Related Documents of Milanese Ambassadors in France and Burgundy, 1450-83*, ed. P. M. Kendall and Ilardi (2 vols.; Athens, Ohio, 1970-1).

Dugdale, W., *Monasticon Anglicanum* (6 vols. London, 1817-30).

*Feodera, Conventiones, et Literea*, ed. T. Rymer 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. (10 vols. The Hague, 1739-45; repr. 1967).

Gregory, W., *Chronicle. The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. Gairdner (London, 1876).

Hardyng, J., *The Chronicle of John Hardyng, with a Continuation by Richard Grafton*, ed. H. Ellis (London, 1812).

- Hoccleve, T., *Works. The Minor Poems*, ed. F. Furnivall and I. Gollancz (London, 1892, 1925).
- Issues of the Exchequer*, ed. F. Devon (London, 1837).
- Knighton, H., *Chronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby (2 vols. London, 1889-95).
- La Marche, O. de, *Mémoires*, ed. H. Beaune and J. d'Arbaumont (4 vols. Paris, 1883-8).
- Lannoy, G. de, *Oeuvres*, ed. C. Potvin (Louvain, 1878).
- Le Baker, G., *Chronicon*, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889).
- Le Bel, J., *Chronique*, ed. J. Viard and E. Déprez (2 vols. Paris, 1904-5).
- Le Fèvre, J., *Chronique*, ed. F. Morand (2 vols. Paris, 1876-81).
- Leland, J., *De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea* (6 vols.; London, 1774).
- Liber Regie Capelle*, ed. W. Ullman (London, 1961).
- Lydgate, J., *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, ed. H.N. MacCracken (2 vols. Oxford, 1934).
- Otterbourne, T., and Whethamstede, J., *Duo Rerum Anglicarum*, ed. T. Hearne (2 vols.; Oxford, 1732).
- Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England*, ed. N. H. Nicolas (7 vols.; London, 1834-7).
- Rotuli Parliamentorum*, ed. J. Strachey (7 vols.; London, 1783-1832).
- The Boke of Noblesse*, ed. J. G. Nichols (London, 1860).
- The Brut; or The Chronicles of England*, ii, ed. F.W.D. Brie (1971).

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

*The Inventories of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, 1384-1667*, ed. M. F. Bond (Windsor, 1947).

*The Latin Brut, in English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford, 1913).

*The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince: From Contemporary Letters, Diaries and Chronicles, Including Chandos Herald's Life of the Black Prince*, ed. Richard W. Barber, (Rochester, 1997).

*The Lisle Letters*, ed. M. St. Clare Byrne (Chicago, 1988).

*The Manuscripts of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle*, ed. J. N. Dalton (Windsor, 1957).

*The Paston Letters*, ed. J. Gairdner (Gloucester, 1983; repr.1986).

*Thomas Bulfinch, Mythology: The Age of Fable, The age of Chivalry, Legends of Charlemagne* (New York, 1970).

*Political Poems and Songs*, ed. T. Wright (2 vols. London, 1859-61).

*Sir Gwain and the Green Knight*, ed. J.R.R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. rev. N. Davis (Oxford, 1967).

*Six Town Chronicles*, ed. R. Flenev (Oxford, 1911).

Walshingham, T., *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley (3 vols. London, 1867-9).

Waurin, J., *Recueil des Croniques et Anchiennes Istoire de la Grant Bretagne*, ed. W. and E. L. C. P. Hardy (5 vols. London, 1864-91).

*Winner and Waster*, ed. Sir I. Gollancz (Oxford, 1921, repr. Cambridge, 1974).

*Wynere and Wastoure*, ed. S. Trigg (Oxford, 1990).

### **Secondary Sources:**

Acheson, Eric, *A Gentry Community: Leicestershire in the Fifteenth Century, c. 1422 - c. 1485* (Cambridge, 1992).

Alexander, J. J. G., 'Painting and Manuscript Illumination for Royal Patrons in the Later Middle Ages', in V. J. Scattergood and J. W. Sherbourne, eds., *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1983).

Allmand, C. T., *Society at War* (New York, 1973).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War, c. 1300-1450* (Cambridge; New York, 1991).

Anstis, J., *The Register of the Most Noble Order of the Garter ... Called the Black Book* (London, 1724).

Archer, Rowena E., ed., *Crown, Government and People in the Fifteenth Century* (Stroud, 1995).

Armstrong, C. A. J., *England, France and Burgundy in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1983).

Ashmole, E., *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London, 1672).

Aston, Margaret, *The Fifteenth Century: The Prospect of Europe* (New York, 1979).

Barber, R., 'Malory's *Le Morte Darthur* and Court Culture', *Arthurian Literature*, 12 (Cambridge, 1993).

