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Autumn may be the season of mists and mellow fruitfulness, but for the Society it is always a busy time. We have our Members’ Day and AGM coming up in October and with this Bulletin you will receive a copy of our Annual Report for the year 2003/2004. This is an important document, not only because it shows you just how much work the Society is engaged in, but also because it is a very good means for explaining to people just what we are about. More significantly, I hope that it gives you reassurance that the Society is making real progress towards its aim of securing a reassessment of the life and times of Richard III. I believe that we are having a tangible and positive impact on the popular perception of the king. Indeed, we have had many examples this year that testify to this. Of course we can do more, and with the reforms under way to improve the efficiency of our membership and sales services we are getting into good shape to do just that. In particular, we want to look again at our publicity strategy and use of information technology. Consider, out of 141 people who recently joined the Society, 73 came via our website. The potential is there.

This year we celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of HRH the Duke of Gloucester’s Royal Patronage of the Society, and during November we will be hosting a reception for the Duke to mark the milestone. This will be held at the College of Arms and will provide an opportunity for the Society to thank him formally for the support he has given us over the past quarter-century. In the meantime we recall some of the highlights of those years in this issue of the Bulletin.

This year, I have attended events held by two branches celebrating their twenty-fifth anniversaries: Norfolk, and Devon and Cornwall. Both were very enjoyable and I was made most welcome. Attending such events helps me to keep in touch with the grassroots, and I am encouraged by the positive feedback I have received about all the changes we are making. Out in the branches much good work is being done and we need to link all this activity with what the Society does as a whole. Synergy is a bit of a buzz word at the moment, but it does capture the advantages of co-operating to achieve a shared goal. During my visit to the Norfolk Branch, I was very impressed by their new initiative to provide a small bursary to the University of East Anglia for students of fifteenth-century history. This is the sort of good practice that others might consider. It brings us to the public’s notice and may even bring in new members.

I am pleased to announce that at the AGM the Executive Committee will be nominating Peter Hammond for the post of Society President. This post has been vacant since the death of Jeremy Potter in 1999. Peter’s achievements are well known and his reputation widely established both within and without the Society. In many respects he is an obvious choice.

This year, our Members’ Day and AGM are in Bristol on the 552nd anniversary of Richard III’s birth. I’m looking forward to it and hope for a good attendance and the opportunity to talk with many of you.

Phil Stone
New Sales Arrangements

Time Travellers Ltd will not be renewing their contract for the storage and distribution of the Society’s sales stock. This will now be taken back in-house. However the work involved is really too much for a single person to undertake so we have decided to establish a sales team and divide up the sales work between them. Another factor behind this decision is that Pat Ruffle, who has been distributing the back copies of the Ricardian and Bulletin for many years has decided to ‘retire’, so we have added this responsibility to the sales team.

The New Sales Process

A Sales Liaison Officer (SLO) has been appointed who will be the primary contact for members in all matters relating to sales. The officer will be supported by a team of people who will each hold a section of the sales stock. It is important to note that all orders should be sent to the SLO and this can be done by either post or e-mail. The SLO will process the order and advise the appropriate stockholders by e-mail to despatch the goods. In some instances this will result in your order comprising of more than one parcel. This will not result in any additional postage costs for you. The Society will aim to process and despatch your order within seven days of receipt.

There is one exception to the above: for back copies of the Ricardian and the Bulletin orders should be sent direct to the officer responsible who will check and advise on availability and cost.

Meet the Team

We welcome the following to the sales team:

Sally Empson – Sales Liaison Officer
Anne Macmillan – Non-Trust books
Wendy Moorhen – Trust books
Charles Walker – Ricardian Indexes
Keith Horry – Merchandise

We are delighted that the above have agreed to take on this voluntary work. It will enable the Society to make cost savings which will help to improve our overall financial position.

Sales Catalogue and Bargain Basement

Members received a copy of the new sales catalogue with the Spring Bulletin, together with details of the items on sale in the ‘bargain basement’ (see blue centre pages). Some of these bargain items are still available.

We are confident that these new arrangements will provide members with an efficient and cost-effective sales service. We would like to take this opportunity of thanking Time Travellers for their past service.

The Executive Committee
Richard III Society’s Members’ Day and Annual General Meeting
Saturday 2 October 2004

Notice is hereby given that the 2004 Annual General Meeting of the Richard III Society will be held on Saturday 2 October 2004 in the Watershed, Bristol

The meeting will begin at noon and the formal business will include reports from the officers, the presentation of the annual accounts of the Society to 31 March 2004 and the election of the Executive Committee for the next year.

Nominations for the Committee should reach the Secretary, Miss E M Nokes, not later than 17 September. All nominations must be proposed, seconded and accepted in writing by the member proposed.

Resolutions for the Agenda, proposed and seconded, should reach the Secretary by 17 September.

A New Venue

Saturday 2 October is a Members’ Day of which the AGM forms a part. There will be the old favourites – a great variety of stalls – including many new ones – and there will be opportunities for members to have their say.

Because much of the material formerly reported by officers at the AGM has been included in the Society’s Annual Report (included with this issue of the Bulletin – please do read it, and bring it with you on 2 October) officers’ reports will need only to bring matters up to date, and the focus of the meeting can be on members’ issues.

In addition there will be an open forum/question time to answer your questions, and respond to your issues. These can be raised verbally, or can be written down: there will be a supply of ‘post-it’ notes and a board. Queries can be anonymous, but if they cannot be answered on the day you may be asked to supply name/address, so that an officer or member of the Executive Committee or standing committee or working party can respond to you.

The focus is on you, the members of the Society. Please make this new approach worth while by coming, and letting us have your views.

The new venue for the Members’ Day is ‘The Watershed’, 1 Canon’s Road, Harbourside, Bristol. See page 39 of the Summer Bulletin for further details about the venue and Bristol. A location map is on page 22.

Public Transport - there is an open top bus service from Bristol Temple Meads Station. Parking - there are a number of car parks in the area.
Programme

11.00   Members arrive, time to visit stalls, etc
12.00 - 13.00  Annual General Meeting
13.00 - 14.30  Lunch
14.30 - 15.30  Lecture by Dr Hannes Kleineke
15.30   Open Forum/Question time followed by tea
17.00   Close

Other Attractions

Major Craft Sale. The twenty-fifth Major Craft Sale will be held around the AGM Members’ Day. The sale will start at 11.00 a.m., will run until the start of the AGM at noon and will then continue in the lunch and tea intervals. We shall have on sale Ricardian embroidery, cakes and sweets, paperweights, RCRF Christmas cards, knitted items and baby clothes, soft toys, collage, and Ricardian and other bric-a-brac.

Sales at the AGM. As a result of the stock being housed with officers living in different parts of the country it will not be possible to have a comprehensive range available for sale at the AGM. Instead there will be examples of our sale items for members to examine and place orders. The incentive will be that orders taken at the AGM will not be subject to any charges for postage and packing. The benefit will be that members will not have to carry home heavy books. There will, however, be stock of end-of-line items and some very special offers.

Research Officer, Webmaster and Barley Hall Co-ordinator. (Wendy Moorhen, Neil Trump and Lynda Pidgeon) will have a stall. They will be delighted to talk to members about Ricardian research activities, the Society’s website and Barley Hall. Lynda will showing the latest plans and acquisitions at Barley Hall.

Bookseller’s book stall

Branches and Groups Tables. The branches and groups will showcase their publications and activities. [Will secretaries please contact Elizabeth Nokes as soon as possible to book a table]

Visits Team table. This will be hosted by members of the Visits Team, and will display information on past visits and details of future visits: suggestions for the latter will be welcomed.

Membership & Treasurer’s Table. The Treasurer (Bill Featherstone) will be able to receive payment of subscriptions at Members’ Day, and will have a table for this purpose from 11.00 a.m. to noon, and 1.00 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

Refreshments will be available from the Watershed café and bar where they can be purchased on a cash basis. There are numerous cafés and bars within a short walking distance of the venue.

During the lunch break Steve Morris and Paul Crook from Destrier, an authentic fifteenth-century mounted soldiery re-enactment society, will display armour and weapons from the period.

Apropos of the Craft Sale we would warmly welcome offers of items for sale. We do appeal to members to try to provide some item(s) for the sale. If you cannot do any form of craft work,
please try to look out some item(s) of jumble or bric-a-brac. We would of course also warmly welcome all items of any sort of craft. If you wish to bring items along on the day, it would be most helpful if you could mark them with an indication of the price(s) at which you think they should be sold.

