English Heritage Battlefield Report: Stoke Field 1487

Stoke Field (16 June 1487)

Parishes: East Stoke, Elston, Syerston, Flintham

District: Newark & Sherwood, Rushcliffe

County: Nottinghamshire

Grid Ref: SK 742490

Historical Context

The Battle of Bosworth and the death of King Richard III in August 1485 did not signal the end of the Wars of the Roses. The tenure of the new King, Henry VII, remained insecure. Recognising this, Henry, as a means of strengthening his claim to the throne, married the eldest daughter of the first Yorkist King, the late Edward IV. But other Yorkist heirs with pretences to the throne remained. Foremost amongst these was the fifteen year old Edward, Earl of Warwick, son of the ill-fated Earl of Clarence 'drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine'. Although King Henry acted quickly after his accession and placed Warwick in the Tower of London, this did not prevent diehard Yorkists declaring an imposter, Lambert Simnel, King Edward VI in Dublin (24 May 1487).

In June 1487 the Yorkists crossed from Ireland to Lancashire. They carried 'Edward VI' with them but the real leaders of the expedition were the Earl of Lincoln and Lord Lovell. Theirs was a heterogeneous army. Amongst its ranks were not only dissident Englishmen and lightly-armed Irish but some 2,000 German mercenaries, hired by the dowager Duchess of Burgundy, Margaret of York, and headed by an experienced commander, Martin Schwarz.

The local adherents of King Henry VII made only ineffectual efforts to dispute the passage of the rebels through Yorkshire. Even so, Lincoln and Lovell failed to gather as much support in the county as they had hoped. King Henry, meanwhile, advanced from Kenilworth to confront the rebels. Passing through Coventry and Leicester he arrived at Loughborough on 8 June. From there he continued towards Nottingham. On 15 June Henry received firm news of his opponents' movements: they were heading away from him in the direction of Newark. Henry set out in pursuit, encamping the night at Radcliffe before coming up with the rebels the next day near a village called East Stoke, five miles southwest of Newark.

Location and Description of the Battlefield

Stoke battlefield today consists of rolling agricultural land just to the south of the River Trent. Farming is predominantly arable. The small village of East Stoke lies to the north-east, the slightly larger villages of Elston and Syerston to the south-east and south respectively. To the north of the battlefield the ground, which has risen gently to this point from the south, falls away sharply from an average height of 150 feet towards a large meadow created by the meanderings of the Trent. The village of Fiskerton is on the far bank of the river, marking the location of a ford which existed at the time of the battle but which exists no longer.

Landscape Evolution

We are fortunate in possessing information concerning the nature of the ground around East Stoke in the years immediately after the battle. In 1517 enclosure commissioners were appointed to discover the extent to which arable land had been converted to pasture, a phenomenon lately perceived to have been on the increase. Nottinghamshire is one of the counties for which records are extant[1]. For the three parishes of Elston, Stoke and Syerston the commissioners found that since 1489 some 30 acres of arable land had been enclosed. In

relation to what was happening elsewhere 30 acres is an insignificant amount, suggesting that in this locality at least the close proximity to one another of three villages limited the scope for the enclosure of arable land to pasture or parkland.

In a little-changing landscape, the 1796 Enclosure map gives an indication of how the landscape had looked at the time of the battle. The village of East Stoke extended along Church Lane towards St. Oswald's church, which had been built in the 13th and 14th centuries. The remains of the former village survive as earthworks on both sides of the lane, where they are surrounded by the ridge-and-furrow topography of the open fields[2]. Close by stood an almshouse, the Hospital of St. Leonard, which was founded in the early 12th century and not dissolved until 1573. The land extending from the top of the escarpment to the Fosse Way was largely unenclosed, forming arable open fields for the villages of East Stoke, Elston and Syerston. The escarpment and the gulley known as 'Red Gutter' were not wooded but were more open with scrub woodland.

The prominent roads would have been the Fosse Way and, connecting it with the River Trent, Longhedge Lane, Trent Lane and Church Lane. By 1796 there is no evidence as to whether or not the Upper Foss was still in use.

Enclosure by hedges increased in intensity from the late 18th century. The landscape had assumed much of its modern appearance by 1850. Stoke Hall was built close to the church in the late 18th century and with it an area of parkland was created on either side of Church Lane, which included Red Gutter and the escarpment now known as Stoke Wood. Syerston Hall (Listed Grade 2) was also built at this time to the south-west of the battlefield area. The village of East Stoke had shrunk back to Humber Lane by 1887.

