

10. Not Chatting but Discussing

What did Elizabeth and Richard talk about? c1399-c1413

Why, when between friends, discussion is the very stuff of life should it have such potential danger within families? ... the deft avoidance of all those rogue subjects that can shatter the smooth passage of a meal, an outing, the three days of Christmas. By the collusion of all parties, they have to be smothered for the sake of appearances.

Penelope Lively, *The Road to Lichfield*, 1983

Way back in chapter 1, I described visiting the effigies of the Redmayns in All Saints Church and wondering what they talked about as a family. Since then, I've suggested some of the conversations that Richard and Elizabeth may have had. Richard's political and military career must have been a running thread and Elizabeth and her sister, Sybil, likely discussed Elizabeth's widowhood, the suitors who came to Harewood hoping for marriage to the newly-wealthy heiress, her decision to marry Richard. A third group of conversations were the 'rogue subjects' that Penelope Lively identified as creating 'potential danger within families'. Three of those 'rogue subjects', which were amongst the most difficult issues Elizabeth and Richard ever discussed, are the subjects of this chapter.

Given the seriousness of these topics, I think that lengthy, emotional and even rancorous discussions within the wider family must have been inevitable though, in suggesting this interpretation, I'm aware that I'm contradicting William Greenwood who wrote in his family history in 1905 '*the Redmans and Rythers appear to have occupied the castle of Harewood alternately, under an amicable arrangement which worked smoothly for many generations*'.

Greenwood's comforting idea of an amicable 'happy families' relationship between the Redmayns and the Rythers is repeated in such diverse places as Mark Punshon's doctoral thesis on political society in the West Riding and in *The Lord Lieutenants and High Sheriffs of Yorkshire 1066-2000*, edited by Professor Mark Ormrod. The trouble is that there's no contemporary evidence to support this statement but there is evidence to suggest friction between the Redmayns and the Rythers in the early fifteenth century. In fact 'amicable' is one of the last words I'd use to describe their relationship.

Being able to identify these three deeply problematical family issues has come as something of a surprise as no letters survive to tell us what Elizabeth and Richard wrote to each other and, by implication, talked about. However, these issues are revealed by a handful of entries in administrative documents and they're so central to the Redmayns' lives that I'm completely confident they did discuss them – and that, by exploring these discussions we can develop insights into Richard and Elizabeth's relationship and into the characters of Richard and Elizabeth and also Sybil and her husband, William Ryther.

One final paragraph by way of introduction – the years covered by this chapter were the core years of Richard's and Elizabeth's marriage. During this period they became the parents of four or more

children, Richard moved from being 45 years of age to around 60, Elizabeth from 35 to 50. They were mature, experienced, capable and responsible but that didn't make dealing with one of the most intractable and infuriating problems we all face – family – any easier. The issues they discussed also involved three members of the next generation – Elizabeth and Richard's eldest son, Matthew Redmayn, Elizabeth's son by her first marriage, Brian Stapleton and also William and Sybil Ryther's son, another William Ryther. Happily, this surge of people won't all arrive at once – I'll introduce them gradually, making the family dynamics and stresses much easier to follow!

Talking about ... their troublesome nephew

The first 'rogue subject' that reveals all was not 'happy families' at Harewood castle revolves around young William Ryther, son of Elizabeth's sister Sybil and her husband Sir William Ryther and therefore Elizabeth and Richard Redmayn's nephew.

The evidence that leads me to believe that young William was the focus of much heavy-duty family discussion is a single entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls for 8th August 1405:

Pardon to William, son of William de Ryther, knight, for all treasons, insurrections, rebellions, misprisions and felonies committed by him against the king and his royalty; and pardon to him of the forfeiture of his lands and goods.

The date of August 1405 suggests that William (who was in his early 20s) had been involved in one of the rebellions against Henry IV, possibly the protests led by Archbishop Scrope in York but more likely, given the Rythers' links with the earl of Northumberland, the risings in north Yorkshire on behalf of the earl. Exactly which rising it was, however, is less important than Richard Redmayn's reactions to William's involvement. As one of the men commissioned by the king to deal with the rebels in Yorkshire, Richard was probably deeply embarrassed and angry to find his nephew involved in a rebellion which didn't 'just' threaten the king but Richard's own individual and family security.

Given the seriousness of William's actions, this must have been one of those 'rogue subjects' that had to be discussed, regardless of its impact on family relationships. Richard may not have seen much of young William since he'd married Elizabeth (around eight years earlier) as William, in all likelihood, had spent his teens serving in another gentry or noble household, but that's unlikely to have lessened his embarrassment and anger.

How it was discussed is, of course, entirely conjectural, but just identifying questions about their probable conversations suggests how serious an issue this may have been within the family.

- Did Richard discuss William's involvement in rebellion with Elizabeth first – seeking ideas on whether to approach Sybil and William or should he tackle young William first?
- Was Richard incandescently angry, exchanging strong words with young William's father and perhaps with his mother, Sybil?
- Did Richard have direct words with his nephew?
- How did the Rythers respond to criticism of their son?

- What did Richard and Elizabeth say to each other in private?
- Did Elizabeth play the role of mediator between Richard and her sister, Sybil?

How this was handled may well have depended on the relationship between the brothers-in-law, Richard Redmayn and William Ryther – and they may not have been natural allies and friends. Their careers suggest they were quite different characters and I do wonder how William felt about the arrival at Harewood of Richard Redmayn around 1397, given that Richard was an outsider to Yorkshire until his marriage to Elizabeth. By then William had been married to Sybil for the best part of twenty years and had been the ‘dominant male’ in the family since 1391 when Elizabeth’s first husband, Brian, had died and the sisters inherited Harewood. It wouldn’t be surprising if William resented Richard’s marriage to Elizabeth, his political prominence in Yorkshire and the appointments and rewards he received from the crown.

One thing they did have in common was their military experience. William took part in the invasion of Scotland in 1384, serving in the earl of Northumberland’s retinue alongside Sir Matthew Redmayn (Richard’s father) and perhaps Richard himself. He also spent time in the garrison at Berwick, as did Richard. However, in comparison with Richard, William’s public career was extremely limited. He was a member of minor commissions in Yorkshire in 1384 and 1390 – but that’s it! It’s a very thin record for the head of one of the wealthier gentry families in the West Riding, suggesting some combination of lack of energy, lack of ambition, illness or that those who made royal appointments had no confidence in his abilities. The contrast with Richard Redmayn couldn’t be greater. Richard continued to serve the crown until he was around 70 years old while William, who died by 1424, played no public roles in the last thirty years of his life.

It doesn’t look as if Richard and William were natural allies – and the most compelling evidence for their differences is still to come in the next few pages! It therefore wouldn’t be surprising if the younger William’s involvement in the risings of 1405 led to a decidedly frosty relationship between Richard and William senior but, whatever form the family conversations took – and however loud, angry or defensive they were – that entry in the Patent Rolls also tells us that young William was pardoned. Perhaps Richard Redmayn spoke on behalf of his nephew to smooth his path to pardon, maybe directly with King Henry as the pardon was issued while the king was still in Yorkshire.

If harsh words were said, they paid dividends. Young William Ryther went on to have a successful and loyal career, fighting in France for Henry V and being appointed Sheriff of Yorkshire four times, of Lincolnshire once and being elected a Knight of the Shire for Yorkshire for the 1426 Parliament. However, in 1405 that was all in the distant future. For the moment there may well have been careful planning to ensure that William stayed well away from his uncle Richard. Hopefully the situation was ameliorated by sympathy between Elizabeth and Sybil. That there was a sympathetic relationship between the sisters is suggested by my next topic, the deeply disturbing problem of the relationship between Sybil and her husband, William.

Talking about ... William Ryther’s abuse of his wife, Sybil

Only one of the effigies in All Saints Church at Harewood has been seriously damaged over the centuries, the effigy of Sybil Ryther, sister of Elizabeth Redmayn. Whether the damage was caused by the drip, drip, drip of water over an extremely long period of time or by some other means, Sybil’s

face has been completely worn away, only the shape of her right eye remaining, and a crack in the alabaster runs up through her cheek into her forehead. As a result, Sybil looks severely battered and mutilated, an all-too appropriate metaphor for her brutal experience of marriage to Sir William Ryther.

The evidence for his brutality comes in a single document recording the outcome of Sir William's appearance before Henry Bowet, Archbishop of York, at the archbishop's residence of Cawood, near York, on 18 March 1408. There Sir William took an oath that he would henceforth:

- do Sybil no bodily harm nor beat nor imprison her but keep her in freedom as a man of his degree ought to do with his wife, without doing or saying anything to harm her or her reputation.
- 'void' Marion of Grindon out of his company and out of Sybil's and their children's company as long as Sybil lives, and never have anything more to do with Marion by way of 'synne'.
- provide Sybil, her maidservant and her chamberer with food and drink appropriate to her estate.

This document (of which the bullet points above provide a partially modernised and abbreviated version) reveals a horrifying picture of William's treatment of Sybil – of violence, bullying, mental manipulation and degradation and some form of imprisonment or confinement which may have been intended to separate Sybil from her sister Elizabeth. Whether the imprisonment was at William's home at Ryther, twelve miles from Harewood, one of his other estates (perhaps Scarcroft, four miles from Harewood) or at Harewood itself, isn't stated. Sybil had also been on the receiving end of financial threats or intimidation from William related to Sybil's half share of Harewood, intended to boost his own income as the expense of Sybil and the Redmayns.

We can also infer that Sybil had suffered the humiliation of William setting up his lover, Marion of Grindon, at one of his homes or perhaps as a servant in Sybil's household. It would be easy to depict Marion as the 'femme fatale' cause of this horrific treatment of Sybil but in fact we know nothing about Marion. She too could have been a victim of William's violence for all we know.

How long had this abuse been taking place? There's no direct evidence but it may be that it began long before 1408, the date of the Archbishop's judgement. By then William and Sybil (who was in her early forties) had been married for perhaps twenty-five years so the abuse may have started much earlier. One reason for suggesting this is that resorting to the Archbishop's court would not have been the first response of Sybil or her family to the problem. To quote Professor Sara M Butler there is *'ample evidence to suggest that there existed an established process for dealing with marital violence. Victims of abuse had a variety of options available to them before even contemplating legal action. First, family members, friends and neighbours all expected to play an active role in the supervision of spousal violence, and did not hesitate to step in when required to remind an overly aggressive husband of his responsibilities towards his wife.'*

Thus it seems likely that Sybil's sister, Elizabeth and her husband, Richard Redmayn, made earlier efforts to intercede with William Ryther to protect Sybil and may have involved others who might have an influence on William. How long such interventions had been going on is, of course,

unknowable. During the 1380s, Elizabeth may not have seen Sybil very often because she [Elizabeth] was living on the estates of her first husband, Brian Stapleton. The sisters probably saw more of each other after 1391, the year of Brian's death and of Elizabeth and Sybil inheriting Harewood. Even then there may have been a period when William's violence was, to return to my opening quotation from Penelope Lively, 'smothered for the sake of appearances'. At some point, however, Elizabeth must have become aware of Sybil's suffering, perhaps heard and saw the sounds and signs of verbal and physical violence. Once married to Richard Redmayn, Elizabeth must have discussed William's treatment of Sybil with Richard because he's named in the document produced by the Archbishop's court as one of two formal witnesses to William Ryther's oath, the other witness being Henry Vavasour of Hazelwood castle (who I introduced in chapter 5 and suggested that he and his wife were friends of the Redmayns).

So what might have been the nature of the conversations between Elizabeth and Richard and who else could have been involved? The document as a whole plus its identification of Richard and Henry as the witnesses to William's oath suggests several possibilities:

- Conversations between Elizabeth and Richard may have first focussed on how bad William's treatment of Sybil was and why it was taking place, whether Sybil's suffering might get worse and at what point Elizabeth or both of them should talk to Sybil or to William.
- Richard supported Elizabeth's wish to protect her sister, suggesting a mutual support and closeness between Richard and Elizabeth. This is the clearest evidence of the nature of their relationship that we have.
- Elizabeth may well have talked to Sybil separately but at some stage conversations may have widened to include Henry Vavasour and, perhaps, his wife Margaret. Henry may have been involved because William Ryther held his estate at Scarcroft from Henry and because of the friendship between the Redmayns and Vavasours suggested in chapter 5.
- Elizabeth, Richard and the Vavasours were supportive of Sybil and discussed how best to protect her in future. Without this support, it seems unlikely that the issue would have been taken to the Archbishop's court.
- A crisis conversation may have taken place as a result of a particular incident (of violence or the imprisonment of Sybil?) that led to decision to take the issue to the Archbishop's court.

It's also possible that there was a strategic discussion about how to present the evidence of William's abuse of Sybil. This suggestion is prompted by two elements in the document. The first is the wording that William should treat Sybil in future '*as a man of his degree ought to do with his wife*'. This is targeting William's desire to be seen as man of 'honour'. To quote Professor Butler again '*Spousal abuse in the context of English communities in the late Middle Ages was as much about male honour as it was about wives as victims. An honourable man was one who demonstrated an ability to control his household, but without exceeding the boundaries of that power. In short, a good husband chastised his wife (or hoped that he would not need to); a poor husband beat her.*

The second relates to the comprehensive nature of the accusations against William. If he had 'only' been accused of violence against Sybil he could have argued that he was justified in beating her, that it was appropriate chastisement, but the accusation against him is far more wide-ranging – violence, the imprisonment, humiliation and economic deprivation of Sybil and his adultery with Marion of

Grindon. It seems possible that every detail was included, not just because they were true but to ensure that judgement went against William, and was the result of careful family discussion.

Sybil, therefore, had the support of her family. Although, as Professor Butler argues *'Spousal abuse, always horrific and sometimes fatal, was nevertheless not widespread in late medieval Yorkshire'*, when it did take place having family support was clearly vital, both practically, legally and psychologically. Further evidence of the extent of Richard Redmayn's support for his sister-in-law is provided by the fact that he appeared at the Archbishop's court in mid-March 1408 while also closely involved in political and military events at the same time. It's easy to compartmentalise the Redmayns' lives (separating political activities from social lives as I'm doing in these chapters!) but, like all of us, they had to juggle competing demands and this was one of those demanding times for Richard because, just a month earlier, the earl of Northumberland had led his supporters south into Yorkshire in yet another attempt to overthrow Henry IV.

This time, however, Northumberland had only been able to muster a small force for what has all the appearance of the last throw of the dice by a bitter and desperate elderly man. As a result, the king's Yorkshire retainers, headed by the county sheriff, Sir Thomas Rokeby, confronted Northumberland's force without waiting for the king's arrival. They cornered Northumberland's men near Tadcaster and defeated them in a brief battle at Bramham Moor on 19th February. Northumberland was killed, his threat to Henry IV finally over.

We don't know for certain that Richard Redmayn was alongside Rokeby at Bramham but it's highly likely that he was for several reasons:

- Richard had now been one of King Henry's leading supporters in Yorkshire for several years and had been sheriff himself in 1403-4
- He was one of the two knights of the shire elected from Yorkshire to the parliament of 1406 – the other being Thomas Rokeby.
- The battle of Bramham Moor took place almost in Richard's back garden as it was fought just five miles from Harewood.
- Two months later, in April, the king appointed a heavyweight commission to 'treat in the king's name with any of the king's lieges who lately rose in insurrection' and to ensure they paid the fines levied upon them. The commission was headed by the earl of Westmorland and included the Lord Chief Justice, William Gascoigne (the Redmayns' neighbour), Richard Redmayn and three more of the king's leading retainers in the north.

Richard was therefore heavily involved in the aftermath of Northumberland's rising and in attendance on the king (who was in Yorkshire from mid-March to late April) at the same time as his visit to the Archbishop's court in mid-March to deal with such a significant and delicate family issue. This clash of responsibilities underlines Richard's support for Elizabeth over William's abuse of her sister.

What happened in the following years we don't know. Anxiety and discussion over the relationship between Sybil and William must have continued as Elizabeth waited to see how her sister was being treated – would William Ryther really treat Sybil 'as a man of his degree ought to do with his wife'?

Perhaps Sybil lived apart from her husband who had his own estates and need not have been resident at Harewood. Perhaps, as a result, Richard and Elizabeth didn't see much of William Ryther after 1408. If so, I doubt they missed his company.

One final point in this section that hasn't fitted neatly into the flow of discussion above but is very relevant to Elizabeth and Richard – assuming that William Ryther's abuse of Sybil was of long-standing I wonder whether it influenced Elizabeth's thoughts on re-marriage in the 1390s and whether she accepted Richard as her husband because she was confident that he would not behave as William had to Sybil?

Talking about ... who will inherit Harewood?

The final topic for this chapter is the question of who would inherit Elizabeth's half-share in the Harewood estate. During the 1390s, Elizabeth's heir was Brian Stapleton, her son by her first marriage. However that changed in April 1401 when King Henry agreed to Richard Redmayn's request that heir to Harewood would instead be Matthew Redmayn, Richard and Elizabeth's eldest son (or to his younger brother in the event of Matthew's death). Brian Stapleton would only inherit Elizabeth's share of the Harewood estate if his Redmayn half-brothers all died.

Was this decision, potentially setting up the half-brothers, Brian and Matthew, as rivals and even enemies, the result of discussion between Elizabeth and Richard? There's no hint of a discussion in the straightforward story of avarice told by Professor Carole Rawcliffe in her biography of Richard Redmayn in *The House of Commons 1386-1421*. Professor Rawcliffe describes Richard's behaviour towards Brian Stapleton and the Harewood lands as 'rapacious', creating the impression that Richard trampled over his step-son's rights without a second thought in his determination to increase the Redmayns' wealth and power. By implication, it was Richard who made the decision and, as Professor Rawcliffe makes no reference to Elizabeth, it appears she just had to accept his decision. There is another possible interpretation, however – that Elizabeth discussed the inheritance with Richard and that the decision to make Matthew heir to Harewood was a joint one, rational not rapacious, and in the best interests of the family as a whole.

In setting out this alternative, I'm encouraged by the work of Professor Pauline Stafford on Emma, queen of England in the eleventh century. Emma, like Elizabeth Redmayn, had sons by her two husbands (both of whom were King of England – Ethelred and Cnut) and all her sons had a claim to the English crown. It was a grander inheritance than Harewood but Emma, as Professor Stafford explains, Emma was an individual whose personality and experience gave her the capacity to take part in discussions and influence choices rather than having to give way to men at all points. She had 'points of choice' and 'agency' - 'Which [son] was she to support? How was she to judge all of their best interests?'

Did Elizabeth Redmayn also have agency and therefore the ability to discuss the inheritance with Richard and influence, perhaps determine, the decision to make Matthew the heir to Harewood? A range of evidence suggest that Elizabeth may well have been shared discussions and decisions – Richard and Elizabeth co-operated in protecting her sister, Sybil, from William Ryther's violence; Elizabeth had spent several years running her estates as a widow, suggesting independence and

intelligence, and she chose to accept Richard as her husband; Richard was absent a great deal on royal service so it's highly likely that Elizabeth dealt with a wide range of administrative matters which in turn implies that Richard trusted her ability and judgement. In addition, Professor Rawcliffe herself describes Elizabeth as 'intelligent and interesting' in her biography of Brian Stapleton in the same *House of Commons 1386-1421* volume as her biography of Richard Redmayn.

For all these reasons it's at least possible that Richard and Elizabeth did discuss the Harewood inheritance which was, after all, a significant and delicate issue better dealt with by husband and wife together. So, assuming discussion took place, what might they have taken into account that led to Matthew Redmayn becoming the heir? Several issues spring to mind:

1. As the Stapleton heir, Brian was due to inherit one of the richest estates in Yorkshire and his marriage to Agnes Goddard (probably agreed during the 1390s) brought him lands in Lincolnshire. Therefore, even without the Harewood estates, Brian would be a major figure in the county, head of a family already regarded as highly influential.
2. Conversely, Matthew Redmayn (much younger than his half-brother, being only 3 or 4 in 1401) would inherit a much smaller income from the Redmayn lands in the north-west. Without the Harewood estates to boost his income, he would be much the poorer of Elizabeth's two sons.
3. Brian Stapleton's character and development as a young man may have played a part in discussions. He was at least 14 in 1401, not far from adulthood so had begun learning about his responsibilities for his estates and was old enough to be involved in discussions – perhaps with Elizabeth as mother and son – if that was deemed valuable. (At 14 the future Henry V was leading an army in Wales.) If Brian was showing the abilities that had marked out his grandfather and other Stapletons – and he may have been doing so, given his later military career – it would be far better for the Redmayns to have him as an ally who accepted that Matthew becoming heir to Harewood was in the wider family interests, rather than as a rival who resented the loss of Harewood and would try to undermine the Redmayns. In return, Richard Redmayn could promise Brian that he would use his powerful contacts to smooth and accelerate Brian's path in royal service.
4. By 1401 Richard Redmayn's role and influence in Yorkshire was growing but he was still relatively new to the county and had not yet held any major county offices (such as Sheriff) or been chosen as a Knight of the Shire for parliament. If Harewood was destined for Brian Stapleton, this declared to everyone that the Redmayns' influence in Yorkshire would be short-lived, limited to Richard's own lifetime. However, if Matthew Redmayn became the heir, this said that the Redmayns expected to remain a considerable influence in the county. Given the ways in which King Henry used Richard Redmayn to buttress his royal authority in Yorkshire then it's understandable that he agreed to the plan to make Matthew heir to Harewood.

Taking all this into account, we can see why Richard Redmayn wanted his son, Matthew, to inherit Harewood. It's also at least possible that Elizabeth too believed that Matthew inheriting Harewood

was the better option all round. It seems reasonable to suppose that she wanted both her sons to enjoy significant inheritances – but if Brian inherited Harewood as well as the Stapleton lands then his inheritance would be considerably greater than Matthew’s in the north-west. In contrast, the share agreed in 1401 gave both her sons a substantial inheritance.

Much clearly depended on the relationship between Elizabeth and Richard and on Elizabeth’s sense of her own agency but, as we’ll see in later chapters, there’s more evidence to come about the careers of Brian Stapleton and Matthew Redmayn that reflects back on the decisions taken at the beginning of the 1400s about who would inherit Elizabeth’s share of Harewood. For the moment it’s sufficient to identify that by asking questions about Elizabeth’s role we can put forward an alternative interpretation to the view that sees Richard Redmayn’s behaviour as ‘rapacious’.

For all the unpleasantness and sadness associated with some of the topics in this chapter, I’ve found it very satisfying to identify some of the serious family topics that the Redmayns talked about – but it’s not simply identifying the topics that’s important. Those discussions then enable us to draw conclusions, even if they are necessarily tentative, about family relationships and enable us to see the Redmayns as people like ourselves, struggling to find ways of handling ‘rogue subjects’ within the family. We can hear Richard and Elizabeth thinking or asking each other ‘Do we try to talk about this or not?’ ‘When will be a good time to broach it?’ ‘Which of us is going to start?’ and, later, ‘Did we get it right?’ ‘Do you think they listened properly?’ ‘Do we need to discuss this again?’

Much of this has been familiar in every family in history, ‘cat-sitting’ moments we can all share.

In the following chapters, I’ll continue to explore the topics that the Redmayns may have talked about, whether more of those difficult ‘rogue subjects’ or ‘have you had a good day?’ conversations about visits to friends, the latest gossip about people they knew or activities such as hawking or hunting. In the next chapter I’ll return to Richard Redmayn’s political career and his support for Henry IV but even this unpromising-sounding topic raises very personal issues. When, for example, was Richard going to slow down and maybe even retire from his incessant travelling? Let’s hope he managed it better than I’ve done!

But my lasting image from this chapter is of Sybil’s worn, damaged and exhausted effigy – all too closely echoing the violence and humiliation she suffered at the hands of William Ryther. It’s good to know that her family supported her in trying to put an end to William’s violence but one final detail on her effigy sums up the horror of her situation. When I look at the little dogs around the feet of Elizabeth’s effigy they seem to be frolicking, frisky and playful, but the dogs at Sybil’s feet look to be crouched, on guard, ready to defend their mistress. I’d like to think this is my imagination running away with me but I fear that is another, all too appropriate, metaphor.

How do I know?

Notes on my sources and reading for Chapter 10

In addition to the biographies and sources listed earlier I found the following most helpful:

Chapter Introduction

William Greenwood, *The Redmans of Levens and Harewood, 1905* – see chapter 2 above for comment on this book.

W M Ormrod (ed.), *The Lord Lieutenants and High Sheriffs of Yorkshire 1066-2000*, 2000

M C Punshon, *Government and Political Society in the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1399-1461* (Unpublished thesis, York 2002)

William Ryther's abuse of his wife, Sybil

The summary record of the meeting of the Archbishop of York's adjudication on William Ryther's abuse of record of his wife, Sybil, can be seen at:

https://archbishopsregisters.york.ac.uk/browse/registers?utf8=%E2%9C%93®ister_id=3f462646f&folio=634

Sara M Butler, *The Language of Abuse: Marital Violence in Later Medieval England*, (unpublished thesis, Dalhousie University 2001)

Sara M Butler, 'Spousal Abuse in Fourteenth-Century Yorkshire: What can we learn from the Coroners' Rolls?', *Florilegium*, 2001.

The inheritance of Harewood

Pauline Stafford, 'Writing the Biography of Eleventh-Century Queens' in David Bates, Julia Crick, Sarah Hamilton (eds.), *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Frank Barlow*, 2006

For Brian Stapleton's age see the Inquisition Post Mortem of his grandfather, Sir Brian Stapleton

<https://www.british-history.ac.uk/inquis-post-mortem/vol17/pp209-232> – items 524 to 528

The inquisition taken in York (item 528) in 1394 says that he was at least 7 years old which would put his birth at 1387 at the latest. This made him at least 14 in 1401 (perhaps slightly older as his own daughter appears to have been born in 1404) so, while he was six or seven years away from inheriting Harewood, he was not far from adulthood.