

ANNE MOWBRAY, DUCHESS OF YORK: A 15TH-CENTURY CHILD BURIAL FROM THE ABBEY OF ST CLARE, IN THE LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS. SUPPLEMENT APPENDIX: ANNE MOWBRAY – THE PRINCESS IN THE PRESS, PARLIAMENT AND PERIODICALS

Bruce Watson and Geoffrey Wheeler

CONTENTS

- 1. Commentary**
- 2. Catalogue of Newspaper Articles and Hansard Entries**
- 3. Catalogue of Journal or Magazine Articles and Items concerning Anne Mowbray**
- 4. Catalogue of Books About Anne Mowbray’s Life**
- 5. Catalogue of Museum of London Archaeological Archive Reports (LAA AMS 64) and Related Documents Concerning Anne Mowbray**
 - Correspondence**
 - Photographs**
 - Draft Copies of London Museum Documents**
 - Copies of London Museum Documents**
 - Copies of Other Documents**
- 6. Catalogue of Anne Mowbray Material Included in Books, Exhibition Catalogues Etc**
- 7. Catalogue of Anne Mowbray Material Included in the *Paston Letters***
- 8. Catalogue of Anne Mowbray Material in the Wellcome Trust Records**

This catalogue is published online as a supplement to the article ‘Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York: a 15th-century child burial from the Abbey of St Clare, in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets’ by Bruce Watson and William White, *LAMAS Transactions* Volume 67 (2016). The aim of this catalogue is to provide a comprehensive list of the UK press coverage, including articles in magazines, academic journals, plus material in books and unpublished archive reports, all relating to the discovery and reburial of Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York. The coverage of Anne’s discovery and subsequent developments in the UK national press was extensive and we are aware that the regional material listed here is incomplete. There was also considerable coverage in the North American media about Anne’s discovery, but this is not included in this catalogue. Refer also to the Bibliography in the main article.

1. COMMENTARY

The unexpected discovery of Anne Mowbray's remains in 1964 created tremendous interest in the press in Britain and beyond. This was a story that combined a heady mixture of royalty, romance, mystery (the connection with the Princes in the Tower), sudden death and the unexpected rediscovery of a forgotten princess. Incidentally, many of the 1960s press reports contain very few pictures by modern standards. Some of the press reports were critical of the conduct of the London Museum, who were unfairly blamed for the damage Anne's remains had sustained during their discovery (eg *Daily Telegraph* and *The Times* 16 January 1965; Watson 2013). However, problems really started when it was realised that the London Museum had failed to obtain a Burial Licence from the Home Office, which would have legally allowed them to have the custody of Anne's remains until their eventual reburial and this omission had serious consequences. There was also pressure for Anne's immediate reburial from the present holders of her titles in the House of Lords (eg *Daily Telegraph* 25 and 26 February 1965), one of whom, Lord Mowbray, Segrave and Stourton, mistakenly believed he was descended from Anne (*The Times* 3 January 2007). These factors resulted in the planned analytical study of Anne's remains being curtailed to facilitate her immediate reburial (*The Times* 23 January 1965; *Hansard* 10 February 1965). It was pointed out by Dr Francis Celoria that curtailment of his ongoing research on Anne's remains would result in a loss of valuable data (*Daily Telegraph* 26 February 1965; Celoria 1966).

Due to the missing archival material and the absence of most of the contemporary London Museum correspondence concerning Anne's reburial, the press coverage explains how the political pressure for her immediate reburial developed and was resolved. Some details, such as the proposal by one of the team's pathologists to attempt a facial reconstruction of Anne (*Daily Express* 16 January 1965) or the 1965 London Museum exhibition about her discovery and burial, are only recorded in the press coverage (*The Times* 18 January 1965; *Illustrated London News* 23 January 1965). This exhibition may have included a cut-away model of Anne's burial vault (LAA AMS 64, slide 287). A portrait of Anne was apparently produced, but never published or documented so its artist and purpose remain uncertain (LAA AMS 64, negative 254; see section 5). In 2016 a new facial reconstruction of Anne Mowbray was produced by Amy Thornton of Dundee University. It was commissioned by John Ashdown-Hill (see below). This reconstruction was produced from digital scans of the 1965 photographs of Anne's skull in the London Archaeological Archive (see section 5).

The best known representation of Anne Mowbray is the splendid history painting of her marriage produced by James Northcote RA in 1820, exhibited in 1821 and also published in 1822 as an engraving, which has been used by many picture editors to illustrate articles (see cover *LAMAS Transactions* Volume 67). Much less well known is the cinematic representation of her marriage in the Universal Pictures 1939 cult classic 'The Tower of London' (reviewed in *Picture Show* 18 May 1940, p 10), which depicted a scene from her wedding. The theme of this film is the struggle for the English crown between 1471 and 1485. It was directed by Rowland V Lee, and starred Basil Rathbone as a villainous Richard III; five-year-old Donnie Dunagan played Prince Richard and six-year-old Joan Carroll (her role is uncredited) played Anne Mowbray. The film was available on DVD.

A transcript of the 1477 invitation to Anne's wedding was originally published as a letter to *The Daily Telegraph* (12 March 1965). Subsequently, a more accurate transcript of this unique document has been produced (Watson 2015; see section 3). It has been claimed that the future Henry VII, then the Earl of Richmond was present at Anne's wedding. This is a mistake, as while Henry's mother, the Countess of Richmond, may have been present at Anne's wedding her son was not (Scofield 1923, ii, 205; see section 6).

Anne Mowbray has also been the subject of numerous articles in the *Ricardian Bulletin* (the quarterly magazine of the Richard III Society; see below).

It is interesting to compare the press coverage concerning Anne's discovery with that of the 2012 rediscovery of the remains of her uncle, Richard III, now known as 'the king in the car park', during an archaeological evaluation. A burial licence was obtained for the exhumation of Richard's remains from the Ministry of Justice. However, this discovery of another 15th-century royal burial again turned into a dispute. There was an acrimonious legal case to determine Richard's place of reburial when a group known as the Plantagenet Alliance, claiming to be his relatives' descendants wanted him reburied in York, while the Ministry of Justice, Leicester City Council and the University of Leicester wished to rebury him in Leicester Cathedral. On 23 May 2014, a High Court judgement rejected the claim of the Alliance, bringing to an end a year-long legal dispute. The judgement argued that once the identity of Richard III had been established, the Justice Secretary was not obliged to carry out a public consultation over the proposed location of the king's place of reburial, which would be Leicester Cathedral as originally planned. See the media commentaries on Richard III and the controversy over his reburial by Watson and Wheeler in *The Ricardian Bulletin* (from December 2012 until September 2015). Copies of *The Ricardian Bulletin* from the autumn of 2003 onward are available online at www.ricardiii/6-4-0-richardian-bulletin.php.

2. CATALOGUE OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND HANSARD ENTRIES

Unless stated otherwise all illustrations are black and white photographs. Items marked with an asterisk (*) are included in the Museum of London Archaeological Archive (LAA) AMS 64.