The Sources

In common with many other battles from the Wars of the Roses the extent of the source material relating to Stoke 1487 is disappointing. However, amongst the small number of accounts to survive there is one which possesses a certain immediacy. This is credited to an anonymous herald or pursuivant who, it would seem, served during the campaign. His narrative is especially valuable for the movements of Henry's army before the battle. In the extract which follows the English has been modernized.

> And from thence, on the Friday, the King, understanding that his enemies and rebels drew towards Newark ward, passing by Southwell and the far side of the Trent, the king with his host removed thitherwards, and lodged that night beside a village called Ratcliff [i.e. Radcliffe], nine miles out of Newark. That evening there was a great scry, which caused many cowards to flee; but the earl of Oxford and all the nobles in the foreward with him, were soon in a good array and in a fair battle, and so was the King and all the very men that there were. And in this scry I heard of no man of worship that fled but rascals.
>
> On the morn, which was Saturday, the King early arose and heard two masses, whereof the Lord John [i.e. Richard] Fox, Bishop of Exeter, sang the tone. And the King had five good and true men of the village of Ratcliff [Radcliffe], which showed his Grace the best way for to conduct his host to Newark, which knew well the country, and showed where were villages or groves for bushments [ambushes], or straight ways, that the King might conduct his host the better. Of which guides the King gave two to the Earl of Oxford to conduct the foreward, and the remnant retained at his pleasure. And so in good order and array, before nine of the clock, beside a village called Stoke, a large mile out of Newark, his foreward reconnoitred his enemies and rebels, whereby the help of Almighty God, he had the victory. And there was taken the lad that his rebels called King Edward, whose name was indeed Lambert, by a valiant and gentle esquire of the King's house, called Robert Bellingham. And there was slain the Earl of Lincoln, John, and diverse other gentlemen, and the Viscount Lord Lovell put to flight. And there was slain of English, Dutch, and Irishmen 4,000....[4]

Ideally the Herald could have said a lot more about the battle itself. But he does make it clear from which direction King Henry approached the battlefield (which is important), he identifies the Earl of Oxford as the commander of the vanguard, and he supplies detail about casualties (as well as the time when the battle began).

The classic account of the events of the 1487 rebellion has long been held to be that written by Polydore Vergil. Later Tudor chroniclers - Hall and Holinshed - merely paraphrased his words. Vergil first came to England from Italy in 1502; four years later he was asked by Henry VII to compile a history of England. The initial draft of Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, covering events up to 1513, was completed in 1512-13. Whereas Vergil had to cull material for distant history from existing chronicles, for more recent occurrences he could speak to those who had themselves shared in events. He had access to such circles.

The most important thing to note about Vergil's narrative is that, in contrast to the Herald, he has King Henry approaching Stoke battlefield from the north-east rather than the south-west. This discrepancy will be examined below.

The King has marched from Coventry to Nottingham. Here he is joined by 'George Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury, George Lord Strange, and John Cheyney, all outstanding captains, with many others well versed in military affairs':

The Earl of Lincoln meanwhile had entered Yorkshire with the other rebels, proceeding slowly and offering no harm to the local inhabitants, for he hoped some of the people would rally to his side. But when he saw his following was small he resolved none the less to try the fortunes of war, recalling that two years earlier Henry with a small number of soldiers had conquered the great army of King Richard: and although both the Germans and the Irish in the force announced they had come to restore the boy Edward, recently crowned in Ireland, to the kingdom, the Earl (who, as we have shown, was the son of Edward [IV's] sister) planned to seize the throne himself in the event of victory. Thus placing his trust in the fortunes of war, the Earl began to make his way out of Yorkshire towards the town called Newark, situated on the bank of the River Trent, so that, having augmented his troops there, he could march directly on the King. But before he came to this place, King Henry (on the evening of the day preceding the battle) set off to meet the enemy and came to Newark. He did not tarry there for long but marched three miles beyond the town and there encamped for the night. The Earl, having learnt of the King's approach, was by no means alarmed but continued on his chosen way, until the same day he came to a village near the camp of his enemy, a place they call Stoke, where he pitched camp. The following day the King, having formed his whole force into three columns, marched to the village of Stoke, halted before the Earl's camp and, on the level ground there, offered battle. Accepting the chance, the Earl led forward his troops and, at a given signal, gave battle. Both sides fought with the bitterest energy. Those rugged men of the mountains, the Germans, so practised in warfare, were in the forefront of the battle and yielded little to the English in valour; while Martin Schwarz their leader was not inferior to many in his courage and resolution. On the other hand the Irish, though they fought most spiritedly, were nevertheless (in the tradition of their country) unprotected by body armour and, more than the other troops engaged, suffered heavy casualties, their slaughter striking no little terror into the other combatants. For some time the struggle was fought with no advantage to either side, but at last the first line of the King's army (which was alone committed to the fray and sustained the struggle) charged the enemy with such vigour that it at once crushed those of the hostile leaders who were still resisting. Thereupon the remaining enemy troops turned to flight, and while fleeing were either captured or killed. Indeed it was only then, when the battle was over, that it was fully apparent how rash had been the spirit inspiring the enemy soldiers: for of their leaders John Earl of Lincoln, Francis Lord Lovell, Thomas Broughton, the most bold Martin Schwarz and the Irish captain Thomas

> Geraldine were slain in that place, which they took alive in fighting [sic]. Lambert the false boy king was indeed captured, with his mentor Richard [Simons]: but each was granted his life - the innocent lad because he was himself too young to have committed any offence, the tutor because he was a priest. Lambert is still alive to this very day, having been promoted trainer of the King's hawks; before that for some time he was a turnspit and did other menial jobs in the royal kitchen[5].

Polydore Vergil's account tells us that Henry's army approached from Nottingham,passed through Newark and encamped the night before the battle three miles beyond the town. To fight at East Stoke the following day the royal army must therefore have retraced its steps some seven or eight miles. In the past many writers accepted this interpretation and represented the Battle of Stoke as taking place with the forces of the King approaching from the north-east, and the rebels barring their road to the southwest. Other writers, however, lent greater credence to the testimony of the anonymous herald, who has Henry VII's army advancing to battle from the opposite direction, the south-west.

In deciding between the two sources the evidence of the Herald carries greater weight. Both the detail provided by him and the style in which he writes marks him as an eyewitness. Polydore Vergil, on the other hand, despite his scholarly credentials, is only as reliable as his sources of information. It is not just a question of the accuracy of his informants' recollections after twenty years, but of whether Vergil fully understood what they were saying. He was probably ignorant of local geography; this by itself could have led to a misunderstanding. Vergil, for instance, possibly never realised that writing that King Henry's troops camped three miles beyond Newark implied they retraced their steps the next day. He gives no indication that he was aware of it. Perhaps, as suggested by Colonel Burne in his analysis of the battle, Vergil believed that Stoke lay to the north of Newark rather than the south[6].

Vergil also informs us that the royal army was arranged in three divisions; that the Earl of Lincoln, battle having been offered, advanced to the attack; and that only the royal vanguard was engaged. Interestingly, Vergil's view that the vanguard went on to win the battle by itself appears to be shared by the Herald who, it will be recalled, wrote tersely that Henry's 'foreward reconnoitred his enemies and rebels, whereby the help of Almighty God, he had the victory'. The agreement of the evidence on this point is reassuring.

Until recently, Polydore Vergil and the Herald were the only contemporary (or near contemporary) sources cited by writers on the Battle of Stoke. But modern scholars, such as Anthony Goodman and Michael Bennett[7], make greater use of foreign chronicles, for there remained, in the late fifteenth century, considerable Continental interest in English affairs. Many chroniclers commented on the prevailing instability in England. Jean de Molinet's *Chroniques* (c.1490), for example, contains a reasonably detailed description of the Battle of Stoke. Molinet was historiographer to the Burgundian court and sympathetic to the Yorkist cause:

> King Edward, driving his enemies before him, rode through the forest of Nottingham and, without entering into the town, came to Newark where he crossed the river which is very broad, along which he marched through the country around two or three leagues; and, at the end of a meadow, found King Henry's army, near a village named Stoke, and there was the upset.

> King Henry had three battles with two wings. In the rearguard [i.e. vanguard] as leader was the Earl of Oxford, accompanied by Lord Stanley, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Hastings, the son of the Duke of Norfolk [i.e. Suffolk], brother of the Earl of Lincoln, and numerous nobles, great and puissant barons of England. In the right wing of the vanguard, as leader, was Lord Scales, having 2,000 horse and on the left, Sir John Savage with 1,200 horse in all. In the large battle was King Henry in person, accompanied by noble princes and notable knights, 20,000 in number, and then in the rearguard was Lord Strange, leader of 14-15,000.