Barber, Richard W., *Edward, Prince of Wales and Aquitaine: A Biography of the Black Prince* (Woodbridge, 1996).

Barnie, J., *War in Medieval English Society* (Ithaca, 1974).

Bean, J. M. W. *From Lord to Patron: Lordship in Late Medieval England* (Philadelphia, 1989).

Begent, P. J., 'A note upon the Practice of Encircling Arms with the Garter', *Coat of Arms*, new ser., 7/144 (1989), 184-99.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Ladies of the Garter', *Coat of Arms*, new ser. 8/145 (1989).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Creation of the Office of Garter King of Arms', *Coat of Arms* new ser. 11/172 (1995), 134-40.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter, 650 years*, (London, 1999).

Beltz, G. F., *Memorials of the Order of the Garter* (London, 1841).

Bennett, Michael J., 'Henry VII and the Northern Rising of 1489', *The English Historical Review*, 105, (1990), 34-59.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Battle of Bosworth* (New York, 1985).

Biddle, M., 'Why is the Bishop of Winchester Prelate of the Garter?', *Winchester Cathedral Record*, 60 (1991), 85-161.

Bond, S., 'The Medieval Constables of Windsor', *English Historical Review*, 82 (1967), 225-49.

Bonney, Margaret: *Lordship and the Urban Community: Durham and its Overlords, 1250-1540* (Cambridge, 1990).

Bornstein, D., 'Military Manuals in Fifteenth-Century England', *Medieval Studies*, 37 (1976), 469-77.

Boulton, D'A. J. D., *The Knights of the Crown. The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520* (Woodbridge, 1987).

Britnell, R. H. and Pollard, A. J., eds., *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society* (Stroud, 1995).

Brown, A. L., 'The King's Councillors in Fifteenth-Century England' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., 19 (1969), 95-118.

Chope, R. P., 'The Last of the Dynhams', *Trans. Devonshire Association*, 1 (1918), 431-92.

Chrimes, S. B., Ross C. D., Griffiths R. A. ed., *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509: Studies in Politics and Society* by and (Stroud, 1997).

Clayton, Dorothy J. and Davies, Richard G. and McNiven, Peter, eds., *Trade, Devotion and Governance: Papers in Later Medieval History* (Stroud, 1994).

- Clough, Cecil, C., 'The Relations between the English and Urbino Courts, 1474-1508', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 14, (1967), 202-18.
- Cokayne, G. E., *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom etc*, revd by V. Gibbs *et al.* (12 vols. in 13, 1910-59).
- Cole, Hubert: *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1973).
- Coles, G. M., 'The Lordship of Middleham, especially in Yorkist and Earl Tudor Times', (unpublished M.A. thesis, Liverpool University, 1961).
- Collins, Hugh E. L., *The Order of the Garter, 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval Europe* (Oxford, New York, 2000).
- Colón, G., Premiers échos de l'Ordre de la Jarretière, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, 81 (1965), 441-53.
- Colvin, M. H., ed., *The History of the King's Works* (2 vols.; London, 1963).
- Coss, P. R., *The Knight in Medieval England 1000-1400* (Stroud, 1993).
- Coward, B., *The Stanleys, Lords Stanley, and Earls of Derby, 1385-1672* (Manchester, 1983).
- Crouch, David and Carpenter, David A. and Coss, Peter, R., 'Debate: Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present*, 131 (1991), 165-303.
- Cuttino, G. P., *English Medieval Diplomacy* (Bloomington, 1985).
- Davies, R. G., and Denton, J. H., eds., *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1981).
- Daw, Ben, 'Elections to the Order of the Garter in the reign of Edward IV, 1461-83', *Medieval Prosopography: History and Collective Biography*, 19, (1998), 187-213.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Order of the Garter in the Reign of Edward IV' (unpub. B. A. thesis, Univ. of Manchester, 1993).