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
1964	
11 December	‘A “mummy” found on city site’ <i>Evening News</i> Illustrations: a man inside the burial vault showing the hole where the coffin was removed and the finder Henry Cooper with the upright lead coffin.*
12 December	‘Lead-shrouded body unearthed in City’ <i>Guardian</i> Illustration: workman David Tunshall with upright coffin.*
13 December	‘Lead mummy mystery’ <i>Sunday Times</i> Illustration: unopened coffin with two labels tied around its neck.*
14 December	‘Discovery in hidden vault: riddle of girl in coffin solved’ <i>Evening News</i> Illustration: workman David Tunshall with upright coffin and Terry Docherty inside vault seen through the hole made to extract the coffin. In the visible wall of the vault there appears to be a recess or perhaps a blocked entrance.*
1965	
14 January	‘A child bride? Amazing find’ <i>Evening Standard</i> *
15 January	[Editorial] ‘Lead coffin secret: bride of a prince’ <i>Birmingham Post</i> *
ditto	‘Background to the news: child brides as pawns of politicians’ <i>Birmingham Post</i> Account of Anne’s wedding. Illustrations: Alfred Rooke and Arthur Trotman (London Museum conservation staff) with Anne’s coffin and Francis Celoria and other experts clustered around Anne’s open coffin.*
	‘Prince’s child bride found in coffin: unearthed on building site in London’ <i>Birmingham Evening Mail and Dispatch</i> Illustration: Alfred Rooke and Arthur Trotman (London Museum conservation staff) with Anne’s coffin.*
	‘Child bride: expert hits out’ <i>Bolton Evening News</i> Celoria explained at the press conference that it was mishandling of Anne’s coffin when it was discovered which had jumbled and damaged her skeleton.*
	‘Mystery child from 1481 is named royal bride’ <i>Daily Express</i> Illustration: unopened coffin being examined by London Museum staff. Another edition had the same article entitled: ‘The girl from 1481 is named ... a royal bride’.
	[Front page] ‘Tower prince: child wife find’ <i>Daily Mail (News Chronicle)</i>

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	Illustration: Alfred Rooke and Arthur Trotman (named in caption) of the London Museum examining Anne’s coffin. There was speculation that it might be possible ‘to establish if Anne was poisoned’.*
	[Vision] ‘When only maids married for love’ <i>Daily Mail (News Chronicle)</i> Opening line: ‘You must remember that in those days only servants married for love ...’. Anne was described as ‘hot property’ ... ‘fit for a royal takeover’. Illustrations: engraving of Northcote painting, engraved portrait of Edward IV and the tomb effigy of Queen Joan of Navarre in Canterbury Cathedral (d 1437) professing to be Elizabeth Woodville, plus engravings of the widowed Elizabeth Woodville handing over her younger son to Richard III’s men, so he can be taken to the Tower (Cipriani G P,) and the burial of the murdered princes after Northcote.*
	[World Spotlight] ‘Found – the bride of a Prince in the Tower’ <i>Daily Mirror</i>
	‘Remains of prince’s child bride found: married aged 5 in 1484’ <i>Daily Telegraph (and Morning Post)</i> The inscription from Anne’s coffin was on display at the London museum at Kensington Palace. Illustration: Alfred Rooke and Arthur Trotman (London Museum conservation staff) examining Anne’s coffin.*
	‘Building site find to get the “tin-opener” treatment’; ‘City mummy gives up its secrets’ and ‘Queen and Tower Bride’ <i>Evening News</i> Celoria explains that the London Museum are getting the Latin inscription on the coffin translated and they will let the coffin dry out before opening it or in his own words ‘give it the tin-opener treatment’.*
	‘London’s Secrets’; ‘Child bride of Prince in Tower’ <i>Evening Standard</i> Illustration: Anne’s skull and matted hair.*
	‘Duchess turns up in Stepney: wife of murdered prince’ <i>Guardian</i> *
	‘Alas ... poor little Duchess Anne ...’ <i>London Evening Standard</i> Illustration: view of Anne’s skull inside opened coffin.*
	‘Royal coffin “mishandled”’ <i>Oxford Mail</i> *
	[Front Page] ‘After 484 years, found: the child bride of Prince in the Tower’ <i>Sun</i> Illustrations: experts examine Anne’s coffin and an engraving of the murder of the princes (after Hilderbrandt).*
	‘Child bride has broken bones’ <i>Stoke-on-Trent Evening Sentinel</i> *
	[Home News] ‘Stepney coffin contains a Duchess of York: child bride of prince killed in tower’ <i>The Times</i> This states that 70 specialists will be involved in the study of Anne’s remains and that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey had decided to rebury her in the abbey ‘as near as possible to the presumed site of her first interment’. The coffin was described as weighing over one hundredweight.*

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	<p>‘Coffin gives up its medieval secret’ <i>Yorkshire Post</i></p> <p>Illustration: Very Revd Eric Abbot Dean of Westminster.*</p>
16 January	<p>‘Little Anne from 1481 lies here: scientist claims we will reconstruct her face’ <i>Daily Express</i></p> <p>The pathologist concerned was not named. Illustrations: vertical view of opened coffin and skeleton with string grid and the inscription.*</p>
ditto	<p>‘A “murder” probe on child bride Anne’ <i>Daily Mirror</i></p> <p>Illustration: close-up of Anne’s skull within her coffin. The theme was the search for Anne’s wedding ring within her coffin.</p>
	<p>‘Late call to Mowbray find deplored’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i></p> <p>London Museum officials yesterday deplored a delay of three hours before they were called after the discovery of Anne’s coffin.*</p>
	<p>‘Broken pelvis in Duchess’s remains: museum “not told” soon enough’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>Dr Francis Celoria explained that when Anne’s coffin was opened her pelvis was already broken probably due to mishandling at the time of her discovery. It was pointed out that there was a delay of two hours between the actual discovery and the London Museum being informed. Illustration: Anne’s skull and matted hair.*</p>
	<p>‘On the operating table 500 years after she died’ <i>Sun</i></p> <p>Illustration: part of Latin inscription on coffin.*</p>
17 January	<p>‘The Little Princess: doubt about the Princes in the Tower’ <i>Observer</i></p> <p>A discussion of who murdered the ‘Princes in the Tower’.*</p>
ditto	<p>[Insight Archaeology] ‘The discovery of Anne Mowbray’s coffin was hailed last week as a big historical find. It might have been a disaster but for the ... pirate diggers’ <i>Sunday Times</i></p> <p>This was an account of the parlous state of archaeological fieldwork in London, explaining how important archaeological sites like Anne’s burial place were being constantly destroyed by redevelopment without record. It highlighted the work of two volunteer groups, the Southwark Rescue Group and the Thames Basin Observers Group. These teams were ‘formed by wildly enthusiastic amateurs – intellectuals, professional and working men – who were appalled by the inadequacies of London archaeology brought about by lack of funds’. Illustration: ‘Francis Celoria with members of his “pirate gang”’. * Reprinted (10 February 2013) in their ‘From the archives section: Buccaneers pluck prince’s child bride from her grave’. 2013 illustrations: photo of the 1965 research team grouped around Anne Mowbray’s open coffin and a copy of James Northcote’s 1820 painting of her wedding.*</p>
18 January	<p>[Court Circular] ‘Duchess’s coffin lid on show at museum’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>Anne’s coffin lid formed part of a temporary display about her burial: in two hours it was seen by 500 visitors. Objects included a brick from her burial</p>