The battle formation of King Edward, however, was in one mass, amounting to only 8,000 men, the

> which, when it came to the joining in battle of the one side against the other, could not withstand the shooting of the English archers, especially the Germans [i.e. the Irish] who were only half-armed; and, although they displayed great bravery, as much, indeed, as their small number and substance allowed, they were routed and defeated, shot through and full of arrows like hedgehogs. There died the Earl of Lincoln, most noble and renowned in arms, Sir Martin Schwarz, a most enterprising knight and of greatest courage, along with numerous notable people in such great number that of their whole army only 200 escaped; of whom those, in the two days following, who were found to be Irish and English were hanged, and those who were foreigners were dismissed. And King Edward was taken and made a prisoner in the town of Newark, about four leagues from which place King Henry, joyous of his victory, went, without dismounting, to give thanks to Our Lord for his good fortune ... Two days later [Henry] so completely broke up his army that he had in his company no more than 4-5,000 men[8].

Molinet has the Yorkist army marching to Stoke after crossing the Trent at Newark;this accords rather better with what the Herald, as opposed to Polydore Vergil, wrote about the approach to battle, with the royal army advancing from the south-west and the rebels in position to the north-east. Notwithstanding a slip of the pen Molinet confirms that the Earl of Oxford led the vanguard. He then provides useful detail about the formation adopted by Oxford's command, although he does not go as far as to imply that it won the battle by itself. Instead, the royal army's archers are held to have made the decisive contribution.

If one adds up Molinet's figures Henry VII's army totalled in excess of 40,000 men, the largest force fielded in England since Towton 26 years earlier. Although this number appears inflated Molinet's figure for the Yorkist army - 8,000 men - agrees with the official estimate made of the rebel strength in the Act of Attainder passed against the Earl of Lincoln and his adherents after the battle[9].

A further brief account of the Battle of Stoke appears in the *Vita Henrici Septimi* of Bernard Andre, Henry VII's court historian. Like Polydore Vergil, Andre also made use of oral sources. His account was written in about 1500. In Andre's version of events Henry VII has just delivered the speech traditionally expected by chroniclers on these types of occasion:

When he had finished the Earl of Oxford was prepared as before to reply, but because time was
> pressing, the King proclaimed silence, and ordered attention to the exigencies of the time. Rushing headlong, like doves before a black storm, the men grabbed their weapons. And now the royal army approached the mass of barbarians. They were arrayed on the brow of the hill, and were lying in wait for our men. But God, the Lord of Vengeance, avenged their unjustified rage, just as when Constantine struggled against the enemies of the Church, with a sudden whirlwind which rose up while they were fighting. And our men, whom they thought were overcome, in the end defeated them. Then suddenly there rose to the sky the shout 'King Henry', and the blaring of trumpets on all sides filled everyone's ears with gladness[10].

Passing over the convention of divine intervention, which the clash of an anointed King and impious rebels dictates, the most interesting reference is to the Yorkists lying in wait on the brow of a hill. When attempting to reconstruct a battle, writers tend to look for the military crest and this reference justifies their attempt to do so. The elevated ground of the escarpment above the River Trent appears best suited for the purpose, particularly the feature known as Burnham Furlong, a 200 yard flat stretch on the ridge-top. The presence to the rear of the 'Red Gutter', a narrow ravine leading down the escarpment to the river, where traditionally many fleeing rebels were slaughtered after the battle, strengthens the assumption that the Earl of Lincoln was positioned here; as does the proximity of the Burrand Bush monument, near which Henry VII is said to have raised his standard following victory. Polydore Vergil's comment that the royal army offered battle on the level ground before Lincoln's camp need not be read as contradicting the claim. Indeed, the mention of level ground implies that Lincoln's army occupied different terrain - a hill, for instance.

Another contemporary source, the *Great Chronicle of London*, a narrative that only came to light at the turn of this century, gives further details of the Battle of Stoke. The extract, in modernized English, echoes the Herald's observation that the royal cause suffered desertions. No one knew whether or not treachery might undermine Henry VII as it had Richard III.

> [The rebels] held on their journey till they came near unto the foresaid town or village of Stoke, where they were encountered with the King's host, and there followed a sore and sharp fight for the while it endured upon the foresaid 16th day of June. The victory whereof fell unto the King, loved be God, how be it that by subtle ways men were set atween the place of the field and many of the King's subjects which were coming toward his Grace, showing unto them that the King had lost the field and was fled. By such subtle means and report many a true man to the King turned back again, and some men of name for fear rode unto sanctuary, and tarried there till to them was brought better tidings. This field was the sorer fought by reason that forenamed Martin Schwarz was deceived, for when he took this voyage upon him he was comforted and promised by the Earl of Lincoln, that great strength of this land after their landing would have resorted unto the said Earl. But when he was far entered and saw no such resort, then he knew he was deceived, wherefore he said unto the Earl, Sir, now see I well that ye have deceived yourself and also me, but that notwithstanding, all such promise as I made unto my lady the Duchess [of Burgundy], I shall perform, exhorting the Earl to do the same. And upon this sped them toward the field with as good a courage as he had had twenty thousand men more than he had, and there held promise in such wise that he and the Earl both were slain upon the field, with much of their people[11].

The *Great Chronicle* suggests that the rebels displayed reckless courage. The battle was 'sore and sharp' as long as it lasted. Such a verdict does not clash with the usual interpretation put on the events of 16th June 1487, i.e. that the Earl of Oxford's vanguard fought the battle largely by itself, the other two divisions lagging in the rear. For this reason alone the fight was, for a time, evenly contested. Polydore Vergil states that the rebels attacked: it is generally held that Lincoln, seeing the gap between Oxford and the rest of the royal army, hoped to defeat the enemy in detail. And for a while it appeared Lincoln might succeed; hence Andre's comment that, at one point, the rebels thought 'our men' were overcome. The Earl of Oxford, however, a veteran of Barnet and Bosworth, put up stout resistance. Soon the battle was won for King Henry.

The Battle

It remains to decide exactly where, in light of the evidence, the battle lines of the two sides were drawn up. Discounting theories spawned by the belief that Henry VII approached Stoke from the north-east, we are left with the royal army advancing along the Fosse Way from the south-west, Syerston village to their right. The rebels, we know, were already in position. Assuming, therefore, that Lincoln had chosen his ground well, the royal army would have to conform to his dispositions. So where were the Yorkists? According to Molinet they had reached the battlefield from the direction of Newark. Most writers on the battle, however, noting the Herald's reference to the rebels 'passing by Southwell', four miles north of the Trent, have them approaching the battlefield from across the ford at Fiskerton. This gives them a different line of retreat, one which, were any significance to be attached to the tradition of the Red Gutter, makes sense.

Colonel Burne, in his interpretation of the battle, favoured a battle line for the Yorkists stretching south-east between Burnham Furlong and a point to the west of Mill Hill House[12]. They would have occupied a shallow ridge, falling away from the north-west, about 1800 yards long. However, even Burne admits this to be an extended front: 8,000 men in three battles would be spread thinly. Molinet, in contrast, states explicitly that the Yorkists' 'battle formation ... was in one mass', suggesting an altogether more densely-packed formation. In acknowledgement of this, the most recent account of the Battle of Stoke by Michael Bennett places the Yorkists in a phalanx-like formation on Burnham Furlong. When the royal army approached, Bennett continues, 'it

would have made sense for Oxford to lead the vanguard a little way around the escarpment on which Lincoln and the rebels were established. By veering eastwards towards Elston he would open up space for the other battalions of the King's army to be brought into play..', whilst at the same time threatening the rebels' line of retreat to Newark and avoid having the sun in his men's faces[13]. Bennett also favours this reconstruction because it accords with the archaeological evidence noted by Richard Brooke when he visited the battlefield in 1825, to the effect that human bones, coins and other relics had been found in the fields south of East Stoke[14]. Brooke, however, as a proponent of the view that the battle was fought with the royal army approaching from the direction of Newark, was using this evidence to support a different theory.

It appears most likely, therefore, that the Yorkists were congregated on the highest ground locally near Burnham Furlong - the best candidate for 'brow of the hill'. Whether, when Lincoln's men attacked Oxford's vanguard, they did so south in the direction of Syerston or south-eastwards towards Elston is a matter of opinion. For a time the rebels held their own. Eventually, however, they were overborne. That the broken remnants of their army fled northwards towards Fiskerton and the Trent is accounted for entirely by tradition, although Brooke states that 'human bones and other *indicia* of slaughter' have been discovered in the Red Gutter. Lord Lovell, whom the Herald writes 'was put to flight', is said to have escaped by swimming his horse across the Trent. He disappeared thereafter until, in 1708, a body was found walled up in his home at Minster Lovell, which the discoverers considered to have been his.