- Desmond, Seward, *The Wars of the Roses: and the Lives of Five Men and Women in the Fifteenth Century* (London 1995).
- Denholm-Young, N., *Seignorial Administration in England* (New York, 1937).
- Devlin, Sister M., 'An English Knight of the Garter in the Spanish Chapel in Florence', *Speculum*, 4 (1929), 270-81.
- Dockray, K., *Richard III: A Source Book* (Stroud, 1997).
- Dugdale, W., *The Baronage of England; or An Historical Account of the Lives and Most Memorable Actions of our English Nobility* (2 vols.; London, 1675).
- Dunham, William Huse, Jr., and Wood, Charles T., 'The Right to Rule in England: Depositions and the Kingdom's Authority, 1327-1485' *American Historical Review*, 81 (1976), 738-61.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Books of Parliament and The Old Record, 1396-1504', *Speculum*, 51, issue 4 (1976), 694-712.
- Dyer, Christopher, 'A Redistribution of Incomes in Fifteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 39 (1968), 11-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Ellis, Steven G., 'A Border Baron and the Tudor State: The Rise and Fall of Lord Dacre of the North', *The Historical Journal*, 35/2. (1992), 253-277.
- Fellowes, E. H., *The Knights of the Garter, 1348-1939* (London, 1939),
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Military Knights of Windsor, 1352-1944* (Windsor, 1944).
- Ferguson, A. B., *The Indian Summer of English Chivalry: Studies in the Decline and Transformation of Chivalric Idealism* (Durham, NC, 1960).
- Fifteenth-Century Attitudes: Perceptions of Society in Late Medieval England* ed. by Rosemary Horrox (Cambridge, 1994).
- Fisher, Canon J. A., 'St George the Martyr', *Report of the Society of the Friends of St George's and the Descendants of the Knights of the Garter*, 4 (1960).
- Fowler, Kenneth, *The King's Lieutenant* (New York, 1969).



Gillespie, J. L., 'Ladies of the Fraternity of St George and of the Society of the Garter', *Albion*, 17 (1985), 259-78.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Richard II's Knights. Chivalry and Patronage', *Journal of Medieval History*, 13, no. 2 (1987), 143-59.

Gillingham, John, *The Wars of the Roses* (Baton Rouge, 1981).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Wars of the Roses: Peace and Conflict in Fifteenth-century England* (London 1990).

Goodman, Anthony, *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1981).

Griffiths, R. A., ed., *Patronage, The Crown and The Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981).

\_\_\_\_\_, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1991).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics: The Percies, the Nevilles, and the Duke of Exeter, 1452-55', *Speculum*, 43, issue 4 (1968), 598-632.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Principality of Wales in the Later Middle Ages I: South Wales, 1277-1536*, (Cardiff, 1972).

Hallam, Elizabeth, ed., *The Wars of the Roses* (London, 1988).

Harriss, Gerald L., 'War and the Emergence of the English Parliament', *Journal of Medieval History*, 2 (1976), 35-56.

Hatcher, J., *Rural Economy and Society in the Duchy of Cornwall* (Cambridge, 1970).

Hicks, M. A., 'The Changing Role of the Wydeviles in Yorkist Politics to 1483', in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, in C. D. Ross (ed.), (Gloucester, 1979), pp.60-86.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Warwick, the Kingmaker* (Malden, 1998).

Holland, P., 'The Lincolnshire Rebellion of March 1470', *English Historical Review*, 103, (1988), 849-69.

Holmes, G. A., *The Good Parliament* (Oxford, 1975).

Holmes, G. A., *The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1957).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Good Parliament* (Oxford, 1975).

Hope, W. St. John, *Architectural History of Windsor Castle*, 2 vols. (London, 1913).

Horrox, Rosemary, *Richard III: A Study in Service* (Cambridge; New York, 1991).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Richard III and the North* (Hull, 1986).

Hutchison, H. F., *The Hollow Crown* (London, 1961).

Ianziti, G., *Humanistic Historiography under the Sforzas. Politics and Propoganda in Fifteenth-Century Milan* (Oxford, 1988).

Jacob, Ernest Fraser, *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485* (Oxford, New York, 1993).

Jefferson, L., 'Ms Arundel 48 and the Earliest Statutes of the Order of the Garter', *English Historical Review*, 109 (1994), 356-85.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Two Fifteenth-Century Manuscripts of the Order of the Garter', in P. Beal and J. Griffiths, eds., *English Manuscript Studies, 110-1700*, (London, 1995), 518-35.

Jewell, H. M., *English Local Administration in the Middle Ages* (Newton Abbot, 1972).

Jones, M. K., 'Sir William Stanley of Holt: Politics and Family Allegiance in the late Fifteenth Century', *Welsh History Review*, 14, 1-22.

Keen, M. H., *The Laws of War in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1965).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Chivalry* (Newhaven, 1984)

\_\_\_\_\_, *English Society in the Later Middle Ages* (Hammondsworth, 1990).

Kendall, Paul. Murray, *Richard III* (New York, 1955).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Warwick the Kingmaker* (London, 1985).

Kingsford, C. L., *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913).

Ladner, G. B., 'Homo Viator: Medieval Ideas on Alienation and Order', *Speculum*, 42, Issue 2 (1967), 233-59.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth-Century England* (London: Hutchinson, 1977).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Crown and Nobility, 1450-1509* (Montreal, 1976).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Government and Community: England, 1450-1509* (Cambridge, 1980).

Lloyd, T. H., *England and the German Hanse, 1157-1611: A study of their Trade and Commercial Diplomacy* (Cambridge, 1991).

Mertes, Kate, *The English Noble Household, 1250-1600* (Oxford, 1988).

Milner, J. D., 'The Order of the Garter in the Reign of Henry VI, 1422-1461', (Unpublished M.A. thesis, Manchester, 1972).

Morgan D. A. L., 'The House of Policy: The Political Role of the Late Plantagenet Household, 1422-1485', in D. Starkey ed., *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London, 1987), pp. 25-70.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The King's Affinity in the Polity of Yorkist England', *Transactions of the Royal Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., 23 (1973), 1-25.

Nicholas, Sir N. H., *History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire* (London, 1842).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Observations on the Institution of the Most Noble Order of the Garter', *Archaeologia*, 31 (1846), 1-163.

Orme, Nicholas, *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1973).

\_\_\_\_\_, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066-1530* (London, 1984).

Ormrod, W. M., *Political Life in Medieval England, 1300-1450* (New York, 1995).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Reign of Edward III: Crown and Political Society in England, 1327-1377* (New Haven, 1990).

Otway-Ruthven, J., *The King's Secretary* (Cambridge, 1939).

Payne, Anne, and Jefferson, Lisa, 'Edward IV: The Garter and the Golden Fleece, *L'ordre de la Toison D'or, de Phillippe le Bon à Phillippe le Beau (1430-1505)*' *Idéal ou reflet d'une société?* ed. Pierre Cockshaw and Christine Van Den Bergenpantens, (Turnhout, 1996).

Pollard, A. J., ed., *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History* (Gloucester, 1984).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Richard Clerveaux of Croft: A North Riding Squire in the Fifteenth Century,' *Yorkshire Archeological Journal*, 50 (1978), 151-69.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Northern retainers of Richard Nevill, Earl of Salisbury,' *Northern History*, (1976 for 1975), 52-69

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Tyranny of Richard III' *Journal of Medieval History*, 3 (1977), 147-65.

\_\_\_\_\_, *North-Eastern England During the Wars of the Roses: Lay Society, War, and Politics, 1450-1500* (Oxford, 1990).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower* (New York, 1991).

Powell, J. E., and Wallis, K., *The House of Lords in the Middle Ages. A History of the English House of Lords to 1540* (London, 1968).

Powicke, Michael R., *Military Obligation in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1962).

Powicke, F. M. and Fryde, E. B., eds., *Handbook of British Chronology* (2nd edition 1961).

- Pugh, T. B., 'Magnates, Knights and Gentry', in *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509*, ed. S. B. Chrimes, C.D. Ross and R. A. Griffiths (Manchester, 1972), 70-85
- Ramsey, Lee C., *Chivalric Romances* (Bloomington, 1983).
- Rawcliffe, C., *The Staffords, Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521* (Cambridge, 1978).
- Reeves, A. C., 'The Congress of Arras.' *History Today*, 22 (1972), 714-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Delights of Life in Fifteenth-Century England* (New Orleans, 1990).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Newport Lordship, 1317-1536* (Ann Arbor, 1979).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Pleasures and Pastimes in Medieval England* (Stroud, 1995).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Purveyors and Purveyance* (Notre Dame, 1983).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Marcher Lords* (Llandybie, 1983).
- Renouard, Y., 'L'Ordre de la Jarretière et l'Étoile: Étude sur la genèse des ordres Laïcs de chevalerie et sur le développement de leur caractère national', *Le Moyen Age*, 55 (1949), 281-300.
- Roney, L., 'Winner and Waster's "Wyse Wordes": Teaching Economics and Nationalism in Fourteenth-Century England', *Speculum*, 69, issue 4 (1994), 1070-1100.
- Rosenthal, Joel T., 'Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage, 1350-1500' *Social Institution and Personal Bond.* *Journal of Medieval History*, 10 (1984), 181-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Nobles and the Noble Life, 1295-1500* (London, 1976).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Patriarchy and Families of Privilege in Fifteenth-Century England* (Philadelphia, 1991).

Roskell, J. S., *Parliament and Politics in Later Medieval England* (3 vols.; London, 1981-3).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments, 1376-1523* (Manchester, 1965).

Ross, C. D., *Edward IV* (London, 1974).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Richard III* (Berkeley, 1992).

Saul, Nigel, ed., *Age of Chivalry* (New York, 1992).

Scattergood, V. J., and Sherborne, J.W., eds., *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1983).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1971).

Selden, J., *Titles of Honor* (London, 1614).

Shahar, Shulamith, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London, 1983).

Shaw, W. A., *The Knights of England. A Complete Record from the Earliest Times to the Present Day of the Knights of all the Orders of Chivalry in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of the Knights Bachelors etc.* (2 vols.; London, 1906).

Smith, C. W., 'Some Trends in the English Royal Chancery, 1377-1483' *Medieval Prosopography*, 6 (1985), 69-94.

St John Hope, W. H., *Heraldry for Craftsmen and Designers* (London, 1913).

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Stall Plates of the knights of the Order of the Garter 1348-1485*, (London, 1901).

Storey, R. L., 'Lincolnshire and the Wars of the Roses', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 14 (1970), 64-82

\_\_\_\_\_, *The End of the House of Lancaster* (London, 1966).

- Theilmann, John, M., 'Political Canonisation and Political Symbolism in Medieval England', *Journal of British Studies*, 29, Issue 3 (1990), 241-66.
- Thomas, D. H., 'The Herberts of Raglan as supporters of the House of York in the second half of the fifteenth century' (University of Wales, Unpublished M.A. thesis, 1967),
- Thomson, John A. F., 'John De la Pole, Duke of Suffolk', *Speculum* 54, Issue 3 (1979), 528-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Towns and Townspeople in the Fifteenth Century* (Gloucester, 1988).
- Tuck, J. Anthony, *Richard III and the English Nobility* (London, 1973).
- Tucker, M. J., 'The Ladies in Skelton's 'Garland of Laurel'', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 22/4. (1969), 333-345.
- Vale, Juliet; Vale, Malcolm, 'Knightly Codes and Piety', *History Today* 37/11 (1987), 12-17.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *War and Chivalry* (Athens, 1981).
- Virgoe, Roger (Ed.): *Private Life in the Fifteenth Century* (New York, 1989).
- Waddington, R. B., 'Elizabeth I and the Order of the Garter' *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24/1 (1993), 254-75.
- Wagner, A. R., *A Catalogue of English Medieval Rolls of Arms* (Oxford, 1950).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Heraldry in England* (London and New York, 1946).
- Ward, Jennifer, *English Noblewomen in the Later Middle Ages* (New York, 1992).
- Waugh, Scott L., *England in the reign of Edward III* (Cambridge; New York, 1991).
- Wedgwood, J. C., *History of the Parliament, 1439-1509, Biographies*, 423-7
- Whiting, B. J., 'The Vows of the Heron', *Speculum*, 20 (1945), 261-78.

Williams, Daniel, ed., *England in the Fifteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 1987).

Wolffe, B. P., *The Royal Demesne in English History* (Athens, 1971).

Wood, Charles T., 'The Deposition of Edward V' *Traditio*, 31 (1975), 247-86.

Wright, S. M., *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century* (Chesterfield, 1983).



**APPENDIX:  
NOMINATIONS TO THE ORDER**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	3	Sir Will. Beauchamp	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	2	Lord Laware	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	2	Lord Clyfford	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	3	Sir Robert Roos	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Boucer	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbrook	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir John Montgomery	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Laware	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	2	Lord Wells	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	2	Lord Foix	1	Y
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Roger Fenys	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	3	Sir James Fenys	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	3	Sir Roger Fenys	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	2	Lord Audley	3	N

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	2	Lord Foix	1	Y
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Scales	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Robert Roos	2	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ro. Hungerford	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Grey Ruff.	3	N
1445	127-28	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1445	127-28	Sir Jo. Beauchamp	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	3	Sir John Holland	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Foix	3	Y
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Audley	2	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Richard Woodvile	2	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	3	Sir John Steward	3	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	2	Lord Dudley	3	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	2	Lord Audley	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1445	127-28	Duke of Exeter	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Audley	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir William Bonevile	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir James Fenys	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Roger Fenys	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1445	127-28	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir James Fenys	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1445	127-28	Lord Wylloughby	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	3	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	2	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Foix	3	Y
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Dudley	2	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1445	127-28	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Foix	1	Y
1445	127-28	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1446	130	Lord Scales	2	Lord Albro	3	Y
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Laware	1	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Albro	3	Y
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir John Beauchamp	1	?
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Roger Fenys	2	N
1446	130	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	3	Y
1446	130	Lord Scales	1	Duke of Warwick	1	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir John Montgomery	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir John Beauchamp	3	?
1446	130	Lord Scales	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1446	130	Lord Scales	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1446	130	Lord Scales	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	1	Y
1446	130	Lord Scales	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1446	130	Lord Scales	3	Sir Rich. Woodvile	3	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Albro	2	Y
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Hoo	3	?
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	1	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Henry Herbert	2	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1446	130	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1446	130	Lord Scales	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	3	Sir Jo. Beachamp	2	Y
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Earl of Devonshire	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1446	130	Lord Scales	2	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Dudley	2	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	3	Sir Andr. Dalmade	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	3	Y
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	King of Portugal	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Earl of Oxford	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	N
1446	130	Marquess Southfolk	2	Lord Audley	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Audley	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Warwick	2	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Albro	2	Y
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Roos	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	3	Y
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Thomas Hoo	1	Y
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Lord Albro	2	Y
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Earl of Arundel	3	N
1446	130	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Earl of Devonshire	2	N
1446	130	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Roger Fenys	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir John Popeham	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	3	William Bonevyle	1	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Devonshire	3	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	2	Visco. Bourghch	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Say	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Robert Roos	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Philip Courtney	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Roger Fenys	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Arundel	3	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Say	2	N
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Rob. Hungerford	1	N
1447	132-33	Lord Sudeley	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Clyfford	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Will. Bonevyle	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	2	Baron Carew	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	3	Sir William Ooldale	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	3	Sir William Bonevyle	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	3	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesnroke	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Popeham	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	3	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	1	Rambrith de Walsey	2	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	1	John De Waynoda	3	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Earl of Devonshire	1	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Earl of Northumb.	2	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	2	Lord Say	3	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Robert Roos	1	N
1447	132-33	Marquess of Southfolk	3	Sir Rich. Woodvile	2	N
1447	132-33	Duke of Buckingham	2	Visc. Bourghch	1	N
1447	132-33	Duke of York	3	Sir Andrew Ogard	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	3	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	3	Sir Richard Haryngton	1	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Devonshire	3	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	142-43	Earl of Shrewsbury	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Earl of Wylshire	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Earl of Northumb.	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Northfolk	1	Y
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	L. Sayntmondes	3	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	3	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	2	N



Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	1	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Cromwell	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Ryvers	2	Y
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	1	Duke of Northfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Norhtfolk	2	Y
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1448	142-43	Lord Sudeley	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	142-43	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Bromiswych	3	Y
1448	141	Lord Scales	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Lord Scales	3	Sir William Odar	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Lord Scales	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Lord Scales	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Lord Scales	2	Lord Ryvers	2	Y
1448	141	Lord Scales	2	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1448	141	Lord Scales	1	Duke of Bromiswych	3	Y
1448	141	Lord Scales	1	King of Poland	2	Y
1448	141	Lord Scales	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Rich Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Robert Odar	2	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Milan	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Will. Moundford	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbrook	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Bromiswych	2	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	3	N
1448	142-43	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1448	142-43	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1448	141	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Clyfford	2	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Bromiswych	2	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Ryvers	3	Y
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	2	Lord Cyfford	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Rich. Haryngton	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Will. Moundford	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Tho. Rempston	1	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Northfolk	3	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Fastolf	1	Duke of Bromiswych	3	Y
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Ryvers	3	Y
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1448	141	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Rich. Haryngdon	3	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	1	King of Aragon	1	Y
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	1	Duke of Bromiswych	3	Y
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Visco. Burghch	1	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	2	Lord Clyfford	2	N
1448	141	Sir John Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	2	Lord Clyfford	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Lord Lovell	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	1	The Emperor	1	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	2	Lord Lovell	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	2	Lord Roos	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	2	Viscount Lyle	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	3	Sir Andrew Oogard	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Viscount Beaumont	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Clyfford	1	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Seyntuland	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	L. Hungerford	1	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Bonevyle	3	N
1453	150	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Ric. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Exeter	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	1	The Emperor	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Lovell	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	2	Viscount Lyle	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Edward Hull	1	Y
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ed. Hungerford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Ro. Schotesbroke	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	E. Of Wylschire	3	N
1453	150	Viscount Boucher	1	Earl of Warwick	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	Y
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	1	Duke of Exeter	1	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Edward Hull	3	Y
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Ric. Haryngton	2	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Thomas Stanley	1	N
1453	150	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	3	N
1453	150	Duke of Somerset	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	2	Lord Montague	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	3	Sir Thomas Haryngton	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	3	Sir John Wenlock	3	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	3	Sir William Oodale	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Grey Ruthin	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir John Neville	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	1	Earl of Arundel	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	3	Sir John Wenlock	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	3	Sir John Neville	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Hungerford	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	2	Lord Fitzwarren	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	1	Earl of Warwick	3	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	3	Sir John Wenlock	3	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	1	Earl of Warwick	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Wells	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	3	Sir Thomas Haryngton	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	3	Sir John Schotesbroke	2	N

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	2	Lord Richmond	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	2	Lord Duras	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	1	Earl of Oxford	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir John Neville	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	3	Sir Thomas Haryngton	2	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	3	Sir Thomas Neville	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	2	Lord Fitzwarren	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	2	Lord Bonevyle	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	2	Lord Grey Ruthin	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Rivers	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	3	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Beauchamp	3	Sir John Wenlock	2	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Bereners	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Grey Ruthyn	2	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	3	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	1	Earl of March	2	N
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Wenlock	1	N
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	2	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Neville	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of March	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Warwick	2	Y
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	3	Sir Thomas Kiriell	2	Y
1460	166-67	Duke of Norfolk	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Lord Dudley	1	Earl of March	1	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	3	Sir Thomas Harrington	3	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	3	Sir John Neville	1	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	2	Lord Grey Ruthin	2	N
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	2	Lord Bonevyle	1	Y
1460	166-67	Viscount Bourghyck	1	Earl of Oxford	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	3	Sir John Wenlock	2	Y
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Fitzwarren	3	N
1460	166-67	Earl of Salisbury	2	Lord Grey Ruthin	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bouchier	1	N
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	3	Sir William Parre	2	Y
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bouchier	1	N
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Awdley	3	N



Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir William Parre	2	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Earl of Essex	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	3	Sir Maurice Berkley	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	2	Lord Dacers of the North	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	1	Duke of Buckingham	3	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	3	Sir Roger Towcots	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Hastings	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Dudley	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	1	King of Portugal	1	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Buckingham	2	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Buckingham	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Mantravers	1	Y
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1472	187-88	Lord Montjoy	3	Sir John Donne	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Clarence	1	Count of Urbin	3	N
1472	187-88	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Parre	1	Y
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	3	Sir James Haryngton	3	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	1	King of Castille Leon	1	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	Y
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	1	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Duras	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	1	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Earl of Northumberland	2	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	1	Count of Urbin	1	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Northumberland	3	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1475	190-91	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir john Huddreston	3	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stourton	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	3	Sir John Parre	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1475	190-91	Lord Ferreys	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1475	190-91	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Roger Towcots	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Marquess of Ferrara	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Dacres of Gillesla	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	1	Marquess of Ferrara	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Dacres of Sussex	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Donne	3	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Earl Douglas	1	Marquess of Ferrara	3	N
1475	190-91	Duke of Buckingham	1	Count of Urbin	2	Y
1475	190-91	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	1	King of Spain	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Humphrey Talbot	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Westmerland	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stourton	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Dakars	3	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir John Parre	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Stourton	2	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	1	The Pr. of England	1	Y
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	1	Marquess Dorset	3	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Duke of Buckingham	1	Duke of York	2	Y
1476	194-96	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Laur. Amsord	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	2	Lord Awdley	2	N

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Dakars	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	1	Duke of York	2	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	1	Duke of York	2	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir John Parre	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	1	Duke of York	2	Y
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	1	Marquess Dorset	3	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Awdley	1	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Greystook	2	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Duras	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Hastings	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Bergaveny	3	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	3	Sir John Parre	2	N
1476	193-94	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of York	3	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	3	Sir john Parre	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	The Pr. Of England	1	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	Duke of York	2	Y
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	193-94	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	193-94	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	193-94	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	3	Sir William Norse	3	N



<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	3	Sir Thomas Bourght	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	2	Lord Grey	2	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Earl of Kent	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	3	Sir John Donne	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Grey	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Dakars	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Kent	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Lord Ferrers	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Lord Duras	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Clarence	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1476	194-96	Duke of York	1	Marquess Dorset	1	Y
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	2	Lord Dakars	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	1	Earl of Westmerland	3	N
1476	194-96	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	1	Marquess Dorset	2	Y
1476	194-96	Duke of Suffolk	1	Earl of Westmerland	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	3	Sir John Midleton	3	N
1476	194-96	Sir William Parre	3	Sir Richard Thunstal	2	N
1476	194-96	Duke of York	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Dacres	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	3	Sir Raph Hastings	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Earl of Pembroke	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	3	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Essex	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	1	Duke of Ferrara	2	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Dacres North	3	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir James Harryngton	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	2	N
1477	196-99	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir James Haryngton	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Denham	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	3	Sir John Doone	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	King of Spain	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	2	Lord Dacres of the South	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Westmerland	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Awdley	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Earl of Norfolk	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Henry Talbot	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Earl of Pembroke	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	1	Duke of Ferrara	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Awdley	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Stanley	3	N

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Y
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1477	196-99	Lord Mautravers	1	Duke of Brittany	1	N
1477	196-99	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Wells	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Sellinger	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Lord Stanley	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	2	Richard Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	2	Richard Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Beauchamp	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Harington	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Richard Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Laur. Raynsford	3	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Jo. Huddelenston	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Dakars	3	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Gloucester	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir William Stanley	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Dakars	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Grey	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Ferrers	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Sellinger	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Beauchamp	3	N
1479	206-7	Sir John Ascheley	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	3	Sir Thomas Sellinger	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Stanely	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Glouchester	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Edward Woodville	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Rivers	2	Lord Grey	1	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Howard	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir John Donne	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Dakars	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Lord Hastings	2	Lord Grey	1	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir William Stanley	2	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	N
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N



Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1479	206-7	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	2	Richard the Queen's son	1	N
1479	206-7	Earl of Essex	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	1	King of Spain	1	Y
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1479	206-7	Marquess Dorset	1	Duke of Ferrara	3	Y
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	2	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Stanley	1	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Denham	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Lovell	1	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	1	Duke of Austria	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Thomas Sellinger	2	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Edward Woodville	1	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	1	Richard the Queen's son	3	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	1	Duke of Brittany	2	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir James Harington	2	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	3	Sir Edward Woodville(?)	3	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	1	King of Hungary	2	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Austria	3	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	2	Richard the Queen's son	1	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	1	Sir Richard Grey	2	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Lovell	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	3	Sir William Stanley	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Dudeley	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	1	Duke of Brittany	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	2	Sir Richard Grey	1	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Wells	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir James Harington	1	N
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Powes	2	N
1482	211-12	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Laurence Raynsford	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Edward Woodville	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Denham	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Sir Richard Grey	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Duke of Britany	3	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Duke of Austria	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1482	211-12	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir James Harington	3	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir John Huddleston	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	1	Duke of Austria	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Dakars	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Denham	1	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	1	Sir Richard Grey	3	N

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	1	King of Portugal	1	Y
1482	211-12	Marquess Dorset	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	1	Duke of Austria	2	N
1482	211-12	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Edward Woodville	3	N
1482	211-12	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Edward Woodville	3	N
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Dakars	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Tyrell	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	3	Sir James Harington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	1	King of Spain	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	1	King of Portugal	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	1	Duke of Austria	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	3	Sir Ralph Hastings	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	1	Earl of Huntington	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	2	Lord Laware	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Ferrers	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir James Tyrell	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	3	Sir James Tyrell	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	1	Duke of Austria	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	1	Earl of Lincoln	2	X

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	1	Earl of Huntington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Dacres North	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Lyell	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Lincoln	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Dudeley	1	Earl of Huntington	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Mautravers	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Scroop	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	3	Sir Laurence Raynsford	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Scroop	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Fytzhugh	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	2	Lord Cobham	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir James Tyrell	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	1	Duke of Austria	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	3	Sir James Tyrell	1	X

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	3	Sir Lawrence Raynsforth	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir John Ascheley	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	2	Lord Gre	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	2	Lord Laware	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Richard Radcliff	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	2	Lord Cobham	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	2	Lord Lyell	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	2	Lord Stanley	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	2	Lord Stanley	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Sir Thomas Montgomery	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Sir William Stanley	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Stanley	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir James Tyrell	3	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Henry Wentworth	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	2	Lord Scroop	2	X

Year	Anstis p	Knight	Rank	Nominee	Order	Elected
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	2	Lord Fytzhugh	3	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	2	Lord Lovell	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir James Harington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Southfolk	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	3	Sir James Harington	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	3	Sir John Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	2	Lord Grey	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Gr. Codenore	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	1	Earl of Huntington	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	1	Earl of Lincoln	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	1	Duke of Austria	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	3	Sir James Tyrell	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Arundel	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Northumberland	2	Lord Strange	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	1	Duke of Austria	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	1	Earl of Lincoln	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	1	Earl of Huntington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	2	Lord Grey	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	3	Sir James Harington	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	3	Sir James Tyrell	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Dacres North	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	3	Sir James Harington	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	1	King of Castille	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	1	King of Portugal	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	1	Duke of Austria	3	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	2	Lord Lyell	1	X
1483	217-20	Lord Scroop	2	Lord Dakars	2	X
1483	217-20	Lord Lovell	2	Lord Stanley	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	3	Sir Richard Thunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Lovell	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	1	Earl of Lincoln	3	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	1	Duke of Austria	2	X
1483	217-20	Duke of Norfolk	1	King of Portugal	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	2	Lord Stanley	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	3	Sir Richard Tunstall	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	3	Sir Thomas Bourgh	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	2	Lord Lyell	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	3	Sir James Harington	3	X

<b>Year</b>	<b>Anstis p</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Nominee</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Elected</b>
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	1	King of Spain	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	1	King of Portugal	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	1	Duke of Austria	3	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Stanley	1	X
1483	217-20	Earl Douglas	2	Lord Lyell	2	X
1483	217-20	Earl of Surrey	2	Lord Grey	3	X