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	vault.
19 January	<p>[Letters] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>B Evans, the Convenor of the Bosworth Society, argued that it was not proven who murdered the ‘Princes in the Tower’. While A Marnau called for Anne’s immediate reburial and a Roman Catholic service.</p>
ditto	<p>[Letters] ‘More questions from Mowbray Tomb’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i></p> <p>D Morrah (Arundel Herald Extraordinary) pointed out that Anne’s mother was also buried in the choir of the Minories church and inquired if her remains had been discovered. Also it was noted that Richard III on 28 June 1483 gave the Dukedom of Norfolk to Lord Howard, three days after the two princes had been declared illegitimate: ‘presumably Richard thought wrongly, that illegitimacy invalidated the peerage’. Authors’ comments: this gift of the dukedom is often incorrectly cited as evidence that both princes were already dead.</p>
23 January	<p>[Letter] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i></p> <p>E P J Sourton called for her immediate reburial, stating there was no point in trying to determine her blood group and arguing that Anne was never married but was only betrothed to Richard, Duke of York. Authors’ comments: Anne was certainly married; but her marriage would not have been completed or consummated until she and her husband were considerably older.</p>
ditto	<p>‘Child bride coffin starts row’ <i>Evening News</i></p> <p>A Home Office inquiry into the treatment of Anne Mowbray’s remains was starting. It was to investigate the failure of the London Museum to obtain a burial licence.*</p>
	<p>[Letters] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>Two letters, the first by A Keen expressed amazement at the procedure concerning the treatment of Anne’s remains, pointing out that under the terms of the 1857 Burial Act a Home Office a licence was required to move her remains from their find-spot. The second by I Wigram, Secretary of the Richard III Society (replying to Evans’ letter of 19 January 1965), pointed out that it was not proven that Richard III murdered his nephews and argued that they were probably murdered by Henry VII.*</p>
24 January	<p>[Letter] ‘London “digs”’ <i>Sunday Times</i></p> <p>The Chairman of the City of London’s Library and Museum Committee, C Skilbeck commented on the wanton destruction of London’s archaeological heritage (see 17 January 1965), pointing out that in 1950 the City of London appointed a ‘full-time archaeologist’ and that summary results of fieldwork were now being published annually in the <i>Journal of Roman Studies</i> and the <i>Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeology Society</i>. Authors’ comments: the archaeologist referred to was Ivor Noël Hume, but by 1965 Peter Marsden held this post. In 1928 a field archaeologist for the City of London had been appointed by the Society of Antiquaries to monitor sites, but in 1937 this responsibility had reverted to the Guildhall Museum.*</p>

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
25 January	[Letters] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>The Times</i> E G Nugee disputed Marnau’s (19 January 1965) call for Anne to have a Roman Catholic burial service, claiming she was a member of the <i>ecclesia anglicana</i> , the forerunner of the Church of England (see letter, <i>The Times</i> 19 September 2012).
26 January	[News in brief] ‘Anne Mowbray’s coffin’ <i>The Times</i> The Home Office were awaiting a police report into the circumstances concerning the removal of Anne’s coffin from its find-spot.
31 January	[Letter] ‘Digging up London’s past’ <i>Sunday Times</i> A Golzen (see 17 and 24 January 1965) pointed out that field archaeology in the capital was seriously under-resourced.*
10 February	<i>Hansard</i> ‘Removal of Anne Mowbray remains’ [House of Lords debate] vol 263 cc120–3, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1965/feb/10/removal-of-anne-mowbray-remains (accessed 15 January 2017) Question in the House of Lords asking by what authority Anne’s remains were removed to the London Museum for examination.
ditto	‘What about Anne Mowbray’s relatives asks Peer’ <i>Yorkshire Evening Post</i> *
11 February	‘Lords question on Anne Mowbray’ <i>Guardian</i> *
ditto	[Yesterday in Parliament] ‘Mowbray coffin opened “without authority”’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> Lord Stonham the Under-Secretary at the Home Office pointed out the London Museum required a licence under 1857 Burial Act to move or open Anne’s coffin (which they did not possess). Heading: ‘We did not know – Museum Director Explains’, Dr Harden Director of the London Museum explained that they were unaware that they should have informed the Home Secretary and they should have applied for a licence.*
	‘Anne Mowbray casket moved without authority’ <i>The Times</i> Report on the House of Lord’s debate.*
18 February	<i>Hansard</i> ‘Removal of Anne Mowbray remains’ [House of Lords debate] vol 263 cc613–15, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1965/feb/18/removal-of-anne-mowbray-remains (accessed 15 January 2017) Question in the House of Lords asking for an explanation from the London Museum why they took ‘away without authority the coffin of Anne Mowbray’.
25 February	‘Lord Mowbray’s questions: concerns over the fate of remains’ <i>Evening Standard</i> Illustrations: Lord Mowbray.*
ditto	[Letter] ‘Anne Mowbray’s reburial: family concerns at delay’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> Lord Mowbray and Stourton asked as a member of her family: ‘1. Where is she now? 2. Are there any further experiments being carried out on her? 3. When is she going to be re-sealed in her lead coffin? 4. When is she going to be

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	reburied and where?’ He suggested she should be reburied alongside her husband in Westminster Abbey, ‘bearing in mind that she was a Catholic (as her family still are) she should be reburied by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster or some other priest of her religion as soon as possible.’
26 February	‘RC burial sought in abbey for Lady Anne’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> (follow-up from letter of previous day). A spokesman for Westminster Abbey was ‘non-committal’ about the idea of a Roman Catholic priest officiating in an abbey service. Reburial of Anne’s remains was expected in 3 or 4 months’ time and ‘Dr Francis Celoria, archaeological field officer at the London Museum said a wide gap would be left in what could be a valuable piece of knowledge if the observations had to be halted at the present stage.’
2 March	[Letter] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> K Strugnell expressed concern over the indecent delay’ in reburying Anne’s remains and called for more respect for a member of the ‘Royal House of England’. Letter replying to Lord Mowbray’s letter of 25 February by Revd A W Edser, pointing out that if Anne was to be reburied alongside her husband in Westminster Abbey then the service should be carried out by a member of the Church of England rather than the Roman Catholic Church.
11 March	<i>Hansard</i> ‘Reinterment of Anne Mowbray remains’ [House of Lords debate] vol 264 cc182–5, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1965/mar/11/reinterment-of-anne-mowbray-remains (accessed 15 January 2017) Debate in the House of Lords over the reinterment of Anne’s remains.
12 March	‘Little Anne (from 500 years ago) starts new reburial row’ <i>Daily Express</i> 12/3/65*
ditto	[Yesterday in Parliament] ‘Peers perturbed at delay in reburial of princess’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> Strong feelings were expressed at the continuing delay in Anne’s reburial and the absence of a fixed date.*
	[Letter by Earl Fitzwilliam of Milton Northants] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> The letter is about the summons of his ancestor William Fitzwilliam of Sprotbrough which reads: [the Cipher of King Edward IV: ER top of letter] By the King. ‘Trusty and well beloved we grete you wele, And forsasmuche as We have determynd unto ourself to doo be solemnised a marriage the XV of Januarie next ensuing betwixt our right entirely beloved sone Richard Duc of York and our rite dere and entirely beloved cousin Anne daughter and heir unto oure right well beloved cousin John late Duc of Norffolk whom God pardone. We desiring the marriage of our said sone that day to be the more honoured by giving the ordre of knighthood to honourable persones of noblesse and notable leaven pray and desire you and nothelesse will and charge you that ye purvey and arredie yourself in all things that to a new knight doth appertayne the same day to worship [at] the same marriage in recevyng the said ordre by our hand whiche not only shall be unto you and all your posteritie a perpetual memoir

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	<p>of honour but also unto us a singular pleasure. Given under our signet at our palais of Westm: the iiiith day of Decembre.’ Authors’ comments: see LAA AMS 64 correspondence by Brian Spencer for more about this letter, for a new transcription and commentary see Watson 2015. The original letter is in a private collection and is not available for study (2015). In 1620 William Fitzwilliam became Baron Fitzwilliam of Liffer (County Donegal). In 1716 the third Baron was created Viscount Miltown (County Westmeath) and Earl Fitzwilliam (County Tyrone). In 1742 the third Earl and fifth Baron was created a British peer: Lord Fitzwilliam, Baron of Milton, Northamptonshire, see G E Cokayne (ed) <i>Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the United Kingdom</i> vol 3, 1890, London, 380–1. The tenth Earl (who wrote this letter), died in 1979 without a male heir and his titles became extinct.</p>
	<p>‘Lords rally to Anne Mowbray’s side: early reburial in abbey sought’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>Another call for Anne’s speedy reinterment.*</p>
8 April	<p>‘Mowbray body taken to hospital’ <i>Daily Sketch</i></p> <p>Anne’s remains were relocated from the London Museum to an un-named hospital, according to Celoria to give those studying her some peace and quiet.*</p>
13 April	<p><i>Hansard</i> ‘Re-interment of Anne Mowbray remains’ [House of Lords debate] vol 265 cc273–4, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1965/apr/13/re-interment-of-anne-mowbray-remains (accessed 15 January 2017)</p> <p>Question in the House of Lords asking if a date had been fixed yet for Anne’s reinterment.</p>
14 April	<p>‘Lady Anne’s re-burial’ <i>Daily Mirror</i>*</p>
ditto	<p>‘Anne Mowbray must be reburied by May 15: abbey licence issued’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i></p> <p>Lord Stonham announced yesterday in the House of Lords that the required licence had been issued by the Home Secretary (Sir Frank Soskice). Lord Mowbray inquired about RC rites for her reburial, but was told this was unlikely as it was her second (actually her third) interment.*</p>
	<p>‘Reburial date for child Duchess’; and [editorial] ‘Poor little rich girl’, a lament on Anne’s ‘treatment’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>Since her rediscovery: ‘the less than teenage heiress, ... might have been left to rest in peace. She was so until last December, when her leaded casket was roughly manhandled in a manner that, to put it mildly, was irregular. The remarkable story of how the proper authority, the Home Office, was for long left out of the picture was told last February by Lord Stonham in the Upper House. He was able yesterday to tell their Lordships of a happy sequel to this affair. The remains of the child after the pundits have finished their delvings will be interred in Westminster Abbey. What of serious historical or scientific value may have been achieved will be made public in an official report’.*</p>

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	[News from Parliament] ‘Child bride to be reburied in abbey’ <i>Northern Echo</i> *
12 May	‘Lady Anne’s reburial on May 31 st ’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> *
1 June	‘Child Duchess returns to abbey after 500 years’ <i>Daily Express</i> Illustration: Anne’s lead coffin lying in the Jerusalem Chamber before her reinterment.*
ditto	‘Re-interment of Anne Mowbray in Abbey: coffin near child husband’ <i>Daily Telegraph</i> Illustration: Anne’s lead coffin lying in the Jerusalem Chamber before her reinterment.*
	‘Anne Mowbray reburied in the abbey: candle-light ceremony last 10 minutes’ <i>The Times</i> *
31 December	‘The year in retrospect’ <i>The Times</i> 15 January 1965 included the identification of the remains of Anne Mowbray.
1966	
2 January	‘Teeth link with Tower Princes’ <i>Observer</i> An article is based on Rushton’s 1965 publication on Anne’s teeth. Illustration: diagram showing the suppressed second permanent molar in her upper and lower jaws, plus ‘Edward V’s’ suppressed second premolars in his lower jaw.*
9 August	<i>Hansard</i> ‘Remains of Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York’ [House of Lords debate] vol 276 cc1680–1, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1966/aug/09/remains-of-anne-mowbray-duchess-of-york (accessed 15 January 2017) Question in the House of Lords asking when the investigation of Anne Mowbray’s burial would be published. It was explained that the London Museum was producing a monograph on this subject, which it was expected would be published in the autumn of 1966.
1984	
1 August	[Letter] ‘Sailor’s requiem’ <i>The Times</i> Revd M T Evans pointing out that the recent Anglican reburial services of a sailor from the wreck of the <i>Mary Rose</i> (June 1984) and of Anne Mowbray (1965) both used the ‘Sarum Use’ Requiem pointing out that unless this is linked with a belief in purgatory (which is not part of Anglican doctrine) it is the incorrect form of service. Authors’ comments: the ‘Sarum Use’ Requiem is a 13th-century series of Roman Catholic services developed at Salisbury; its Requiem Mass was intended for the intercession of souls in purgatory.
1985	

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
15 January	<p>‘On this day’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>Rerun of 15 January 1965 story ‘Stepney coffin contains a Duchess of York’ with a note about her subsequent reburial.</p>
1987	
21 May	<p>[Front page] ‘Modern science convicts Richard III of murder’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>‘New evidence’ that the supposed remains of the ‘Princes in the Tower’ were genuine based on Theya Molleson’s 1987 work which supposedly confirmed from the apparent ages of the two juveniles that they had probably died during 1484, and therefore must have been murdered by Richard III. This is an over-interpretation of Molleson’s (1987) analysis. She pointed out that using two different methods of dental age determination, the median age range of the older juvenile was 14.5 and 11.6 years and for the younger one 9.6 and 7.8 years. She also recalculated their ages from their skeletal maturity (trying to correcting the figures for retardation using Anne’s Mowbray’s data) the older juvenile was aged to between 13.5–14.5 years and the younger to between 11.5–12.5 years. The latter set of figures would indicate that, assuming these juveniles were Prince Edward and his younger brother Richard, they died between c.1484 and 1487. None of these estimates were precise enough to establish 1484 as the probable date for their deaths (see below 2015).</p>
1993	
12 July	<p>[Archaeology] ‘DNA tests may identify Princes in the Tower’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>It was argued that the successful DNA profiling used to identify the remains of the last Tsar could also be used to confirm the identity of the supposed remains of the ‘Princes in the Tower’. Based on Molleson’s (1987) work a ‘family resemblance’ between Anne Mowbray and the two juveniles was claimed.</p>
2007	
3 January	<p>[Obituary] ‘Lord Mowbray, Segrave and Stourton (1923–2006)’ <i>The Times</i></p> <p>His ancestor the 20th Lord Stourton acquired the baronies of Mowbray and Segrave in 1877; Mowbray thought that he was actually descended from Anne Mowbray and wanted the analytical work on her remains curtailed and campaigned for her immediate reburial.</p>
2011	
	<p>[28 November–4 December] ‘Stepney’s secret, the child princess who lay undisturbed for 500 years’ <i>News from Tower Hamlets Council and Your Community</i></p> <p>A rather confusing account of the lives of Anne and her husband. Illustration:</p>

Date	Reference, plus Notes and Comments
	Millais's Princes in the Tower.
2012	
19 September	[Letter] 'Abbey precedent' <i>The Times</i> B Watson on how Anne's reburial in Westminster Abbey provided a contemporary Plantagenet parallel for Richard III's reburial in the abbey.
ditto	[Letter] 'Follow that king' <i>The Times</i> E G Nugee points out that in 1964 he wrote to <i>The Times</i> arguing that Anne was not a Roman Catholic but 'a member of <i>ecclesia anglicana</i> , the continuity of which with the Church of England was unbroken'. Authors' comments: a curious argument that completely ignores the English Reformation.
2013	
5 February	'Now DNA team turn to Princes in the Tower' <i>The Times</i>
6 February	'Why the Princes in the Tower are staying six feet under' <i>Guardian</i>
2015	
28 March	[Archaeology] 'Unpicking bones of the princes' murder' <i>The Times</i> Following the reburial of Richard III in Leicester Cathedral, there has been another call for the supposed remains of his two nephews to be re-examined 'and the thesis of his culpability tested'. It cited the 21 May 1987 <i>The Times</i> article, which argued from Theya Molleson's re-appraisal of the 1933 skeletal data that the two juveniles were probably killed during 1484.