If you wish to give or send items to me in advance – do contact me to check that the items are suitable. Please contact Elizabeth Nokes, 4, Oakley Street, Chelsea, London SW3 5NN. Tel. 01689-823569 [voicemail]

NB: the proceeds of the Craft Sale will be devoted to the Ricardian Churches Restoration Fund, as also will the proceeds of the raffle.

**Annual Grand Raffle**

As usual we shall be having a raffle at this year’s Members’ Day, in aid of RCRF. The tickets will be 25p. each, or 5 for £1.00, and will be on sale at the meeting. The prizes are:

- ‘Plantagenet Encyclopaedia’ by Elizabeth Hallam
- ‘The Worlds of Richard III’ by A J Pollard
- ‘Ruling Ambition, the story of Perkin Warbeck’ by Robert Hume
- ‘Book of Hours’
- The Wars of the Roses playing cards
- Framed embroidered boar
- Boar pin
- Boar brooch
- Medieval ‘Mille Fleurs’ embossed candle
- Rose basket
- Bosworth mug

Prizes are not ranked in any order: first ticket drawn will have first choice, and so on. We thank the contributors and suppliers of prizes.

**Branches and Group Reports at the AGM**

If your branch or group wishes to make a report at the AGM, please let the General Secretary know, by 17 September, so that you may be included on the AGM agenda. Reports can be made in person by a branch or group representative, or, for overseas branches or groups, if no local representative is to be in London at the time of the AGM, in printed form, to be read at the AGM. Reports should not exceed three minutes, and should consist of new material not previously reported verbally or in print.

If you have any queries about any matters relating to Members’ Day or the AGM, please contact the Secretary – address inside front cover.

**Subscription Renewal 2004 - 2005**

Annual subscriptions become due for renewal on 2 October, and it would save the cost of reminders if members who do not pay by Banker’s Order would please send their subscription promptly. The rates this year are:
Full member           £15
Families (all members of same family, living at same address)    £20
Senior citizens (ladies and gentlemen over 65)      £11
Senior citizen family (same family, same address, where all senior citizens)  £15
Junior (under 18 years of age)        £11
Student (over 18 in full time education)      . £11
Overseas Members’ postage supplement        £5

Subscriptions should be sent to the Richard III Society Membership Manager, PO Box 1133, Bedford MK43 7ZX.

Cheques and postal orders should be made payable to the RICHARD III SOCIETY. A special insert in this *Bulletin* is provided for those not paying by banker’s order. On the reverse is a banker’s standing form for those members who would now like to use this method of payment. If you are going to make a donation to the Society with your subscription please complete the relevant section on the renewal form.

We regret that despite the savings with our new mailing arrangements we have had to make an increase in the postage supplement for our overseas members. We would, however, point out that the old supplement has been in place for a number of years and has not taken account of recent postal increases. The Executive Committee will be consulting with overseas branches about this change.

**Donations**

Following the migration of the RIMMS database to our new system announced in the last issue of the *Bulletin* we have been checking the data carefully and inevitably a few anomalies have been found.

A number of members have a credit balance. As these are for varying amounts and not necessarily related to other category subscription rates, we conclude that well over a hundred members have made a donation to the Society. We would like to take this opportunity of thanking these members for their additional support of the Society which is very much appreciated.

Executive Committee

**Contacting the Society by e-mail**

The internet and e-mail are wonders of modern technology but sadly are subject to abuse. One of the problems for the Society is the proliferation of junk mail that is sent on a daily basis to the Society’s website addresses (information@richardiii.net, neil_trump@richardiii.net and librarian@richardiii.net) and to the Membership Manager (richsoc@hotmail.com). Unfortunately the internet service providers for these e-mails do not currently offer a filter system to eliminate the unwanted mail. On most days the website addresses receives over fifty junk mails and sometimes it is as high as a hundred. These have to be sorted and deleted on a very regular basis. At worst, this sometimes results in genuine messages being ‘zapped’ and at best, delays in responding to e-mails because so much time is wasted keeping the mail boxes clear. It would be very helpful, therefore, if members writing to these addresses could prefix their subject description with the word Ricardian. Upper or low case, it doesn’t matter, but it will alert the recipients that there is a genuine message from a member waiting to be dealt with.

Neil Trump
Survey

We have had an encouraging response to the membership survey and they are still coming in. A report will be made at the AGM and a written report in the Winter issue of the Bulletin. In the meantime thank you to all members who participated and to the members who have completed the standing order form for payment of their subscriptions. If you haven’t already completed the form but would still like to record your views please do so and send it to the membership manager.

Wendy Moorhen

2004 Study Weekend

The study weekend which took place in York in April made a small surplus. This was due to the course costs being amortised over a smaller number of delegates than actually attended. There is a £10 refund available to each delegate which if not claimed by 1 October will go towards the research project fund.

Wendy Moorhen

Society Badges of Office

Members may remember that at last year’s AGM I raised the possibility of commissioning badges of office for the Society Chairman and President. This had been a project very close to the heart of our late Chairman, Robert Hamblin. The AGM endorsed the idea and during the present year designs have been drawn up and costs investigated. The Society’s Executive Committee having very reasonably decided that the cost should not be taken from the Society’s reserves the Vice Presidents agreed amongst themselves that they would underwrite the project while welcoming donations from members who wished to remember Robert Hamblin in this way.

I am pleased to report that the designs have now been agreed and the badges commissioned. Those for Chairman and President consist of the shield from the Society’s coat of arms surrounded by a border bearing the name of the Society and the title of the officer and will be suspended from murrey and blue woven ribbons. An additional badge has been commissioned for HRH the Duke of Gloucester, to be presented to him at the reception celebrating the 25th anniversary of his becoming our Patron. Smaller versions for the Vice Presidents will be worn as lapel badges. All of them are in silver with a gilded centre.

We should be most grateful for any contributions large or small towards the £2000 needed for this project. Cheques should be made payable to the Richard III Society and sent to me at my address on the inside front cover of the Bulletin. All contributions will be gratefully received and acknowledged.

Peter Hammond
From Vera Smeathers
A ‘Simon Drew’ card chosen for its front ‘Middle aged Spread – to be taken with a pinch of salt’ revealed itself to have on the back: ‘Lunch with Shakespeare’:
When Shakespeare was writing
Richard the Third
It seems that he left out a course
For above all the battle a cry could be heard:
‘A horse, I could just eat a horse!’

From Margaret Jones
I listened to Mastermind on Thursday 1 July, and one of the general knowledge questions was: ‘Sir Thomas More wrote a life of which English king, which has ever since caused him to be regarded as a murderous villain?’ The question was correctly answered.

From Geoffrey Wheeler
‘Think of Shakespeare’s arch villain and the images that spring to mind are of Laurence Olivier with his crooked hump and Antony Sher with his spider-like legs. Scott Palmer’s production for the Bard in the Botanics [Glasgow Botanic Gardens] season aims to strip away those stereotypes to discover the real man behind the mask. That is quite a task because Shakespeare’s portrayal of Richard as the personification of evil was very much influenced by the politics of his own time and our image of Richard is as one of the all-time bad guys – even though it seems he was unfairly framed for the murder of the Princes in the tower.’

The Times
‘The Knowledge’ A-Z, 3-9 July: Nick Barlay pities the children with Y for ... Young Londoners – including ‘Two Little Skeletons. The murder in 1483 of the two little princes’ in the Tower of London is still arguably London’s most famous killing, and it has never been solved conclusively. In 1933, the skeletons of two boys, one aged ten, the other around 13, were exhumed from Westminster Abbey. The bones had been reburied in an urn in 1674 and kept in the Henry VII Chapel in the Abbey. The suggestion was that these were bones of Edward V and his brother, Richard, the Duke of York. The children had been declared illegitimate by Richard of Gloucester, who had taken charge of the boy king Edward V after his father’s death in 1483. Found dead a month later, they were buried in Wakefield Tower, then reburied, finally turning up in the reign of Charles II under the staircase leading to St John’s Chapel. From there, it seems, the skeletons ended up at Westminster Abbey’.

The Times
10 July, ‘Queen inspects £20m polish for the jewel in her tourism crown’ – Alan Hamilton – ‘Royalty have reason to enter the Tower with trepidation ... the young Edward V with his brother were imprisoned, probably by their wicked uncle Richard III, never to be seen again’.

[Editor: protest was made to The Times about the inaccuracy of these two items].

From Dave Fiddimore
Richard’s family turns up in a variety of publications. This is from the February Fortean Times. One wonders how long physician Lind lived after ‘tasting’ the fluid found in the coffin!

‘Royal Pickle. The Royal Society is to try and discover the nature of a pool of unidentified liquid found in the lead coffin of King Edward IV (1442-83) Shakespeare’s ‘Sun of York’. The 7ft (2m) coffin was discovered by workmen in March 1789 as they prepared the ground for a new pavement in St George’s Chapel, Windsor. The Windsor Guide of 1811 stated that the king’s skeleton was ‘immersed in a glutinous liquid with which the body is thought to have been embalmed ...’ A footnote adds: ‘In contradiction to this some phi-

Media Retrospective
losophical gentlemen are of the opinion that the liquid and sediment ... were simply water and earth, to which all bodies resolve’. Before the tomb was secured, members of the public made off with a tooth, a finger, and a lock of hair from a tuft remaining on the skull. In September 2003 an old journal was discovered in the library of the Society of Antiquaries. This stated that Dr James Lind, a physician at Windsor, likened the fluid to ‘walnut pickle’ and said it was tasteless. The account included reports on a series of tests. One expert who is studying the records is forensic pathologist Professor Chris Milroy from the University of Sheffield. ‘We don’t know what this stuff is, but it doesn’t seem to be any kind of embalming fluid. If that was the case, the remains would not have been so much of a skeleton’, said a spokesman for the Royal Society of Chemistry. ‘Professor Milroy’s initial thoughts are that the liquor was produced by the breakdown of body fat and muscle in an airtight environment. Kings of that time had special lead-lined coffins and would have resided in dry conditions’, [Sourced from Times 29 Oct; Western Mail, 31 Oct 2003]’.

From Lesley Wynne-Davies
From MEMRIS Update Newsletter of TNA [The National Archives] Medieval and Early Modern Record Information Service, Spring/Summer 2004: Conference and Lecture Reports: ‘MEMRIS at the 39th International Congress on Medieval Studies, University of Western Michigan, Kalamazo 6-9 May 2004: ‘... papers in the session ‘Power and Authority in Late Medieval England’ ... Sean [Cunningham] ... examining the local and national career of Sir Richard Guildford under Henry VII. ... [was] well received, although Sean was somewhat alarmed that the White Hart banner toppled to the ground on two occasions during his talk – both as he was saying Henry VII’s name. Perhaps the influence of the Richard III society is more far ranging than previously thought’. ... IHR Late Medieval Seminar, 2003-04 Report ‘one of the most assured papers of the year came on 27 February from Dr Joanna Laynesmith who investigated how adulterous queens and elite noblewomen were portrayed in contemporary narrative sources. Part of this session developed into an extensive prequel of the debate between Joanna and Michael K Jones over the alleged bastardy of Edward IV that appeared in print in the Bulletin of the Richard III Society in June 2004.’

From Patsy Conway
From Living History, May 2004. An article on the death of Edward II by Ian Mortimer has a ‘sidebar’ on ‘The crime of regicide. Edward II’s ‘murder’ was not the last ... Henry VI allegedly died of sadness ... ‘it was announced that he had died of sadness, but the presence of Edward IV’s brother, the future Richard III, in the Tower at the time, and the very quick succession of events, allowed no room for doubt that Edward had ordered his cousin’s death’. ... Edward V disappeared without trace ... ‘No one knows what happened to Edward V ... who with his younger brother Richard, disappeared on the way to his coronation in 1483. Although some will dismiss the possibility that he survived, there is no evidence that he was murdered, no exhibition of the corpse and no assignment of responsibility for his disappearance. While Richard III, his uncle, was blamed by Henry VII for his death, Richard III had already inherited the brothers by exposing their illegitimacy. Henry VII never located their bodies (despite having every reason to do so, for imposter and pretender to the throne Perkin Warbeck claimed to be Edward’s brother Richard during Henry’s reign).’

From Elizabeth Nokes
From ‘9 to 5/MW’ 19 July 2004 – ‘London Spy – Pete May on the mean streets of London’ ‘Spy was delighted by director Trevor Nunn’s decision to cast Ben Whishaw’s Hamlet as a ... studenty type, who would surely have been a Smiths fan ... This led Spy to speculate on what musical tastes other Shakespearian figures might have had. Richard III would be a Sex Pistols fan and model his royal persona on Johnny Rotten’.
In June, Charlie Hawes, a television producer for Channel 5, contacted the Society about a programme he was making entitled

Charlie was having difficulty finding somebody to ‘champion’ Richard and he was only a few days away from the first day of shooting. When his e-

Other kings and queens that feature in the programme include William I, Henry VIII, Victoria and both the Elizabeths. The programme is scheduled to be shown next spring or summer, the most likely month being June. If we are advised of a transmission date in sufficient time we will of course publicize it in the

provide you with really up to date information.

---

**Can you believe this?**

The following description of Richard has appeared on a US website:

*Was he really a scoundrel, or unfairly maligned by Shakespeare? Richard III ruled for just two years (1483-5) before dying on the battlefield, yet he’s blamed for several bloody murders - and credited with bringing England into the modern era. You can mull all this over while planting greens or flowers in Richard’s head. Made in the U.S.A. of lightweight stone/resin composite, hand-finished with sand and gravel to mimic stone’s color and texture, it may be used indoors or out.*

Thanks to Dr Richard Tracey of California for bringing this to our attention.

The planter. Guess who?
In Prospect

Conference of the Centre Européen d'Études Bourguignonnes

The 2004 Conference of the Centre Européen d’Études Bourguignonnes will be held in Dordrecht (NL) from 23 to 26 September. The theme is Poetry and Music of the Burgundian World, and I understand that there will be performances of medieval music. If anyone is interested and would like further details, please contact me.

I have also received advance notice of an exhibition to be held in Mechelen in the autumn of 2005 on the theme Margaret of York and Margaret of Austria. Further details will be published when I have them.

John Ashdown-Hill

New Production of Shakespeare’s Richard III by the Kaos Theatre Company

A new production of ‘that’ play will open on 23 September at Darlington Arts Centre prior to a national tour. The press release tells us that the audience will be astounded ‘by the amazing half-man, half-dog human oddity as he transforms before your very eyes into the most dastardly, vexatious, repugnant, magnificent hunchback king you are ever likely to meet in your own lifetime … They perform the furious, fascinating, free-for-all-story of a tyrant’s bloody rise and bloody fall, comprising rapid character play, dark physical theatre, video, intrigue and a red carpet.’

The publicity image for the play will probably horrify Ricardians and, judging from reviews of their past productions, they do perform plays in an unorthodox way. As this production will be taken all over the country it does present the Society with an opportunity to promote itself. A list of the dates and venues is on page 29, and perhaps members in the relevant towns could contact their local theatre to see if they would be willing to take some of our brochures. These are available from the chairman, Phil Stone (see inside front cover for contact details). The website for Kaos is www.kaostheatre.com

Wendy Moorhen
The Royal Patronage: A Celebration

JOHN SAUNDERS

On the 24 October 1980 Lt Col Simon Bland wrote to Society Chairman Jeremy Potter, to advise that ‘The Duke of Gloucester is very happy to accept the Patronage of the Richard III Society.’ This Duke of Gloucester was the first to bear the name Richard since his predecessor King Richard III back in the fifteenth century. However there is more to the royal patronage than this; the present duke has a genuine interest in the life and times of King Richard and over the past twenty-five years has been supportive of efforts to seek a re-assessment of the king’s character and achievements.

The patronage was to be initially for five years to cover the quincentenary period. In this silver anniversary year of the patronage we have the opportunity to remember some of the events that the duke and his family have been involved with and to recall again some of the words he has spoken and written about Richard III.

Born in 1944, HRH The Duke of Gloucester is the second son of the late Duke of Gloucester and Princess Alice. He is a grandson of George V and a first cousin to the Queen. He succeeded his father as duke in June 1974. Australian members will be interested to know that the infant Prince Richard accompanied his parents to Australia where his father was Governor General from 1945 to 1947. Prince Richard was educated at Eton and Magdalen College, Cambridge where he read architecture. The duke first came onto the Ricardian scene in September 1974 when he opened the new Battle of Bosworth Centre in his capacity as chairman of the East Midlands Tourist Board. At the time Jeremy Potter noted that after 500 years Richard of Gloucester reappeared on Bosworth Field. The occasion saw the first official contact between the duke and the Society. Jeremy Potter was able to speak to him and noted in his Bulletin review of the opening that ‘the duke showed considerable interest in the Society and I presented him with copies of some of our publications (“What, tracts?” he exclaimed. “Just the truth,” I explained with proper humility.)’

The following year one of the Society’s then most ambitious projects reached a fitting conclusion. On Sunday, 9 March 1975 the
memorial window to the House of York in the Collegiate Church of St Mary the Virgin and All Saints at Fotheringhay, donated by members, was dedicated by the Assistant Bishop of Peterborough the Right Reverend Archibald Campbell. The ceremony was attended by the duke and his mother HRH Princess Alice Duchess of Gloucester, both then living at nearby Barnwell Manor.

A yet more ambitious project embarked on after the York window was the Leicester statue of King Richard. The concept and appeal for funds was launched in the March 1978 Bulletin. The duke showed an early interest in the project visiting Leicester to view both the site and model of the proposed statue and also to meet the sculptor James Butler RA. After two years of fund raising everything was ready for the statue to be unveiled by the duke on Thursday 31 July 1980. At the last moment he was called upon to represent the Queen at the independence celebrations of the south Pacific island nation of Vanuatu. Fortunately Princess Alice was able to step in and unveil the statue on the duke’s behalf. After the ceremony she attended the reception in Leicester’s medieval guildhall and spoke to members. The speech given by Princess Alice at the unveiling contains one of the best and oft repeated raisons d’être of the Society and it is worth repeating again: ‘... for the purpose and indeed the strength of the Richard III Society derives from a belief that the truth is more powerful than lies – a faith that even after all these centuries the truth is important. It is proof of our sense of civilized values that something as esoteric and as fragile as a reputation is worth campaigning for.’ Words that are as relevant today as when they were first spoken twenty-five years ago.

The Quincentenary years presented a number of opportunities for the duke to attend events associated with Richard III. The high point was undoubtedly the dinner held in London’s historic guildhall to celebrate the 500th anniversary of Richard’s accession to the throne. Joining members were a number of distinguished guests including the Duke of Gloucester, the Duke of Norfolk, Garter King of Arms and the Lord Mayor of Gloucester.

As Patron the duke was one of the after-dinner speakers and he noted that ‘This particular 500th anniversary marks the beginning of a very short period in our history when King Richard Plantagenet reigned. It might have been the beginning of a long and glorious reign in which all sorts of wonderful things happened, but this as we all know was not to be.’ The June 1983 Bulletin commented that the speech left no doubts about the duke’s commitment to the Ricardian cause.

There were other events during 1983 attended by the duke: the unveiling of the plaque in Gloucester to commemorate the quincentenary of the city’s Charter granted by King Richard in 1483; the unveiling of Richard’s Coat of Arms at Crosby Hall and a visit in the summer to Ricardian sites in Yorkshire including Middleham, Sheriff Hutton and York itself.

The significant event of 1984 was of course the televised Trial of Richard III. The proceedings took some six hours with around three hours finally being transmitted on Channel Four. The duke was present throughout the recording and filmed a brief introduction when he observed that ‘1984 is not only the 500th anniversary of these events, it is also, because of George Orwell, the symbol of the state’s potential for control of information to alter not only the present and future but also the past. Is this what the Tudors did to Richard III?’

Another quincentenary event to commemorate was the Charter of Incorporation of the Worshipful Company of Wax Chandlers granted by King Richard in 1484. In October the duke unveiled the original charter and grant of armorial bearings which had been reframed and displayed in the ‘Greate Roome’ of the Wax Chandlers’ Hall. Future society chairman Robert Hamblin was then a member of the Court of Assistants of the Wax Chandlers.

A more unusual event in 1985 was the installation of a new model of Richard III at Madame Tussauds. The figure was based on the National Portrait Gallery picture of the king, far removed from the previous more traditional portrayal. The new ‘King Richard
Princess Alice meeting James Butler. Former chairman, Jeremy Potter, is to her right. Behind the princess is the first president, Patrick Bacon and to his left former treasurer, Bill Norman. Mr Butler is flanked by former secretary, Phyllis Hester, and the present secretary Elizabeth Nokes.
III' was officially unveiled by the duke at a ceremony attended by Society members.

The end of the quincentenary years also saw the completion of the initial five years of the patronage. After discussion between the Society and Kensington Palace it was agreed that it would be extended for a further five years. It was understood on all sides that after the exceptional circumstances of the quincentenary period future opportunities for the duke to attend Society events would be limited. Nonetheless the patronage has been renewed continuously every five years thereafter.

Indeed the next event was not until 1989 when the duke was present at the College of Arms to receive the formal presentation of Letters Patent in respect of the Society’s Grant of Arms. These were presented by the Garter Principal King of Arms and Norroy and Ulster King of Arms, Mr John Brooke-Little. The duke responded by thanking the College on behalf of the Society. He spoke of the importance of seeking out the truth about events and personalities in history. He gave examples of the Tudor denigration of Richard’s reputation and the then recent events in Tiananmen Square. He also reminded his audience of the bicentenary of the French Revolution and that it is said that Louis XVI read Horace Walpole’s *Historic Doubts* whilst awaiting the guillotine.

On 30 October 1990 the duke was present at the inauguration of the plaque in Leicester positioned near to the Greyfriars burial place of King Richard. He joined members for tea at the Grand Hotel and spoke of his pleasure at being the Society’s Patron and how impressed he was that so many members were able to be there mid-week for the unveiling.

In 1996 Society President and founder member Patrick Bacon celebrated his ninetieth birthday with a day of special events in Norwich. Whilst unable to attend the duke sent a message: ‘Congratulations Patrick Bacon on your 90th birthday and also on the
foresight you showed by founding the Richard III Society for those determined like yourself to place this complex character in a more accurate position in the public perception. I hope that you have a very splendid celebration.

The most recent Society occasion attended by the duke was the launch of Anne Sutton’s Festschrift at the Society of Antiquaries. He gave a short speech acknowledging Anne’s contribution as editor of *The Ricardian* and he again emphasised how pleased he was to be the Society’s patron.

Having highlighted the major occasions of the past twenty-five years we should not forget some of the other contributions the duke has made. In 1985 he wrote the foreword to *The Road to Bosworth Field* by Peter Hammond and Anne Sutton and every few years provides us with tickets to attend Buckingham Palace garden parties. These have been allocated to individual members and the experience shared through reviews in the *Bulletin*. By chance we have such a review in this issue.

The patronage brings tangible benefits for the Society and, together with our achievements in many other fields, gives us *gravitas*. It is also further evidence of our viability and respectability. In celebrating the first twenty-five years of the patronage, we also acknowledge and express our thanks to the duke for his continuing support of the Society.
Reception Twenty-HRH The Duke of Gloucester as Patron of the Society

17 November 2004

The Chairman has invited the Patron to join the Executive Committee and members of the Society at a reception to be held at the College of Arms, London on Wednesday 17 November 2004 at 7 p.m.

The College will be represented by Windsor Herald, Mr Peter G Hunt, who will give a short talk about the College and conduct a tour of the record room. The highlight of the proceedings will be the presentation to His Royal Highness of his badge of office.

Members who would like to attend should write to the research officer, enclosing an sae, and the selection will be made at random after the closing date for applications on 2 October 2004. Successful applicants will be notified within ten days.

Research Officer: Wendy Moorhen, 2 Field Hurst, Langley Broom, Langley, Berkshire SL3 8PQ
When asked whether Neil and I would like to enjoy the privilege of attending a Buckingham Palace Garden Party I felt a ripple of pure pleasure and anticipation run down my spine followed by an ‘Ooh-er’. One or two other ‘ooh-ers’ were to follow: what should I wear? How would I manage to balance a hat on my head and juggle tea-cup, cake plate and handbag without spilling the entire contents down my dress? The final ‘ooh-er’ came the Friday before when the weather forecasters predicted a chilly day with torrential rain. My immediate reaction was to hit the shops again for an alternative outfit, a reaction which was quickly quashed by Neil informing me in no uncertain terms that, since I had paid a king’s ransom for my original outfit, I was wearing it whatever the weather decided to throw at us.

Luckily on the day the weather was perfect in every way. Owing to the fact that my hat was large and my skirt long, we decided to drive up instead of taking the train. Besides, when would we ever again have the chance to park down the Mall? As it happens we didn’t park down the Mall on this occasion but were one of the first cars to park down the bottom of Constitution Hill. Having filled a pleasant hour in our car party-guest spotting, we joined the slowly developing queue decorating the Buckingham Palace railings. The guests made a colourful sight for the inquisitive onlookers with the ladies’ hats jockeying for position, brims colliding every so often. The atmosphere was frothy and we could sense the suppressed excitement in everyone. However, the ever-present threat of terrorism intruded with all those in uniform being ushered to the front of the queue as they were likely targets for any snipers in the crowd.

We were allowed into the inner courtyard of Buckingham Palace early. Again, everyone had an excited air of anticipation and the police chatted away to us animatedly. Buckingham Palace is rather imposing but I couldn’t help thinking of a Victorian railway station when I looked at the carriage entrance with its glass canopy supported by elaborate iron work. Surrounded by windows, I also fancied that curtains may be twitching as the royals peeped through to see who they were to mingle with later.

Finally we were invited into the palace itself. We processed up a fanned staircase into the gilt, ornate great hall, dripping with gold decoration and with a sumptuous deep red carpet under foot. As we proceeded into the circular Bow Room, we were watched by the portraits of past royals, Victoria and Albert being conspicuous amongst them. At the other end of the Bow Room there were three French windows leading onto the terrace and the vast expanse of lawn behind the palace. Surveying the scene quickly we took in a huge, elongated marquee on the left which we presumed was for the majority of the guests to take their tea with two shorter marquees, cordoned off on the right by chairs, for the royal party and the diplomats. Two band stands housed the military bands who would play all afternoon, taking it in turns and signalling their status by raising and lowering a flag, depending on whether they were playing or not. It was a typically English scene, which was like the Edwardian age, long gone.

Arriving early posed us a problem. We had arranged to meet our companions for the
afternoon, Shirley and Roy Linsell, at 3pm at
the bottom of the steps. However, we were
standing at the top of the steps at 2.45 pm in-
stead. Knowing that the tables would be
snapped up quickly, Neil and I found a table
and then looked out for the Linsells. Unfortu-
nately we had not met them before and all we
had to go on was that Shirley would be wear-
ing a fancy blue hat and Roy would be wear-
ing his Ricardian tie. Someone once said that
blue is the dominant colour in a crowd and
this was certainly the case on this occasion.
There were blue hats everywhere and we
found ourselves scrutinising everyone in blue
in the vicinity. It was most enjoyable just to
watch the other guests milling about, some
aiming for the chairs but many just ambling
along, happy to be in the Queen’s back gar-
den. Eventually I noticed a couple waiting at
the bottom of the steps and successfully iden-
tified them as Shirley and Roy. Shirley and I
sent the two men off to fetch tea, and we sat
back to view the fashions.

It was interesting to note that, although
many women had gone to great expense with
their apparel, some were quite happy to just
wear an informal afternoon dress with a mod-
est straw hat to complement it. Some women
had not even brought a hat and apparently the
Queen is happy for her guests to adopt this
less formal appearance if they so wish. Those
who had made an effort provided a spectacu-
lar array of colour and style. There were chic
outfits, fun outfits and a few totally inappro-
priate outfits on show. Mrs Shilling would
have envied one or two of the hats. There
was one particularly bright red ‘sea anemone’
perched on one lady’s head which seemed to
follow us about wherever we went. Clergy
were in abundance and we debated individual
clergymen’s denomination and rank, accord-
ing to what colour cassock they were wear-
ning. Of course there were plenty of people
from the forces and again it was interesting to
see how both men and women wore very
similar uniforms, the Wrens preferring to
wear trousers to skirts. If we were hoping to
see anyone famous (which we were) we were
a little disappointed. Shirley managed to spot
Stephen Byers, the MP and the journalist and
broadcaster, John Sergeant but if there was
anyone else famous in the crowd, they es-
caped our detection.

No royal garden party can be reported on
without a mention of the tea. Apparently the
tea is a secret blend which has been produced
solely for these parties and cannot be pur-
chased or indeed drunk anywhere else. I am
not a connoisseur of tea but I have not tasted
anything as smooth, delicious and refreshing
as this cup of tea. Shirley and Roy tried the
iced coffee for our second drink and could
recommend that too but Neil and I stayed
with the tea. I knew this would be the one
and only time I would have the pleasure of
sipping such a superior beverage. The food
was dainty in portion but perfect for the occa-
sion and we enjoyed little salmon, paste or
ham sandwiches and small cakes plus the fa-
mous chocolate cake. The tea marquee was
stunning. To obtain refreshments, the guests
were encouraged to queue in front of huge
floral displays, each next to an impressive
gold urn for the tea. The food was laid out on
delicate serving dishes, constantly being re-
plenished. Although there were 8,000 guests
attending this party, there seemed no shortage
of either beverages or food. I think to cater so
ably for this number of people is no mean
feat, despite the royal kitchens having plenty
of practice over the years.

As we were enjoying our tea, we suddenly
realised that the Yeomen of the Guard had
appeared which heralded the arrival of the
royal party. The lanes for the Queen and the
Duke of Edinburgh were being subtly formed
by the Yeomen and Gentlemen at Arms and
before we realised it there were people three
depth either side. Shirley managed to find a
small gap where we were only two rows back
and we waited to see if the Queen would
come down our lane. A couple had been se-
lected by one of the Gentlemen Ushers to
meet Her Majesty and we were pleased to see
that they were standing close by us so the
Queen would spend some time there. How-
ever, the prospect of seeing her properly was
not promising.

What was overwhelming at this party was
the gentleness and good old-fashioned man-
ners that everyone displayed. All those acting
on behalf of the Queen carried out their duties
very courteously but also with a great sense of humour. Those forming the lanes were happy to mingle with the guests and chat with them and the guests responded in kind. Shirley was listening to what one Gentleman at Arms was telling guests and was passing it back to me. He is a government MP and fulfills two further roles. One is that of hostage whenever the Queen visits Parliament. It is a custom dating back to 1649 when the suspicious Charles I demanded a hostage from Parliament on these occasions and the custom has continued ever since. Therefore whenever the Queen goes to Parliament, this MP has to go to Buckingham Palace and stay there until she returns to ‘release’ him. His other role is that of ‘informant’. He meets with the Queen regularly when she is in London to tell her all the goings-on in Parliament. This is not like the high-profile meeting she holds with the Prime Minister, this is just to let her know what is happening within the Palace of Westminster.

As the royal party appeared at the top of the terrace and we stood to attention to the national anthem, two men in front of Shirley and myself realised that we could not see and in a very kindly way ushered us into the front row. Looking up to the terrace I could see that the Queen was joined by the Duke of Edinburgh, the Duke of Kent and the Duke of Gloucester. I was very hopeful that the tall, blond lad amongst the party was Prince William but unfortunately this was not the case. The Queen walked down her lane greeting those picked out. When she reached us she stood less than ten feet away from us, very relaxed, talking with the lucky couple. She wore a coat-dress of a bright lime green with white markings all over it. Her hat was of a matching green with white trim. Not a tall woman, she looked stunning and her complexion was the envy of all the women watching her.

As the Queen chatted, I had the time to observe the protocol and subtle manoeuvrings around her. As she processed down the lane to each couple who had been chosen and groomed by the ushers, a line of ushers or courtiers followed quietly down behind her, keeping exactly so many paces away. They were good natured and chatted with each other and the guests but they kept their eye on the sovereign and moved when she moved. At the same time the Gentlemen at Arms were keeping the guests at the sides of the lanes at an exact distance. Every so often they would ask us to step back but they did it with such courtesy, no one took offence.

Once the Queen had moved on down the lane, we decided to find the others in the Royal party. We watched the Duke of Edinburgh as he talked with people down his lane but noticed that the Dukes of Kent and Gloucester were much less formal and did not have lanes. We all wanted to give our thanks to the Duke of Gloucester and make ourselves known as he is the Society’s Patron so we decided to follow protocol and see what happened. We knew you had to approach an usher so we button-holed one and asked if we could be presented to the duke. He replied that we could meet the Duke of Kent if we liked and we jumped at the chance. The usher then chats away with you to obtain your names and localities and finds out a little about you for the duke to hang a conversation on. You are then instructed on how to address the duke and how to bow/curtsey and then gently ushered into the correct position to be greeted by him.

The Duke of Kent was extremely pleasant but somewhat perplexed as he knew very little about Richard III. He pointed towards his cousin, the Duke of Gloucester and suggested jovially that perhaps we should be meeting him instead but we enjoyed a brief conversation with him before he moved on. Spurred on by meeting the Duke of Kent, we repeated the protocol with one of the Duke of Gloucester’s ushers and were re-positioned to meet with the duke. The Duke of Gloucester seemed delighted to meet us and we exchanged views about Richard III himself and discussed what the Society was up to today and current thinking in historical circles.

Having achieved more than we could have hoped for in meeting the royal party, we then toured the garden. The herbaceous border had been recommended to us by several people and Shirley, a keen and very knowledgeable gardener, knew it would be worth viewing. It
The mixture of colours and combination of plants and flowers was exquisite and perfectly balanced with much height and variety of texture and shading. Wandering round the back of the garden, where the tennis courts were, we couldn’t believe how, just over the wall, was the centre of London. We discussed the complexities of keeping such a place secure when there seemed to be only a stone wall between the royal residence and the rest of the city. As we approached the lake we could just hear the band playing, the breeze wafting the sound to us, and the whole stroll was very peaceful. There may have been 8,000 people in that garden but we had plenty of space to ourselves and no one else intruded. The lake was very picturesque with a little stone bridge across it which was disappointingly (but understandably) cordoned off from our use. Willows stroked the water and a few ducks pottered about or swam, totally oblivious to everyone around them.

Coming back to the main lawn, we felt the need of some more refreshment. All the tables and chairs had been commandeered and other people were sitting on the lawn by the lake, enjoying the last of the afternoon sunshine. Having refreshed ourselves, we wandered over to the royal tent and diplomatic tent with five minutes to spare before the Queen was due to leave. It gave me time to observe all the colourfu and unusual national costumes some of the diplomats and their wives were wearing. It gave a wonderful cosmopolitan feel to the afternoon.

We clapped the Queen as she and the Duke of Edinburgh walked with their party out of the enclosure and up the side of Buckingham Palace and out of view. Our hosts having left us, we and many other guests left also. The slow meander out through Buckingham Palace gave us a chance really to drink in the gilt and lavishness of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century decoration and admire the portraits as they gazed down on us.

As we left the building, a footman enquired whether we had enjoyed ourselves and we were able to tell him truthfully that we had. It had been a perfect day in perfect company. I shall treasure the memories for a long time to come.

Jane Trump
Richard III: A Better Duke than King?  
Part Two

[In part one we dealt with Richard’s political apprenticeship. In this part we see how he used his skills]

Richard becomes King
Thus we come to the usurpation, the three months between April 9th and June 26th, 1483. We do not know Richard’s motives but self-preservation must have played a part. Edward V’s age was politically disastrous for a minority. He could not rule in person but was old enough to be influenced. Any power held in his minority could only be temporary unless influence was gained over him. The first Richard heard of his brother’s death was a hurried request from Lord Hastings and he must have been alerted to the potential threat to his standing. He had just received the paltinate from his brother Edward and he may have been aware of George Neville’s imminent death, which would seriously undermine his hold over his Neville lordship. He had to gain control of power and royal authority to protect his now vulnerable interests. He also probably considered himself the only appropriate protector for the young king because of his position as the paternal uncle. That he was aiming for the crown itself at this early stage is doubtful.

Initially things went well for Richard. Even though we know of no real evidence for the late king wanting a protectorate, the council was willing to accede to Richard being protector to avoid the Woodville dominance over the new king. This fear of Woodville dominance and its threat to his own position could have prompted Richard to stage the first coup at Northampton/Stony Stratford. Once accepted as protector, Richard set about consolidating his position by stripping the Woodvilles of their power. Otherwise he tried to keep the status quo. Edward IV’s servants continued in office and in Edward V’s household. In all appointments Richard carefully chose men acceptable to the Yorkist affinity and very possibly to Edward V as well. Apart from his generous rewarding of Buckingham, most of the limited patronage available did not go to his supporters but to Edward IV’s men.

Richard worked well with Hastings and the council and made good use of the network of loyal men in the country inherited from his brother. He even managed to ensure that his protectorate would continue after the king’s coronation. So why, with all this success, did he go one step further and claim the crown? It is possible that he had much encouragement from the duke of Buckingham. After all, the information from Robert Stillington, if true, did make him the king so why shouldn’t he take what was his by right? Or perhaps the temptation was just too much to resist, once the opportunity was given to him. Other motives may have been the fear of Woodville reprisals after a short minority or a genuine fear that the political stability was threatened by the Woodville faction.

What is certain is that Richard totally misread the political situation. People’s loyalty was first and foremost to Edward V, as the heir to Edward IV. Richard had gone against all political thought by depriving a young child of his crown before he had the chance to prove himself. It upset the security of everyone’s inheritance rights if a king could lose his inheritance so easily. The great political credibility Richard had enjoyed as the central figure in Edward IV’s polity had disintegrated along with his loyalty to that polity.

Whether Stillington’s story about Eleanor Butler was true or not made little difference
to the political community. They were not won over until Richard’s show of strength in the unexpected dispatch of Lord Hastings and the threat of the imminent arrival of the northern army made them suppress any doubts they had and accept his accession. Once they had recovered from the shock, Richard began to encounter the opposition which was to plague him throughout his short reign.

Relations as king with the nobility

We can now appraise Richard as king and his political actions between June 1483 and August 1485. The aftermath of the 1483 Rebellion posed Richard the most serious problem. The ready-made power base he was hoping to use had disintegrated and he had to build up a new affinity. He was, therefore, forced to turn to those he could trust from the north to fill the vacuum left by the rebels. This was a mistake; their presence was greatly resented because these men had usurped the place of the local established families. Richard was seen to be trying to centralise authority by placing his men into localities so he could control them. This, of course, was not true. Richard realised that, in the long term, these new men would have to become ‘insiders’ in the localities so to give them the necessary standing he redistributed the rebels’ lands in their favour but this of course only aggravated bad feeling because of the threat to local inheritance rights. In the course of time things would have settled down but in the short term it was disastrous for Richard’s political reputation.

To keep things in perspective, it must be noted that many of the native southern landowners still favoured Richard and he was happy to work with those who did. There is also evidence that a good number of the rebels were seeking pardon from the king and were taking out bonds for good behaviour. This posed another problem for Richard. He had given the rebels’ lands to his trusted followers but did not feel secure enough to take them away again to return to their rightful owners. He was therefore unable to regain the popularity he had lost in the south.

So how did Richard’s changing status affect his relations with the nobility? The motives for Henry Percy’s support for Richard’s usurpation are unclear but having suppressed his ambitions in the north under the indenture of 1473/74, he may well have seen his chance to fulfil them under Richard as a higher authority. If this was the case, he must have been sorely disappointed. Lacking wide-scale support from the south, Richard needed support from the north more than ever. He therefore kept his own lands and appointed a deputy who had direct links with the Crown, in this case his son, Edward, Prince of Wales. Percy may not have liked this situation but probably accepted it, as Richard continued to involve him directly. With the death of the young prince in April 1484, however, the appointment of John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln, as head of royal authority on the Council of the North must have galled Percy. It was clear that the Council was a royal tool for the whole of the north and was not tied to any one affinity. Richard was determined to keep local loyalty focused directly on him. This can also be seen in his use of personal servants. Richard Ratcliffe was very active in the Bishopric of Durham and the Palatinate. Again it was this use of outsiders in the place of the rightful leaders of local society which caused Richard trouble. Not only Henry Percy, but Ralph Neville, too, was barred from holding any real power or influence in the north and denied what he and many others must have seen as his rightful place in northern society. This was to have fatal repercussions for Richard at Bosworth. To be fair, the brevity of Richard’s reign obscures his political competence here. Henry VII continued his use of trusted servants and councillors in place of local families and, in time, this practice was accepted.

The Stanleys were sufficiently powerful and influential enough for Richard even as king to court favour with them in order to boost his narrow power base. They certainly supported him against the duke of Buckingham in October 1483 but for personal interests. With the heap of rewards that the grateful Richard had showered on him, Buckingham had encroached into Stanley territory. With Buckingham opposing the king, they had no option but to support Richard in order to protect their own position in the north-west
and north Wales. However, Richard’s policy for the north may only have served to concern the Stanleys. On his progress of 1483 Richard had summoned the Lancashire gentry and had granted annuities to several of them. To the Stanleys this could have been seen as an attempt to build up a more direct royal influence. After the rebellion of October 1483, the Stanleys were rewarded greatly for their support but none of their rewards strengthened their influence in the north. That they were ambitious for more power and status in their region is evident from the fact that very early in Henry VII’s reign Lord Stanley acquired the earldom of Derby and became the Chief Steward of the Duchy of Lancaster. He must have seen no chance of fulfilling these aspirations under Richard III. By 1485 Richard, suspicious of the Stanleys’ probable links with Henry Tudor, attempted to curb their power and on 16 February 1485, he granted the master forestership of Bowland to Sir James Harrington for his loyal service. At the same time Richard would also seem to have been considering re-opening the Hornby dispute. He asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to look into the issue again. This could only have served to heighten the Stanleys’ fears of Richard’s long-term plans for the north and probably encouraged them to support Tudor.

One cannot discuss King Richard’s relations with the nobility without mentioning Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham. A political nonentity in Edward IV’s reign, he saw his chance to acquire power and status under the new regime. So why, when Richard appeared to have given him everything he had coveted, did he so quickly rebel against him? The answer to this question has eluded everyone, including Richard. The most consistent theory is that of Buckingham’s greed and ambition, allowing himself to be persuaded to support Tudor’s attempt for the throne by John Morton in the mistaken belief that he could turn the rebellion around to his own benefit. Another theory, that even Ricardians cannot ignore, is that he turned against Richard as a consequence of his murder of Edward V and Richard of York.

A third theory, put forward by Pamela Tudor-Craig, is worth a mention. When Richard created his son Prince of Wales, his investiture in effect ended the prince’s minority. Buckingham had been created Chief Justice and Chamberlain of north and south Wales on 15 May 1483 and he must have been looking forward to a long spell in this exalted position while the prince was still a minor. With the prince having come out of his minority, Buckingham’s status in Wales was reduced to that of a tax collector. Letters from the Prince of Wales to the knights and squires of north and south Wales requesting them to pay monies to the duke of Buckingham were sent out on 16 September 1483. By 11 October Richard knew of Buckingham’s involvement in the rebellion. Could this be why?

To be concluded

Jane Trump
From Dr Cecil Clough

The current debate on the validity of Richard III’s claim to the throne of England as the only legitimate Yorkist has drawn supposed support from Domenico Mancini’s account of the May-June 1483 events in England, which he asserted he wrote down by 1 December that year. Moreover the assumption is that his narrative, coming from an Italian, was likely to be less biased than if written by a contemporary Englishman; Mancini undoubtedly witnessed events in London between Edward IV’s death and Richard III’s coronation. My purpose is to examine the true nature of Mancini’s text, the better to assess its reliability.

Dr Michael K. Jones has stated that Mancini’s work was a report written for Angelo Cato, his patron ‘in the form of a diplomatic dispatch.’ The text known to us is far from that, being rather a humanistic treatise for a prince to reveal the danger of family rivalry to a state’s security. Mancini’s introduction specifically explains that he wrote it at his patron’s behest, having previously on his return to France from England provided him with a verbatim report; this report is not otherwise known, but one presumes that Mancini was sent to England to furnish this. The treatise supposedly drew on this report for its information but had a different objective, being destined for Cato’s own former patron, prince Federico d’Aragona, Duke of Taranto, the second son of the ruling king Ferrante of the kingdom of Naples.

Cato, by birth Neapolitan, had become a doctor in Aragonese royal service prior to January 1475, when he entered the prince’s service. He travelled with him as his doctor to Burgundy, where the prince sought to marry Mary, daughter of duke Charles the Bold. Late in 1476, this venture having failed, Cato accompanied the prince to the court of King Louis XI of France. There, the king having suffered a stroke in March 1479, Cato was appointed one the king’s physicians and, significantly, a royal councillor; his reward in 1482 was the archbishopric of Vienne. Cato sent Mancini to London probably some weeks after Edward IV’s death on 9 April 1483 supposedly in his function as a royal councillor. Apparently Mancini was recalled by Cato on 6 July. There are actually two separate considerations. Why was Mancini sent to England in the first place and secondly why at the end of 1483 was the humanistic treatise written for presentation to prince Federico d’Aragona? By then the prince was back as a widower in the kingdom of Naples, having married Anne of Savoy, a niece of Louis XI in the summer of 1479. She had died in childbirth the following year.

The intentions of any English monarch were a key consideration for Louis XI. In 1482, anticipating his own imminent death, he made his will preparing for the succession of his own son, Charles VIII, under a regency, for which he named the council. Obviously what was happening in England in similar cir-
circumstances was pertinent, particularly as Louis had stimulated Edward IV’s antagonism in the months prior to his death. On 29 September 1482 King Louis published his secret treaty with Edward at the expense of Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, the claimant of Burgundy. The outcome on 23 December was that Maximilian and Louis signed the treaty of Arras. Among the latter’s clauses was one betrothing Maximilian’s infant daughter, Margaret, heiress to Burgundy, to Charles, the son of Louis XI, thereby ignoring the promise made by the French king in 1475 that Charles should marry Edward’s daughter, Elizabeth. Louis could count on Edward IV’s lack of allies willing to engage in any military actions to repay such insults and seek to enforce payment of the pension likewise agreed in 1475.

On 9 April 1483 Edward IV suddenly died, and the situation that evolved was of vital interest for the French government. Louis XI was ill, Charles, his heir, aged thirteen; an ordonnance of 1374 established the French monarch’s majority at fourteen. The French nobles, particularly duke Louis d’Orleans who had claims to the throne, were actively promoting their own interests in preparation for the impending regency. There were further issues associated with French involvement in Scottish affairs directed against England and, most importantly for the English crown should its dynasty prove insecure, Louis XI desired to annex the duchy of Brittany, where Henry Tudor, the Lancastrian claimant to the English throne, enjoyed sanctuary: on 27 August 1483 Brittany’s duke Francis sought Richard III’s military support in the event of a French invasion. Richard’s reply being that the duke surrender Henry to him, the Tudor forthwith fled to the French court, where he eventually obtained some support against Richard III, deemed in France a usurper. In the light of the situation outlined above, it is understandable why Cato, as a royal councillor, sent Mancini to report back on the situation in England following Edward IV’s death, the better to plan for the anticipated regency of Charles VIII. Louis XI died on 29 August.

Mancini was in Holy Orders, probably a Benedictine, so could travel to England from France without authorisation. Seemingly he knew no English, but could easily converse in Latin with English clergy, as also with residents familiar with Italian. This is of consequence in restricting likely sources in London. His treatise uniquely implies that the Englishman Dr John Argentine was such a source. He was a scholar who knew Italian, and as a physician was doctor to Edward IV’s two sons. According to Mancini he reported that as early as mid-June the two princes anticipated being put to death. Argentine, a Yorkist, in 1486 was to enter Henry VII’s service as physician to his infant son and heir prince Arthur. In the context of Argentine Mancini mentions the scholarly attainments of Edward V as being far beyond his age, information which may have come from Argentine, or perhaps from an Italian, Dr Giovanni Gigli, archdeacon of London and tutor of the two princes at the time of Edward IV’s death. Gigli was opposed to Richard and did not attend his coronation; he too found favour with Henry VII, in 1486 addressing a poem to him and Queen Elizabeth, where he stated categorically that Richard III had had Edward IV’s two sons murdered. Accordingly, the available evidence tends to suggest that Mancini may have been not entirely unbiased but depended rather on those antagonistic to Richard.

In his book Dr Jones mentions Dr Michael Hicks as providing ‘a recent positive evaluation’ of Mancini as a source, though this understanding is not mine regarding what Dr Hicks writes (in his Richard III, 2000). Hicks stresses that Mancini rightly saw the initial issue as being whether Edward V should be crowned forthwith following his father’s death, or if there should be a protectorate. The ensuing debate and resultant delay gave duke Richard of Gloucester his opportunity. Secondly Dr Hicks argues that Mancini implies that there was animosity between the duke and the Woodvilles going back to 1464 at least. This should be rejected as unlikely; clearly Earl Rivers had no serious doubts regarding the duke, or else he would not have agreed to the meeting at the end of April at Stony Stratford, let alone been so easily out-
witted there. The independent testimony of the Crowland Chronicle Continuator supports such a view.

It is to be noted that Mancini’s account is not always chronological. It consistently lacks dates, and often is dramatic for effect, features consistent with the humanistic treatise it typifies. There are notable features conflicting with Dr Jones’ representation of the text. Its title ‘De occupatione’ underlines Mancini’s consistent contention that Richard III had usurped the crown from the legitimate heirs, his nephews, whom he had murdered. This in turn underlines that Mancini deemed Edward IV the legitimate king. Mancini’s account of Clarence is brought forward to illustrate a failed re-run of usurpation by another brother, adopting like techniques. Seen from Mancini’s viewpoint in writing his treatise, such circumstances originating in rivalry within a ruling family - involving murders and claims of adultery - were familiar features of an Italian city-state; Burckhardt’s famous chapter ‘The City as a Work of Art’ testifies horrifically to this.

Since Mancini accepted Edward IV as the legitimate king, it follows that his text cannot convincingly be used in support of the contention that his mother, Cecily, Duchess of York, conceived him in adultery. This in turn underlines that Mancini deemed Edward IV the legitimate king. Mancini’s account of Clarence is brought forward to illustrate a failed re-run of usurpation by another brother, adopting like techniques. Seen from Mancini’s viewpoint in writing his treatise, such circumstances originating in rivalry within a ruling family - involving murders and claims of adultery - were familiar features of an Italian city-state; Burckhardt’s famous chapter ‘The City as a Work of Art’ testifies horrifically to this.

Since Mancini accepted Edward IV as the legitimate king, it follows that his text cannot convincingly be used in support of the contention that his mother, Cecily, Duchess of York, conceived him in adultery. Mancini mentions this claim to illustrate a method adopted by Richard III in support of his bid for the crown. It is also to be remarked that such a claim of adultery better supported Henry Tudor’s claim to the crown, hence its incorporation in his ‘Titulus Regius’ of 1484. This does not mean that the claim was true, any more than Mancini’s implicit denial confirms the opposite. In English history, though not on the Italian peninsula, such a smear on the honour of a ruler’s mother was very exceptional. On the evidence of Polydore Vergil the duchess understandably most bitterly bewailed her son’s slander on her honour and reputation.

On the basis of Mancini’s treatise one can deduce that his representation of the situation in England given in his report to Cato, perhaps in mid July 1483, calmed French fears of any imminent English intervention in French affairs. In January 1484 the situation in England was even turned to promote French pride, as testified by the French chancellor’s address to the states-general at Tours. He congratulated the representatives present on their steadfast loyalty to the established ruling dynasty compared to the situation in England. There Richard III had murdered the rightful heirs, Edward IV’s sons, his nephews; for good measure he added that England had witnessed no fewer than twenty-six rebellions against its legitimate ruling line since 1066. It is credible that Mancini’s verbal report to Cato, or his treatise itself, was the basis for the chancellor’s diatribe against Richard III.

It remains to consider Cato’s request to Mancini to write the treatise, that in some ways parallels the one he made to de Comynes for his memoirs, which he intended to use for his own Latin humanistic history of Louis XI’s reign. In January 1484 Cato’s standing in Charles VIII’s government was unsure. His archbishopric of Vienne was proving intractable, and one can suppose that he would have been ready to exchange it for a diocese in his native kingdom of Naples. Cato was an astrologer of repute and had predicted that prince Federico d’Aragona was destined to become king of Naples. Mancini’s treatise was for presentation to that prince, the typical humanistic hope being it might promote the prince’s support and patronage. It was a treatise, not as claimed a documentary report, of the genre of ‘Mirror of Princes’, as was Machiavelli’s Prince. The latter was to show how a state was won and lost, Mancini’s treatise dealt only with the loss.

From Valerie Withey

I have followed the debate so far with great interest and have the following points to add to the debate:

Although Edward’s date of birth appears to indicate that his conception took place whilst the duke of York was fighting in the Pontoise region (in order for a normal term pregnancy to have occurred), it is not impossible that his mother, Duchess Cecily, could have accompanied her husband on part of the journey or visited him.

Edward’s low-key christening may have
been due to a premature birth, as suggested, but might also have had something to do with the state of his father’s finances at the time. In 1440 York was given a five-year term as Governor of France but was kept short of funds with which to pay the army. Despite being one of the richest landowners in England and Wales Richard of York was impoverished by the war with France. York used his own finances and even sold off some of his Welsh possessions to pay the army. Eventually York was owed more than £38,000 in war expenses. Although York’s next son, Edmund, had a more fitting christening in Rouen cathedral it could simply be that funds, previously in short supply, had reached the duke of York in time for Edmund’s christening.

Finally we have a tailpiece from Lesley Wynne-Davies

It is an undisputed fact that his family were very cross when Edward IV informed them that he had married Elizabeth Woodville. Perhaps during the row Cecily Neville angrily exclaimed ‘you bastard!’ (as one does), and someone (behind the arras?) gleefully took it literally, and had a lovely time spreading the gossip round the castle.
The Old Countess of Desmond

KITY BRISTOW

I knew the stories of course. She was married in the reign of Edward the Fourth, danced with Richard the Third, lived for a hundred and forty years, grew three sets of teeth in her lifetime, in extreme old age, walked from Bristol to London, dragging her decrepit daughter in a little cart to claim her marriage jointure, and died as a result of a fall from a nut or cherry tree. Were any of these stories true, or part of the fairy tales of Ireland, and who was she?

I found that she was probably Katheryn (Kattelyn), daughter of John FitzGerald, Lord of Decies, part of the great Geraldine clan. She was born at Dromana in County Waterford, the date of her birth is unknown, but consensus of opinion is, that she died in 1604. Her age at that time was thought to be 140 or 104 (figures thought to have been transposed at some point in the story) or 114. She married Thomas FitzThomas 11th Earl of Desmond, date of the marriage unknown. He was her second cousin, she was his second wife. He was the third son of the 7th Earl of Desmond, who made the rather rude remarks about Elizabeth Woodville, (i.e. that Edward should divorce her and marry a foreign princess) and who was executed at Drogheda in 1467. The first wife of Thomas was Gyles (Julia), daughter of Cormac McCarty and by her he had a son and a daughter. If Katheryn was 140 years of age when she died, she would have been born in 1464, she could have married in 1482 when she was eighteen, in the reign of Edward the Fourth. However, there is a slight problem. We know his first wife was alive in 1505, because a lease for a piece of land was granted to Sheela (Julia), wife to Sir Thomas of Desmond, by one of the FitzGeralds. She is named not as former wife, or divorced wife but as wife to Sir Thomas. Therefore the marriage of Thomas and Katheryn must have been after 1506. If born in 1464, she was 41 years of age in 1505. I think we can see now that marriage in the reign of Edward, dancing with Richard, and living for a hundred and forty years becomes rather suspect.

If she was 104 when she died, she would have been born in 1500, again marriage at eighteen in 1518 is possible. Thomas, known as Thomas the Bald or Victorious, killed his first wife’s father in 1520. I somehow feel that Sheela/Julia must have died before this time. Katheryn and Thomas had one child, a daughter called Katheryn, date of birth unknown. Thomas became Earl of Desmond in 1529 and died in 1534 being then eighty or eighty-one years of age. At this time Katheryn would have been 34 years old, young enough for re-marriage. On the other hand if born in 1490, she would have been 44 years old (114 when she died) and perhaps re-marriage was not a prospect. The marriage jointure could only have been made when Thomas became Earl in 1529. Inchiquin (which means beautiful land by the river) had possibly been a dower house before. It was probably made over to her as a lifetime jointure, and at her death would revert to the estate of the Earl of Desmond at the time. Therefore she would not need to ‘claim’ her jointure.

In 1575, at his request, she enfeoffed the castle and her lands to Gerald, 15th Earl of Desmond, who hoped to safeguard his property against attainder. The rebel lord was captured and executed in 1583, and all agreements he had made before were declared null and void. So Katheryn’s castle and lands remained in her possession and her lifetime jointure recognized. Sir Walter Raleigh, who was given part of the Desmond lands, Inchiquin being included, knew the Old Countess, and that she was very old. He granted leases of five years on part of the land to two English gentlemen, at the end of which time it was thought she would be dead, and the rents
would double. She lived on. It is from Sir Walter we get the story of the marriage in the time of Edward the Fourth. I am not quite sure where the story of dancing with Richard the Third came from. Fynnes Morrison (traveller and writer, also briefly Chief Secretary to Lord Mountjoy, Lord Deputy of Ireland), visiting the area in 1613, had conversations with people who had known her, and was told how she used to walk the four or five miles from her home to the market town (Youghal) each week. She was known to be a very active old lady. The fall from the nut or cherry tree seems always to be mentioned as the cause of her death. I think our Katheryn lived quietly at Inchiquin during all the troubles that befell the House of Desmond, when that great estate (600,000 acres), was broken up and divided among the victors, English and Irish holding on to what was hers until she died.

I do not think she had three sets of teeth, perhaps just one or maybe two of a third set, we will let her have that, for everything else seems to have been a fairy tale. It is possible that Thomas’s mother, wife to the 7th Earl of Desmond, was with her husband when he was in England, and that she danced with Richard, and perhaps the story was handed down in the family. There was a countess of Desmond who went to the court of Queen Elizabeth and to the court of King James, to claim justice for herself and her family. She was Elinor, wife to the 15th Earl, