

would have deliberately added the crushed shell as tempering to improve the qualities of the clay. Supplies of shell were readily available to potters, even inland, as shellfish, especially oysters, could easily be kept fresh and were widely eaten. Other inclusions comprise sparse quartz sands and red clay pellets.

Culinary moulds are uncommon, but have been found in other parts of the county, for example at Chelmsford, Hatfield Peverel (Drury 1985, 79-81), Canes Lane, Harlow (Robertson 1976, 84), Coryton (Walker forthcoming) and at a moated site at Maidens Tye, near High Easter (Walker 1988, fig. 12.2). The latter find was originally interpreted as a pargetting stamp.

Research on this type of object has suggested that they are ceramic versions of waffle irons (Nenk 1992, 290-302). Waffles, also known as wafers, were made of batter, and cooked between two greased iron moulds. Nenk suggests that the ceramic version would have been heated by standing it at the edge of the fire, and then pouring the batter on to the hot surface, cooking it instantly, the markings on the mould imprinting themselves on to the waffle in the process. Such a use would account for the fire-blackening on the surface of the mould. It is also thought these vessels may have been used in pairs, one placed over the other once the mixture had been added to impress a pattern on both surfaces of the waffle. The two opposing holes through the base of the ceramic waffle iron may have been for the insertion of a rod in order to lift the hot waffle iron away from the fire (Nenk 1992, 296).

The location of this find is highly significant, as Mill Green was an important centre of pottery manufacture during the 13th to 14th centuries, and probably continued into the late medieval period albeit at a reduced scale (Pearce et al. 1982, 268-70). Finely potted glazed and decorated jugs were the main product of this industry, and indeed two Mill Green ware jug handles were found with this object. Culinary moulds however, were also part of the Mill Green repertoire (Nenk 1992, 290). It would seem likely then that Fig. 31 is a Mill Green product, were it not for the fact that there is no mention in the literature of a shell-tempered fabric produced at Mill Green. Mill Green vessels are either un-tempered or have a quartz sand-temper (Pearce et al. 1982, 277-9). In addition, as the mould shows evidence of being heated, it must have been used, and is therefore not a waster.

Closer inspection of the fabric however, does show it to have a fine micaceous matrix like that of Mill Green ware. In addition, it bears a visual resemblance to a mould from Mill Green published by Nenk (1992, fig. 2.12). Although Nenk's example is described as having stamped decoration, the somewhat abstract design includes rows of dashes resembling the combed decoration seen on Fig. 31. These two strands of evidence, and the proximity of this find to the production site indicate that it is most likely a Mill Green product.

Culinary moulds have a very broad date range

spanning the late 13th to 17th centuries (Nenk 1992, 294). However, shell-tempering is generally quite early, used from the 10th to 13th centuries, so this would appear to be an early example of this form. A shell-tempered fabric may have been favoured because of its refractory properties, i.e. it could resist the effects of heating and cooling without cracking.

Waffles were considered great delicacies, and were usually sweetened with sugar or honey, but savoury versions were made with cheese, and there were spicy versions made with ginger (Henisch 1985, 75-7). Nenk (1992, 297) considers that the ceramic version of the waffle-iron may be an example of the lower social classes emulating the culinary habits of their social superiors. However, as Maidens Tye, and the site at Coryton were both relatively high status sites, the presence of ceramic waffle irons may indicate a middle class household.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Ricky Ricketts of BVAS for bringing this object to her attention. The writing of this note was funded by BVAS and the illustration is by Verna Long.

Bibliography

- Drury, P. J., 1985 'The culinary stamps' in Cunningham, C. M. and Drury, P. J., *Post-medieval sites and their pottery: Moulsham Street, Chelmsford*, Chelmsford Archaeol. Trust Rep. 5, CBA Res. Rep. 54, 78-80
- Henisch, B. A., 1985 *Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society*, Pennsylvania and London, Pennsylvania State University Press
- Nenk, B., 1992 'Ceramic culinary moulds', in Gaimster, D. and Redknapp, R. (eds), *Everyday and Exotic Pottery from Europe c.650-1900*, Oxford: Oxbow Books
- Pearce, J. E., Vince, A. G. and White R., 1982 'A dated type-series of London medieval pottery part one: Mill Green ware', *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol. Soc.* 33, 266 - 98
- Robertson, I.G., 1976 *The archaeology of the Mil motorway in Essex 1970 - 1975*, 84-5, Chichester
- Walker, H., 1988 'The pottery', in Sellers, E., Ryan, P. M. and Walker, H., 'Maiden's Tye: a moated site at High Easter', *Essex Archaeol. Hist.* 19, 180 - 91
- Walker, H., Forthcoming 'The medieval and post-medieval pottery' in Dale R. and Peachey, M., 'A late medieval site at Great Garlands Farm, Stanford-Le-Hope, and other archaeological work on the Coryton to Mucking pipeline', *Essex Archaeol. Hist.*

The Society is grateful to Essex County Council for a generous grant towards the cost of publishing this note.

The Death of Edward V — new evidence from Colchester

John Ashdown-Hill

The fate of Edward V, the elder of the two boys known commonly, if somewhat inaccurately, as 'the princes in the Tower',¹ remains a matter for speculation.² One of the earliest references to the death of Edward V currently known is in Dominic Mancini's account 'concluded at Beaugency in the County of Orleans, 1 December 1483'.³ A member of a religious order,

possibly the Augustinian (Austin) friars, Mancini was in the service of Angelo Cato, Archbishop of Vienne, on whose behalf he visited England for about seven months in 1483. It was for Cato that he wrote his subsequent account of the state of affairs he had found in England, under the Latin title *De occupatione regni Anglie per Ricardum tercium*. Mancini, who left England in July 1483, reported:

I have seen many men burst forth into tears and lamentations when mention was made of him [Edward V] after his removal from men's sight; and already there was a suspicion that he had been done away with [*sublatum*]. Whether, however, he has been done away with, and by what manner of death, so far I have not at all discovered.⁴

Thus he suggests that Edward V's death was rumoured in July - December 1483. He does not, of course, establish Edward's death as a fact.

Secondly, there is what Armstrong describes as a 'cryptic note' in the Cely correspondence which has been represented as referring to the death of Edward V. The Cely family were middle-class Londoners. A selection of their family papers, covering the years 1472-1488 was presented as evidence in the Court of Chancery in 1489, in the course of a family dispute, and the papers are now in the National Archives. The undated note to which Armstrong refers was written by George Cely. Armstrong dates it tentatively to 13-26 June 1483 and characterises it as possibly expressing fears for the life of Edward V.⁵ Alison Hanham likewise assumes that George Cely's reference to 'the king' is to Edward V, on the basis that mention in the note of the death of 'chamberlain' must relate to the execution of Lord Hastings.⁶

In fact the Cely note is very difficult to date with certainty. Indeed, it was previously assigned to August 1478, based on its reference to the death of an unnamed bishop of Ely,⁷ though it is unlikely to have such an early date, for it is on the reverse of a document which seems to have been written in late 1481 or early 1482. The note runs as follows (the spelling has been modernised):

There is great rumour in the realm. The Scots has done great [*sic*] in England. Chamberlain is deceased in trouble. The chancellor is disproved [*? dyssprowett*] and not content. The bishop of Ely is dead.

If the king, God save his life, were deceased, the Duke of Gloucester were in any peril, if my lord prince wh[ic]h God defend were troubled, if my lord of Northumberland were dead or greatly troubled, if my lord Howard were slain. De Monsieur Saint John.

It is doubtful whether this tells us anything of value in the present context. The note falls naturally into two parts. The first states what purport to be facts, while the second contains speculations. However, the opening sentence warns that we are dealing with rumour

throughout. The meaning of some 'facts' is far from clear. One of the clearest statements appears to be false (see below). In terms of dating, the 'facts' are mutually incompatible. Only by selecting one and ignoring others can a date be assigned to the note. Armstrong and Hanham select the 'Chamberlain' statement and date the note to June 1483. In the same way earlier attempts to date the note selected the 'bishop of Ely' statement, producing the date of August 1478. The 'chancellor' statement would suggest a date earlier in 1483 (see below). Clearly, any dating arrived at in this way must remain contentious.

Neither Edward IV nor Edward V is mentioned by name. The same applies to Lord Hastings. The 'chancellor' statement (the precise meaning of which has itself been debated) may refer to Archbishop Thomas Rotherham. He, however, was dismissed at the beginning of May 1483. If the 'bishop of Ely' statement refers to John Morton, it was certainly false.⁸ As for the speculations in the second part of the note, some, such as the one relating to the possible death of Lord Howard, are also demonstrably in error.⁹ There is no guarantee that any part of the note is accurate.

It could well have been written earlier than Armstrong and Hanham suggest. The king to whom it refers may be Edward IV, who died in April 1483. If so, the note must certainly have been written before the public proclamation of his death, since it mentions the king's decease only as a speculation, not as a fact. If the 'king' of the note is indeed Edward IV, then 'my lord prince' would be the prince of Wales (the future Edward V), and very much alive.

Hanham, however, infers that the 'prince' of the note must be Richard of Shrewsbury, the younger son of Edward IV. This seems an unlikely interpretation. Richard of Shrewsbury had his own proper titles including duke of York and duke of Norfolk. One would expect reference to him to be by one of these, as it seems to be in Lord Howard's household accounts for 30 January 1483, when Lord Howard gave 2s. 6d. 'to Poynes that dwellyd with my Lord of York, for to bye with a bowe'.¹⁰ Other references to Richard of Shrewsbury during his father's lifetime, and after his creation as duke of York, are generally to 'the right high and mighty prince, the duke of York'.¹¹ There seems to be no instance which omits his ducal title and calls him 'prince' only. On the other hand the future Edward V was, during his father's lifetime, prince of Wales. 'My lord prince' is therefore more likely to refer to him. If the 'king' of the note is indeed Edward IV, and the 'prince', the future Edward V, the only thing that George Cely has to say about Edward V is to speculate whether he 'were troubled'. This certainly does not establish that he was dead, or even rumoured to be so.

Armstrong, however, goes on to associate the questionable evidence of the Cely note with the inference that Edward V's younger brother, Richard of Shrewsbury, may have been dead by 28 June 1483. This inference has been drawn from the elevation of John, Lord Howard, to the dukedom of Norfolk (previously

held by Richard of Shrewsbury) on that date.¹² In this connection Armstrong raises the interesting concept of the distinction between legal and physical death. He argues that in acknowledging Edward IV's prior marriage to Lady Eleanor Talbot, and the consequent illegitimacy of his children by Elizabeth Wbodville, parliament created a situation in which Edward V and Richard of Shrewsbury were legally dead. As princes of the realm they did not exist and all their tides were extinct. This is an important concept to bear in mind. It is a proposition which appears to receive some support from the petition of Elizabeth Talbot, dowager Duchess of Norfolk, to Henry VII, dated 27 November 1489.¹³

The dowager duchess of Norfolk was Richard of Shrewsbury's mother-in-law. She was also Lady Eleanor Talbot's younger sister. Her petition relates to the confiscated manor of Weston, Baldock, Herts. Elizabeth Talbot sets out in detail the transmission of this manor as part of the Mowbray inheritance, including Edward IV's provision for its reversion (in the event of her own death, and that of her daughter, Anne) to Richard of Shrewsbury, but she then makes no reference whatsoever to the latter's death, merely stating: 'afterwards, the said Anne dying, the reversion of the manor descended to John Howard, last duke of Norfolk ... and to William, then viscount, now marquis of Berkeley'. The omission is interesting, because if Richard of Shrewsbury was known to have died in June 1483 there was no possible reason, in 1489, why Elizabeth Talbot should not have said so. If, on the other hand, the reversion of the manor had been held to descend to John Howard because of the illegitimacy of Richard of Shrewsbury, that was a matter to which it would certainly have been unwise for the duchess to make reference in 1489.

There exists one further possible early reference to the fate of Edward V, which has not previously been noted. This is in the borough records of Colchester, in the collection now generally known as the *Oath Book*.¹⁴ This volume comprises various records; amongst them indexes containing listings of burgesses, wills proved in the borough courts and enrolments of property grants covering the period 1327-1564. The folios relating to the fifteenth century are in the form of a year-by-year listing of the bailiffs and burgesses, together with a summary of documents registered by the borough during the year in question.

The *Oath Book* was published by WG. Benham in 1907. Benham's edition is in the form of a calendar, in English.¹⁵ The *Oath Book* is now often cited in Benham's version, since this is more generally accessible than the original. Benham's published text will therefore be considered first. Subsequently the original *Oath Book* text itself will be examined.

In Benham's edition of the *Oath Book* there appears the following entry for 1482-83:

Bailiffs: John Bisshop. Thos. Cristemesse. Bailiffs from Michaelmas in the 22nd year of Edward IV, now defunct, until the 8th April next following, and

then in the first year of Edward V, late son of Edward IV, until the 20th June next following; and in the first year of Richard III, until the following Michaelmas.¹⁶

John Bisshop and Thomas Cristemesse were prominent Colcestrians of the time. John Bisshop had served as bailiff on several previous occasions. Thomas Cristemesse had not held this office before, but he was to hold it again later, and interestingly he was also subsequently elected to represent Colchester in the first parliament of Henry VII.

The normal entry in the Oath Book to mark the start of a new civic year would simply have given the names of the two bailiffs for the year. In this unusual year of three kings, however, the Colchester town clerk clearly thought it desirable to add a note of explanation. In this note he gives precisely (if slightly inaccurately) the accession dates of both Edward V and Richard III.¹⁷ From this one can deduce that in general terms the writer knew what he was talking about, though he was, perhaps, capable of minor error.

From the form of the annual borough records it is also possible to deduce that these were probably written retrospectively, at or shortly after the end of the civic year which ran from Michaelmas Day (29 September). [The Bailiffs were elected on the Monday following 8 September (Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary) and assumed office on the Monday following 29 September (Michaelmas Day).¹⁸ In 1482 the election took place on Monday 9 September, and the bailiffs took office on Monday 30 September.]

This deduction is based upon the fact that the listing of deeds and wills is normally continuous and in the same hand. Occasionally one or two additions have been made, in different ink, at the end of a year's record, but before the start of the following year. If a bailiff (or in the present case a king) died in the course of a year, this fact is recorded under the bailiffs' heading for the year, and before the list of deeds for the year commences. In the present instance, this implies that the 'three kings' note for 1482-83 was written about 29 September 1483.

In its published form, the note is quite specific in the case of Edward IV, who is described as 'defunct'. The case of Edward V is less clear, though the calendar's wording 'late son of Edward IV would seem to imply that by 29 September 1483 Edward V was also deceased, or at least, that the town clerk believed him to be so. It is important to bear in mind that the published edition of the *Oath Book* which has so far been cited is in the form of a calendar rather than a translation of the *ipsissima verba* of the Latin text. Comparison with the original text on which the published entry was based, reveals that the published version, while accurate in its general tenor, omits details which could be significant. The original entry is as follows:

Colchester Oath Book f.107r (modern foliation - old page no. 156)¹⁹

Tempore Iohannis Bisshop & Thome Cristemesse,

Ballivorum ville Colcestrie a festo Sancti Michelis Archangeli Anno domini Edwardi quarti nuper Regis anglie, iam defuncti, vicesimo secundo, usque octavum diem Aprilis nine primo sequentem, Anno regni Regis Edwardi R — p — [Regis spurii?] "quinti nuper filii domini Edwardi quarti post conquestum primo, usque vicesimum diem Iunij tunc primo sequentem, Anno Regni Regis Ricardi tercij post conquestum primo incipiente, et abinde usque ad festum Sancti Micheli Archangeli extunc primo futuro quasi per unum Annum integrum.

Translation:

In the time of John Bisshop and Thomas Cristemesse, Bailiffs of the town of Colchester from the feast of St Michael the Archangel in the 22 year of the reign of the Lord Edward IV, late king of England, now deceased, up until the 8th day of April first following; [and] in the first year of the reign of King Edward [erasure; see note 20] V, late²¹ son of the lord Edward IV after the Conquest, up to the 20th day of June then first following; [and] in the first year of the reign of Richard III after the Conquest, from the beginning, and thence until the first feast of St Michael the Archangel thereafter as for one complete year.

This record appears (as do all the year headings naming the bailiffs) in red ink, while the yearly record of burgesses, deeds and wills which follows is in black ink. There is no doubt, therefore, that this note was entered in the record as an entirety, and not piecemeal. As has already been indicated, the entry was made towards the end of 1483 (i.e. on or about 29 September of that year).

The phrase *regis spurii* is unusual, and is not elsewhere attested with reference to a deposed and supplanted monarch. The terminology employed by the functionaries of Edward IV to describe Henry VI was quite different. He was characterised as *rex de facto, non de iure* (king in fact but not in law). However, the situation of Edward V was fundamentally different from that of Henry VI. The personal legitimacy of the latter was never in question. Only his right to be king was at issue. Edward V, on the other hand, was adjudged illegitimate by birth and his exclusion (for he was excluded, not deposed) depended upon that judgement. It would not be surprising, therefore, to find him referred to in a different manner. In Edward's case the phrase *rex de facto, non de iure* would have been entirely inappropriate.

The erasure of the words which seem likely to have characterised Edward V as an illegitimate king, would presumably have been made in the autumn of 1485, following the repeal by Henry VI's first parliament of the *Titulus regius* of 1484. The repeal and destruction of this act automatically re-established the legitimacy of Edward IV's children by Elizabeth Woodville.²² It is interesting to recall, in this connection, that Thomas Cristemesse, one of the two bailiffs for 1482-83, was

elected a member of Henry VII's first parliament. It is note-worthy that the enactments of this parliament in respect of the title to the throne were clearly well known in Colchester at the time, and are recorded in precise and accurate detail in the borough records.²³ Thus the erasure of offending words implying the bastardy of Edward IV's children might well have been ordered by the bailiffs in September 1485, as a politic move.²⁴ Even more interesting is the fact that at precisely this time (and in addition to his role as member of parliament) Thomas Cristemesse was once again one of the two town bailiffs. His second year of office ended on Monday 3 October 1485 (being the Monday following Michaelmas Day).

As for the wording of the original entry in respect of Edward IV and Edward V, the former is characterised both as *nuper Regis* and as *iam defuncti*, so that, as one might expect, there can be no doubt that he was known to be dead. In the case of Edward V the entry is more intriguing. The phrase *nuper filij Edwardi quarti* is capable of more than one interpretation. It could mean that Edward V was dead (or at least, that the writer thought him to be so). On the other hand the town clerk could have meant that Edward V (reference to whose name could not entirely be avoided, since documents existed dated to the first year of his reign) was nevertheless an illegitimate king. This interpretation would tend to be reinforced if the erased words have been correctly read as *Regis spurii*. In Armstrong's words Edward V as a monarch would then be legally (but not necessarily physically) dead. In favour of this interpretation we also have the fact that the specific and unequivocal adjective *defunctus* is not used in respect of Edward V.

The 1483 entry in the Colchester *Oath Book* is therefore an interesting addition to the very limited body of evidence which bears upon the fate of Edward V. It appears to be the earliest surviving substantial record implying that Edward may have been dead by the autumn of that year. Mancini's account, by comparison, merely retails rumour, although in his suggested date for Edward's death Mancini is certainly consistent with the *Oath Book* record. Both sources permit the conclusion that Edward IV's elder son was dead by September 1483. Unfortunately the wording chosen by the Colchester town clerk remains imprecise. He may have meant that Edward V was legally rather than physically dead, and even had he selected a more specific Latin term, the *Oath Book* entry would still record only his belief and not an incontrovertible fact.

The Colchester *Oath Book* does, however, provide evidence in support of the belief that Edward V was dead by September 1485. His re-establishment in the borough records as a legitimate king at about that time (by the deletion of the phrase which had formerly impugned his right to reign) would have been a potentially dangerous undertaking had it not been fairly certain that he was then no longer alive to contest his reinstated claim to the throne. This evidence concurs with the general Yorkist belief current in the 1490s,

which regarded Edward V as dead, but the fate of his younger brother as uncertain.²⁵ It does not help us to determine how Edward died, or who (if anyone) may have been responsible.

Notes

1. Parliamentary acceptance in 1483-84 of the prior marriage of their father, Edward IV, to Lady Eleanor Talbot, meant that they were illegitimate. Thus their legal status during the period June 1483 - August 1485 was that they were not (and never had been) 'princes'. From April to June 1483 and from September 1485 onwards Edward V's legal status was that of a king, not a 'prince'.
2. Yorkist opinion in the 1490s was inclined to believe that Edward IV's younger son, Richard of Shrewsbury, might then be still alive. This is demonstrated by the Yorkist response to the problematic figure of 'Perkin Warbeck'. However, even the most optimistic Yorkists seem to have thought that by this time Edward V was probably dead, though clear evidence of his death was, and is, lacking.
3. C.A.J. Armstrong, ed., 1989, D. Mancini, *The Usurpation of Richard III*, 105. Dominic Mancini (c. 1434 - c.1500) was from a Roman family of unremarkable origin, members of which subsequently attained noble status in France through their relationship with Cardinal Mazarin, first minister during the youth of Louis XIV.
4. Armstrong / Mancini, 1989, 92-93. Whether, in itself, *sublatum* necessarily implies death could perhaps be questioned, but from the general context this does seem to be what Mancini is implying.
5. Armstrong / Mancini, 1989, 128, n. 91.
6. A. Hanham, ed., 1975, *The Cely Letters 1472-1488, 184-85*; 285-86. Also A. Hanham, 1985, *The Celys and their World*, 287.
7. Bishop William Grey of Ely died on 4 August 1478.
8. Far from being dead, John Morton survived to plot against Richard III, ultimately becoming Henry VII's chancellor and cardinal archbishop of Canterbury.
9. Lord Howard was about to become duke of Norfolk (see below and note 12). He was killed with Richard III at Bosworth. Hanham (1985, 287) recognises that 'most of these flying rumours were untrue'.
10. A. Crawford, ed., *The Household Books of John Howard, Duke of Norfolk, 1462-71, 1481-83*, Stroud 1992, part 2, p. 348.
11. N.H. Nicolas, ed., *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York & Wardrobe Accounts of Edward IV*, London 1830, pp. 155-56, 160-61.
12. For example in C.F. Richmond, 1989, 'The Death of Edward V, *Northern History*, 25, pp.278-80. Richmond argued from the date of 22 June 1483, given for Edward V's death in the Anlaby cartulary, in an entry written after 1509. In fact the significance of Lord Howard's elevation remains debatable. Richard of Shrewsbury was given the dukedom of Norfolk in 1477 in preparation for his marriage to the Mowbray heiress, Anne. The marriage followed in 1478. Anne Mowbray's subsequent death, together with the fact that Lord Howard was the senior Mowbray coheir, are factors which may have influenced Richard III.
13. *CPR 1485-1494*, pp. 307-08.
14. Described in detail in R.H. Britnell, 1982, 'The Oath Book of Colchester and the Borough Constitution, 1372-1404', *EAH*, 14, 94-101.
15. Britnell describes Benham's published version as 'edited in translation', but recognises that it fails to 'adequately represent the detail of the manuscripts'. Britnell 1982, 94; 99, n. 2.
16. W.G. Benham, ed., 1907 *The Oath Book, or Red Parchment Book of Colchester*, 134.
17. The actual accession dates were 9 April (Edward V) and 26 June (Richard III). 20 June 1483 may well be the date on which news of the prior marriage of Edward IV and Eleanor, and the consequent illegitimacy of Edward's Woodville offspring, first reached Colchester.
18. Britnell 1982, 96.
19. Britnell notes (p. 94) that the present binding of the Oath Book is late seventeenth century. Folios 85-144 contain 15th and 16th

century material, but have no contemporary page or folio enumeration. The 'old' page numbering noted here presumably dates from the 17th century, when this material was gathered together and bound. The folio enumeration is in pencil, and is modern.

20. At this point there has been a subsequent and very heavy erasure of one long word, or more likely of two words. This erasure has actually shaved off much of the surface of the parchment. Under ultra violet lighting, however, it is possible tentatively to discern the first erased letter as an upper case 'R', while beyond the mid point of the erasure a lower case 'p' seems to occur. The erased words might thus have read *Regis spurii* ('illegitimate King'). Such a phrase used with reference to Edward V would probably have been erased after the accession of Henry VII.
21. It is difficult to find a different English translation for *nuper*. 'Former' would sound odd in this context. However, the Latin word does not necessarily imply that Edward V was dead.
22. The destruction of all copies of the act of 1484 was specifically commanded by Henry VII. The repeal and destruction of this act was important to Henry because he planned to marry the eldest daughter of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville, and to represent her to the nation as the Yorkist heiress. It was therefore imperative for him to re-establish the legitimacy of Edward IV's children by Elizabeth Woodville. By so doing, however, he in effect reinstated Edward V as the rightful king. Henry VII's action in repealing the act of 1484 thus implies that Edward was already dead. Indeed had either 'prince' been living when the act was repealed Elizabeth of York's heiress status would have been questionable.
23. W.G. Benham, ed., 1902 *The Red Paper Book of Colchester*, 60 & *passim*.
24. The erasure could possibly date from slightly later, but it seems certain to have been made before Henry VII visited the town in 1487.
25. Hicks' assertion that 'by autumn [1483] they [Edward V and Richard of Shrewsbury] were generally assumed to be dead' cannot be accepted in the light of the subsequent response to 'Perkin Warbeck'. M. Hicks, *Richard III*, Stroud, 2000, p. 242.

The cost of publishing this article is supported by the Society's Publications Development Fund

Late medieval and post-medieval remains at the former St John's Ambulance Shop, Park Street, Thaxted

Mike Roy

with contribution by Joyce Compton

Archaeological excavation on the edge of the medieval town of Thaxted recovered evidence of late medieval activity, with limited bone-working waste from the cutlery industry.

Background

The medieval town of Thaxted is situated on a south-east-facing slope, with the parish church standing on approximately the highest point (Fig. 32). It was a well-established community by the time of the Domesday Book (Rumble 1983) and by the 14th century had expanded rapidly to become the centre of a major cutlery industry. The cutlers were probably concentrated along a stream through the centre of the town (Medlycott 1998), and associated bone-working debris has been encountered during excavations at 23 and 34 Town Street (Medlycott 1996; Germany and Wade 1998) and Weaverhead Lane (Andrews 1989;