Indication of Importance

Stoke, not Bosworth, was the last pitched battle of the Wars of the Roses, and therein lies its significance. Victory strengthened the grip of the Tudor dynasty on the crown.

In itself the Battle of Stoke is lifted out of the ordinary by the presence of Schwarz's fairly sizeable contingent of German mercenaries. Polydore Vergil praised their martial prowess. The Germans' participation in the battle, displaying a different style of fighting, adds variety to the study of the art of war as practised in England.

Henry VII did not have a taste for warfare and Stoke was his second and last battle. The Earl of Oxford, a soldier with a good record, bore the brunt of the fighting on his behalf. Among their opponents the Earl of Lincoln had shown promise as a political figure, but he did not get the opportunity to continue his career.

The written sources for the Battle of Stoke are sparse, particularly with regard to the period of actual fighting (as opposed to the battle's preliminaries). However, as the progenitor of modern historical writing in England, Polydore Vergil's account of the battle is of special interest.

Battlefield Area

The battlefield area boundary defines the outer reasonable limit of the battle, taking into account the positions of the combatants at the outset of fighting and the focal area of the battle itself. It does not include areas over which fighting took place subsequent to the main battle. Wherever possible, the boundary has been drawn so that it is easily appreciated on the ground.

From the River Trent in the west the south-western edge of the battlefield area follows the former line of Longhedge Lane to the A46(T). Drawing the battlefield line in this fashion provides room for the Earl of Oxford's division to deploy off the Foss Way a safe distance from the rebels on the hill to the north. It is likely that Oxford's men also approached the rebels along the edge of the Trent Hills to the north (i.e. across the length of Syerston Airfield), but that the vanguard approached along the Fosse Way. Otherwise the Yorkists would have derived no advantage from their position and could not be described by Andre as possessing 'the brow of the hill'. Similarly, it has been assumed that the royal army would wait until clear of Syerston village on its right flank before making its deployment.

The south-eastern boundary to the battlefield follows the line of the Fosse Way into the centre of modern East Stoke. The spring at Willow Rundle, by Elston Lane, where legend has it the Earl of Lincoln was buried, is therefore excluded from the battlefield area[15].

Proceeding north-west from East Stoke along Church Lane, the battlefield area boundary incorporates part of Stoke Hall Park where, in 1825, Sir Robert Bromley, the then occupant, informed Richard Brooke that mass graves had been recently discovered. Thereafter the line of the battlefield area follows the footpath along the foot of the steep slope to rejoin the river. This means that the Red Gutter, focal point of the rout of the rebels, is included in the battlefield area but the extended line of retreat towards Fiskerton Ford, where Lord Lovell, amongst others, is reputed to have either drowned or escaped, is not.

Notes

1. 'The Domesday of Inclosures for Nottinghamshire, from the Returns to the Inclosure Commissioners of 1517, in the Public Record Office' ed. I S Leadam *Thoroton Society Record Series* vol. II (1904) pp43-5.

2. Bishop, M W *The Battle of East Stoke 1487* (Nottingham County Council Planning &Transportation 1987) p15.

3. *Ibid.*

4. Leland, John *Collectanea* ed. Thomas Hearne (London 1770) iv 213-4.

5. *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485-1537* translated by D Hay(Camden Society, 1950) pp23-5.

6. Burne, Lt-Col. A H *More Battlefields of England* (London 1953) p154.

7. Goodman, Anthony *The Wars of the Roses: Military Activity and English Society,1452-97* (London 1981); Bennett, *Michael Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke* (Gloucester 1987).

8. *Chroniques de Jean Molinet* ed. G Doutrepont and O Jordogne (Brussels 1935) i 564-5(translation taken from Michael Bennett's *Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke* p131).

9. *Rotuli Parliamentorum* ed. J Stachey and others (1767-83) vi 397.

10. Translated from the Latin in Bennett *op. cit.* p133.

11. *The Great Chronicle of London* eds. A H Thomas and I D Thornley (London 1938)p241.

12. Burne *op. cit.* pp157-8.

13. Bennett *op.cit.* p94.

14. Brooke, Richard *Visits to Fields of Battle in England* (London 1857) p185.

15. Bennett *op. cit.* p101, quoting from R P Shilton's *The Battle of Stoke-Field* (Newark 1828).