3. Catalogue of Journal or Magazine Articles and Items concerning Anne Mowbray
 Items marked with an asterisk (*) are included in the Museum of London Archaeological Archive (LAA) AMS 64 archive.

Date	Reference plus Notes and Comments
18 May 1940	<p>‘Tower of London’ <i>Picture Show</i>, 10</p> <p>An illustrated review of the Hollywood film directed by Rowland V Lee. One of the stills from the film depicted Anne’s wedding; the caption reads: ‘Edward’s determination to get the Norfolk wealth into the royal family somehow results in the wedding of his tiny son, Richard to Anne the Norfolk heiress’.</p>
23 January 1965	<p>‘Around Britain’ <i>Illustrated London News</i> no. 6547, no page nos</p> <p>Includes a photograph of part of the London Museum exhibition about Anne’s burial. It depicted the top half of her coffin and its inscription, above which was a large-scale vertical photograph of her opened coffin.</p>
May 1965	<p>Melhuish, J M, ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>Ricardian</i> 12, 2–5</p> <p>A short account of Anne’s life and rediscovery.</p>
23 May 1965	<p>‘The world of Lady Anne Mowbray’ <i>Observer Magazine</i> supplement, 10–19</p> <p>Major illustrated feature by P Murray Kendall; illustrations included an 1822 engraving of Northcote’s painting, a view of her unopened coffin and colour portraits of her in-laws including Elizabeth Woodville, Edward IV and the National Portrait Gallery portrait of Richard III. *</p>
5 June 1965	<p>‘Around Britain’ <i>Illustrated London News</i> no. 6566, no page nos</p> <p>Included a photograph of Anne’s coffin in the Jerusalem Chamber before her reburial.</p>
1965	<p>Langdon-Davis, J, (ed) <i>Richard III and the Princes in the Tower</i> Jackdaw Series 24, London</p> <p>A collection of facsimiles of various contemporary documents with commentaries including modern views of Anne’s remains.</p>
1965	<p>Rushton, M A, ‘The teeth of Anne Mowbray’ <i>Brit Dental J</i> 119, 355–9</p> <p>Illustrations: various photos and radiographs of Anne’s teeth. *</p>
1966	<p>Celoria, F, ‘Burials and archaeology: a survey of attitudes to research’ <i>Folklore</i> 77, 161–83</p> <p>Dr Francis Celoria organiser of the research on Anne’s remains commented that her discovery ‘produced not only a surge of curiosity but also strong criticism of those who moved and studied her remains’. He also admitted that pressure for Anne’s rapid reburial had resulted in</p>

Date	Reference plus Notes and Comments
	‘a truncated and sketchy programme of research’.*
1970	<p>Celoria, F, 1970 ‘The archaeologist and science’ <i>Sci Archaeol</i> 1, 4–8</p> <p>This was the first issue of a short-lived quarterly newsletter which he edited. This article consists of a number of case studies of scientific analysis of archaeological material including the work carried out on Anne’s hair and lead coffin.*</p>
1971	<p>Stafford, F, ‘Insects of a medieval burial, <i>Sci Archaeol</i> 7, 6–10</p> <p>This article was produced by Francis Celoria under a pen name (he lived in Stafford). It discussed the insect remains recovered from Anne’s burial, which were identified by the Dept of Entomology at the Natural History Museum.*</p>
June 1978	<p>Jones, F, ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>Ricardian</i> 4, no. 61, 17–20</p> <p>An account of Anne’s life, rediscovery and reburial.</p>
September 1978	<p>Hampton, W E, ‘The ladies of the Minories’ <i>Ricardian</i> 4, no. 62, 15–22</p> <p>An account of the lives some of the widows who resided at this monastic house, including Anne’s mother the dowager duchess of Norfolk.</p>
June 1981	<p>Crawford, A, ‘The Mowbray inheritance’ <i>Ricardian</i> 5, no. 73, 334–40</p> <p>The background to Anne’s inheritance and its claimants.</p>
1986	<p>Warwick, R, ‘Anne Mowbray: skeletal remains of a medieval child’ <i>London Archaeol</i> 5, 176–9</p> <p>Illustrations: Anne’s unopened coffin, selective elements of her skeleton including skull and sacrum, femora and metacarpal bones. *</p>
ditto	<p>[Letter by J Rogers & T Waldron] ‘Anne Mowbray’ <i>London Archaeol</i> 5, 232</p> <p>Concerning an aspect of Warwick’s article disputing that the distal epiphyses of the first metacarpals is a rare abnormality.*</p>
1987	<p>Molleson, T, ‘Anne Mowbray and the Princes in the Tower: a study in identity’ <i>London Archaeol</i> 5, 258–62</p> <p>Illustrations included a family tree showing Anne’s kinship with Edward IV’s sons and age determination tables.*</p>

Date	Reference plus Notes and Comments
September 1998	<p>Ashdown-Hill, J, ‘The missing molars: a genealogical conundrum’ <i>Ricardian</i> 11, no. 142, 340–3</p> <p>A preliminary account of the congenital absence of teeth in both the adult female burial (CFII) from Norwich Carmelite priory (believed to be Lady Eleanor Talbot) and her niece Anne Mowbray.</p>
March 2001	<p>Ashdown-Hill, J, ‘Norfolk requiem: the passing of the House of Mowbray’ <i>Ricardian</i> 12, no. 152, 198–217</p> <p>It includes a transcription of the will of the Anne’s mother, the dowager Duchess of Norfolk.</p>
March 2005	<p>Moorhen, W, ‘Anne Mowbray: in life and death’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i>, 24–6</p> <p>Another account of Anne’s life, rediscovery and the subsequent problems. Illustration: an engraving of Northcote’s painting of Anne’s wedding.</p>
September 2009	<p>White, B, ‘Anne Mowbray: publication at last’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i>, 14–16</p> <p>Bill describes his ongoing attempt to research and publish Anne’s burial.</p>
September 2010	<p>Watson, B, ‘Anne Mowbray: Duchess of York: her place in history’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i>, 32–3</p> <p>The context of Anne’s burial within the Minorities.</p>
2010	<p>Watson, B, ‘Findspot: Anne Mowbray: royal child bride’ <i>London Archaeol</i> 12, 235–6</p> <p>Illustrations: Northcote’s painting (colour), Anne’s unopened coffin and 1965 research team around the opened coffin.*</p>
December 2012	<p>Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Initial reflections and press coverage’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i>, 39–47</p> <p>The first of a series of quarterly reviews of media coverage concerning the rediscover of the remains of Richard III ‘the king in the car park’ and their subsequent analysis. Later reviews focused on the discussion concerning his reputation, his theatrical portrayal, the legal dispute over his intended place of reburial and his reinterment in March 2015.</p>
2013	<p>Watson, B, ‘The princess in the police station’ <i>Brit Archaeol</i> May/June</p>

Date	Reference plus Notes and Comments
	no. 130, 20–3 Illustrations including: Anne’s opened and unopened coffin, Northcote’s painting (colour) and an 18th-century engraving of Edward IV’s burial vault. *
March 2013	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘The king in the car park crowned: initial reflections on the press and television coverage’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 38–44
June 2013	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Here or there: the debate over the reburial of Richard III and the ongoing press and television coverage’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 46–50
ditto	‘Anne Mowbray: the princess in the police station’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 56–7 Illustration: Anne’s unopened coffin.
September 2013	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Richard III: further debate and discord in his ongoing press and media coverage’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 47–9
December 2013	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Richard III: further media alterations mainly concerning the location and design of his tomb’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 31–3
March 2014	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Richard III: the king in the courts (not the car park), further legal and media controversy’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 29–33
June 2014	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Media review, Richard III: the king still in contention compared with the king who burnt the cakes’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 34–8
September 2014	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Richard III: the legal end of the “Wars of the Roses” as the High Court decides that he should be reburied in Leicester’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 31–6
December 2014	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Richard III: the king in the car park portrayed as the “office psychopath”, a glutton and a “Stars Wars character”’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 45–50
2015	Watson, B, ‘An invitation to the wedding of Richard, Duke of York’ <i>Ricardian</i> 25, 55–9 The publication of a transcription, photograph and commentary on the 1477 invitation first published in the <i>Daily Telegraph</i> 12 March 1965.
March 2015	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Media review, Richard III: his DNA reveals a historic sex scandal at court and his reburial creates more controversy’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 26–31
June 2015	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Media review, “the return of the king” to Bosworth and reinterment in Leicester Cathedral’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 45–51

Date	Reference plus Notes and Comments
September 2015	Watson, B, & Wheeler, G, ‘Media review, Richard III wins <i>BBC History</i> Poll’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 40–3
December 2016	Ashdown-Hill, J, ‘Hypodontia and the bones from the Tower of London’ <i>Ricardian Bull</i> , 36–7 It was suggested that Anne’s congenital dental anomaly might have been inherited from her maternal aunt Eleanor Butler (née Talbot). Illustration: facial reconstruction of Anne.

4. CATALOGUE OF BOOKS ABOUT ANNE MOWBRAY’S LIFE

Date	Reference and Comments
2014	<p data-bbox="456 300 1325 394">Roberts, M, <i>Lady Anne Mowbray: The High and Excellent Princess, the child bride of a prince in the Tower</i> (revised edition first published 2013), Scunthorpe</p> <p data-bbox="456 415 1344 678">This is the only book about Anne’s life and was produced as a spinoff from <i>The Mowbray Legacy</i> (2004) by the same author. It included Anne’s family tree, an account of the discovery of her remains in 1964 and the ensuing problems, which the author contrasted with the 2012 discovery of Richard III’s remains. She concluded: ‘in the light of current events, might it not be reasonable to think that, in spite of being found half a century before his [Richard III], and their discovery having been followed by five months of heated controversy, the child’s remains did after all, fare better?’ (p 77).*</p>

5. CATALOGUE OF MUSEUM OF LONDON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARCHIVE REPORTS (LAA AMS 64) AND RELATED DOCUMENTS CONCERNING ANNE MOWBRAY

Correspondence

Only selective key items are individually mentioned. Material present includes copies of recent letters sent by the late Bill White and Bruce Watson to Francis Celoria and others.

LETTERS SENT AND RECEIVED BY DR DONALD B HARDEN (DIRECTOR OF THE LONDON MUSEUM IN 1965)

This material includes inquiries from the public, correspondence with the Home Office concerning obtaining the burial licence for Anne Mowbray's remains and the arrangements for her reburial in Westminster Abbey.

On 8 February 1965 the Home Office wrote explaining that the removal of Anne's remains from St Clare Street was unlawful without 'either a licence of a faculty'.

On 5 March 1965 the Home Office confirmed that they would only issue a burial licence if a number of conditions were met including no 'further interference with the remains' and reburial of Anne's remains within her original lead coffin as soon as possible.

Harden sent (8 March 1965) a detailed reply to this letter that included their 'investigation aims' and outlined the 'practical difficulties of haste' which would be caused by the premature ending of the ongoing scientific investigation. Authors' comments: this document was presumably written by Celoria, it appears to have been completely ignored by the Home Office.

On 12 April 1965 the burial licence was received (copy not on file).

LETTERS BY BRIAN SPENCER (ASSISTANT KEEPER AT THE LONDON MUSEUM IN 1965 AND SUBSEQUENTLY A MEDIEVAL CURATOR AT THE MUSEUM OF LONDON)

These letters span the period 1965–82, most dealing with inquiries from members of the public asking about the publication of Anne Mowbray's remains, but several in 1965 concern the photography of the 1477 Fitzwilliam summons (see below; Watson 2015).

One letter (13 July 1965) stated that the paper the summons is written on has a flagon watermark, which marks several French examples dating to 1474–80. It also explained that William Fitzwilliam was not one of those who were knighted on 17 January 1477, so he presumably did not attend.

Another letter dated 17 February (the year is missing from the carbon copy, but it was probably c.1967–8) asked if the Metropolitan Police Forensic Laboratory would help identify 'fibres' initially considered to be 'threads' but subsequently thought more likely to be hair samples apparently recovered from Anne's coffin fill.

LETTERS FROM DR FRANCIS CELORIA

Two letters addressed to Arthur Trotman (13 July 1964 and 24 July 1966) discussed the facial arrangement of Anne's cerecloth and her pillow. Authors' comments: the intended date of the first letter obviously should be 1966.

Two letters addressed to Brian Spencer discussed the publication of the Anne Mowbray burial. The first dated 15 July 1973 stated that the HMSO monograph was to be jointly edited by Francis and Brian, the number of contributors was not mentioned, but it was noted that two reports were still awaited and that the length of the publication was expected to be over 100,000 words. In the second letter dated 19 October 1982 Celoria stated that: 'I am pretty sure we have got most of the material'. He also inquired if Brian was 'happy with the original material' he had produced on 'Anne's background'.

A letter (4 October 1998) from Celoria to the Director of the Museum of London stated that: 'this letter is another attempt to get the Museum of London to publish, in whatever form it chooses the report of the findings of the remains of Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York, compiled by Brian Spencer and myself. An attempt is made to sketch for you the problems that have hindered publication. A brief proposal is made to offer what Brian and I would edit into camera-ready final or disc form for you to publish for the museum shop.' Authors' comments: a reply was sent by Hedley Swain then Head of Early London History and Collections of the Museum of London on 12 October 1998, offering to discuss the matter, but Celoria never replied to his letter. It is quite possible that the late Brian Spencer (died 2003) during his retirement was asked by Celoria to help complete the Anne Mowbray publication, but there is no evidence he actually worked on it.

On 17 June 2009 Bruce Watson wrote to Celoria (via registered post) explaining that he was compiling material relating to Anne Mowbray's burial with a view to publishing it and invited Celoria to contribute to the project. Celoria's reply (23 June 2009) stated he was 'not sitting on any material' and that as 'so much material had been made publicly available' he had 'resolved just to produce a general essay on burial methods. ... This was drafted some years ago...' and this was apparently the manuscript he had written to the Director about publishing in 1998.

Photographs

There are 410 photographs (mostly black and white) including Anne's coffin (opened and unopened), site photographs, plus detailed shots of her hair, skull *etc.* There are also working views of the research team. These are catalogued in a modern image register. Numbers 249–51 are black and white 4 x 6in prints of the 1477 Fitzwilliam summons to Anne's wedding and nos 252–3 are the reverse of the same document (see *Daily Telegraph* 12 March 1965). This collection includes a black and white negative (no. 254) of a painting depicting the head of a girl with shoulder length dark hair. It is believed to depict Anne, and it is signed 'G M'.

Draft Copies of London Museum Documents

Only one of these typescripts is dated, but they were all produced by Dr Francis Celoria during December 1964 or January 1965.

LEAD COFFIN FOUND IN ST CLARE STREET, STEPNEY ON 11 DECEMBER 1964

This appears to a preliminary version of the January 1965 press release, it also lists all the scientific equipment required for the study of Anne's remains including test tubes and trays.

PROGRAMME OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ON BURIAL; STEPNEY BURIAL PROCEDURE FOR OPENING (SUNDAY 20 DECEMBER 1964)

These two documents explain the proposed research aims in some detail. These aims included the following: the ‘detailed description’ of the burial; the metallurgy and workmanship of Anne’s coffin; examination of her hair, nails and body tissue; facial reconstruction; blood group determination; osteology; study of any artefacts present; and analysis of the coffin silts for chemical residues, parasites, plant remains, seeds and pollen. Authors’ comments: clearly most of these research topics were begun, but how many were completed is uncertain from the available material. Anne’s cerecloth is not mentioned as a research topic so these documents were obviously written before the coffin was opened: as body ‘tissue’ investigation was listed as an aim it was clearly expected that organic preservation would be much better than it actually was.

Copies of London Museum Documents

Date	Reference and Comments
1965	
15 January	[Joint press release on the Stepney child bride] Produced by the London Museum and Westminster Abbey (release date 15 January 1965).
	Copies of a rubbing of the coffin inscription, an English typescript and Latin version (hand written).
	‘Anne Mowbray: the teeth’ by M A Rushton, unpublished report Illustrated typescript on which the published article in <i>British Dental Journal</i> 119 was closely based
1966	‘The metallurgy of the lead coffin of Anne Mowbray’ by H C Harris, unpublished report by Perivale Laboratories
	‘An examination of the hair from the exhumed body of Anne Mowbray’ by A W Holmes (compiler), typescript of unpublished report by Unilever Research Laboratory team
	‘The Stepney burial: the conservation and technical considerations’ by A Trotman, London Museum typescript
c.1967	‘Who was Anne Mowbray?’ by B Spencer, unpublished typescript manuscript Some of the various chapter endnotes were later revised probably during the 1980s or 90s as they have been word processed.

Copies of Other Documents

Date	Reference and Comments
No date (est 1960s or 70s)	‘The historical finds (medieval and Roman) excavated from 14–18 St Clare Street, Minories, EC3’ by W J J Winmill, unpublished Illustrated typescript. Illustrations include the only plan showing the location of the vault where Anne’s burial was discovered and the various medieval wall foundations of the Minories church. Authors’ comments: Winmill was the ‘general foreman’ during ground works and compiled the only available account of the archaeological discoveries.
2007	‘The discovery in 1964 of the leaden coffin of Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York and Norfolk’ vol 1; ‘Anne Mowbray: the forgotten princess’ vol 2, by D Thorn, unpublished typescripts

6. CATALOGUE OF ANNE MOWBRAY MATERIAL INCLUDED IN BOOKS, EXHIBITION CATALOGUES ETC

Date	Reference and Comments
1840	<p>Black, W H, (ed) ‘Narrative of the marriage of Richard Duke of York and Anne of Norfolk: the matrimonial feast and jousting AD 1477’ in <i>Illustrations of Ancient State and Chivalry</i>, London</p> <p>This is an excellent eye witness account of Anne’s wedding and the associated festivities.</p>
1923	<p>Scofield, C L, <i>The Life and Reign of Edward the Fourth: King of England and of France and Lord of Ireland</i> (reprinted 2016 by Fonthill Media UK), Stroud</p> <p>Vol 2, mentions Anne’s marriage (pp 203–6) and her death (p 323).</p>
1973	<p>Tudor-Craig, P, (ed) <i>Richard III: Catalogue for Exhibition, 17th June–7th October</i> National Portrait Gallery, London</p> <p>A cast of the inscription on Anne’s coffin was exhibited. This is the definitive Latin text (no. 69, 32).</p>
1973	<p>Clive, M, <i>The Sun of York</i>, London</p> <p>Pages 243–4 succinctly outline the background to Anne’s wedding, her burial and rediscovery in 1965. On the matter of Anne’s reburial she observed that: ‘the whole incident, which would appear far-fetched in the pages of a comic novel, demonstrates the peculiar obstacles which are strewn in the way of a simple historian’.</p>
1975	<p>Hanham, A, (ed) <i>The Cely Letters 1472–1488</i> Early English Text Soc no. 273, Oxford</p> <p>Richard Cely in a letter written in London on 22 November 1481 to George Cely at Calis records the death of Anne: ‘byt my zeunge lady of zeurke ys dead’ (p 124, no. 136/41)</p>
1978	<p>Jenkins, E, <i>The Princes in the Tower</i>, London</p> <p>Pages 118–19 describe the Duke of York’s wedding; pages 132–3 mention Anne’s death, and illustrations include Anne’s skull within her open coffin.</p>
1988	<p>Powers, R, ‘Appendix 4: A tool for coping with juvenile human bones from archaeological excavations’ in W White <i>Skeletal Remains from the Cemetery of St Nicolas Shambles, City of London</i> London and Middlesex Archaeological Society Special Papers 9, London</p> <p>Pages 74–8, Anne Mowbray’s data is included in this osteological study, see fig 59.*</p>
1993	<p>Weir, A, <i>The Princes in the Tower</i>, London</p> <p>It includes surprisingly little material on Anne’s life and wedding (p 46). Fig 17 is a close-up of Anne’s skull. This was reprinted in 2014 as <i>Richard III & the Princes in the Tower</i> with a new forward.</p>
1998	<p>Werner, A, (compiler) ‘The little princess: Lady Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York (1471–81)’ in <i>London Bodies: The Changing Shape of Londoners from Prehistoric Times to the Present Day</i> Museum of London Exhibition Catalogue, London, 69–70</p> <p>Illustrations include colour photos of Anne’s hair, her skull inside her coffin and her</p>

Date	Reference and Comments
	remains ready for reburial, plus black and white photos of her unopened and open coffin.
2002	Molleson, T, ‘Anne Mowbray and the skeletons in the Tower’ in P Bahn, (ed) <i>Written in Bones: How Human Remains Unlock the Secrets of the Dead</i> , London, 151–4
2003	Wroe, A, <i>Perkin: A Story of Deception</i> , London Page 62 discusses the marriage of Richard of York and Anne Mowbray and her death is mentioned on page 63.
2004	Horrox, R, ‘Richard, Duke of York and Duke of Norfolk (1473–1483)’ in H C G Matthew & B Harrison, (eds) <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> vol 46, Oxford Anne’s marriage and her death are mentioned (pp 713–14).
2004	Richmond, C, ‘Mowbray John (VII), fourth Duke of Norfolk’ in H C G Matthew & B Harrison, (eds) <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> vol 39, Oxford Anne’s marriage is discussed in this account of her parent’s life (pp 583–5).
2007	Baldwin, D, <i>The Lost Prince: The Survival of Richard Duke of York</i> , Stroud Pages 50–4 describe the duke’s wedding and the associated events, based on Black (1840).
2010	Thomas, C, & Watson, B, 2010 ‘The Mendicant Houses of medieval London: an archaeological review’ in N Rogers (ed) <i>Harlaxton Medieval Studies</i> 19, Donington, 265–97 It includes a conjectural ground plan of the London house of the Minoreesses, where Anne and her mother were both buried (pl 34).*
2015	Ashdown-Hill, J, <i>The Dublin King: The True Story of Edward Earl of Warwick, Lambert Simnel and the ‘Princes in the Tower’</i> , Stroud Pages 26–8 discuss the marriage of Richard of York and Anne Mowbray and their probable living arrangements within the royal household.
2015	Horspool, R, <i>Richard III: A Ruler and his Reputation</i> , London Page 125, describes Anne Mowbray’s wedding and page 185 explains how Theya Molleson (1987, see section 3) used Anne’s osteological data to reassess the age of the two juveniles believed to be the Princes in the Tower.
2016	Ashdown-Hill, J, <i>The Private Life of Edward IV</i> , Stroud Plate 29 is a facial reconstruction of Anne Mowbray. On page 196, it is claimed that the Duchess of Norfolk was pregnant with her second child at the time of her husband’s death and that she subsequently had a miscarriage. This claim is based on the author’s interpretation of Sir John Paston’s letter of 27 January 1476 (see below). Anne’s marriage is mentioned on page 203. ‘Appendix: The mtDNA sequence of the ‘Princes in the Tower’ by Glen Moran, repeats the statement that the presence of hypodontia in Anne and the two juveniles has been used to try and confirm the identity of the latter.
2016	Ashdown-Hill, J, <i>The Secret Queen: Eleanor Talbot the Woman who put Richard III</i>

Date	Reference and Comments
	<p><i>on the Throne</i>, Stroud</p> <p>Pages 245–51, discusses the congenital dental anomaly identified in Anne Mowbray’s teeth (see above Rushton 1965, section 3) and its potential to help identify the burial of her maternal aunt (Eleanor Talbot). It is suggested that as Richard III exhibited no sign of congenitally missing teeth, unlike the two juveniles from the Tower of London (believed to be Edward V and his younger brother Richard), he ‘had no blood relationship’ with these two individuals.</p>

7. CATALOGUE OF ANNE MOWBRAY MATERIAL INCLUDED IN THE PASTON LETTERS

Anne is briefly mentioned a number of times in the Paston letters. The first two references are actually pre-natal as the pregnancy of the Duchess of Norfolk was obviously a matter of considerable public interest in East Anglia, but Anne’s death was not mentioned.

Source: Gairdner, J (ed), 1986 <i>The Paston Letters</i> 6 vols, Gloucester (reprint of 1904 edn)	
Reference	Quotation/Comments
Vol 5, p 143, letter no. 804, John Paston to Sir John Paston, 5 June 1472	‘Lady Norfolk is with child’.
Vol 5, pp 155–6, letter no. 812, Sir John Paston to John Paston, 4 November 1472	Sir John is concerned that when he recently met the Duchess of Norfolk and discussed her pregnancy he was inadvertently rude or over-familiar with her.
Vol 5, p 158, letter no. 813, Sir John Paston to John Paston, 8 November 1472	Sir John wants John to pass on his good wishes to the Duchess of Norfolk, who is about to start her ‘lying-in’.
Vol 5, pp 171–2, letter no. 823, John Paston to Sir John Paston, 18 December 1472	Reporting that the duchess’s child ‘Anne’ has been christened by William of Wainfleet, Bishop of Winchester at Framlingham and he is also one of her godparents.
Vol 5, p 250, letter no. 884, Sir John Paston to John Paston, 27 January 1476	Sir John writing after the unexpected death of the Duke of Norfolk states: ‘God sende my Lady off Norffolk a soone, for upon that restythe the moche mater: ffor if the Kynys soone mary my lords dowghter, the Kynge wolde that hys soone sholde have a ffayr place in Norfolk ...’ In other words he thinks or hopes that the Duchess of Norfolk is pregnant with a male heir or King Edward will seek to marry Anne to one of his sons to secure her wealth.
Vol 5, p 310, letter no. 812, John Paston to Sir John Paston, 21 January 1478	‘... but we wold fayne here of all your royalte at London, as of the maryage of my Lord of York’, referring to the marriage of Richard Duke of York to Anne Mowbray.
Vol 6, p 24, letter no. 917, John Paston to Sir John Paston, 6 November 1479	‘My Lord and Lady of York’ are mentioned in connection with the wardship of John Clippesby.

8. CATALOGUE OF ANNE MOWBRAY MATERIAL IN THE WELLCOME TRUST RECORDS

This material is filed under the ‘History of Medicine’, group no. 1.11, file 8216 (archive section at Euston Road, London, NW1). Copies of this correspondence have been added to the Museum of London Archaeological Archive collection. In June 1966 Dr Francis Celoria of the Department of Extramural Studies at Keele University was awarded a grant of £500 towards the secretarial assistance with his editorial work connected with the production of an HMSO monograph on the remains of Anne Mowbray. It was noted on the grant approval that ‘more than half the report deals with medical or pharmaceutical aspects of the study’.

Date	Correspondence/Comments
1966	
8 May	Celoria to Dr Poynter explaining some of the background about the Anne Mowbray publication: ‘more than half the report will be medical or pharmaceutical. ... For example Mr Leslie Matthews has done an excellent chapter on the apothecarial knowledge of Anne’s day. Professors in London teaching hospitals are writing reports on the anatomy, radiognosy [presumably radioscopy] etc. ... Unilever’s laboratories have spent thousands on producing a report on Anne’s hair.’ It was stated that the publication would be an HMSO monograph ‘over 100,000 word long’, which it was hoped would be published by the end of 1967. Also it was stated that a textile research firm had examined the ‘linen shroud’.
10 May	Letter from Dr F N L Poynter, Director of the Wellcome Trust, explaining the application procedure to Celoria.
13 May	Celoria to Dr Williams explaining some aspects of the Anne Mowbray publication such as ‘the editing of the work of over 60 persons is a complex matter’ and he provided a detailed breakdown the projected costs (total £485 10s).
16 May	Letter from Poynter, seeking additional details about Celoria’s ‘standing’ and background from Dr P O Williams.
20 May	Reply to Dr Poynter from Dr Williams explain that Celoria was ‘well known in archaeological circles’ and was now helping establish a new archaeology department at Keele University.
17 June	Letter of grant approval for £500.
27 June	Letter of thanks from Celoria thanking them for approving his grant application.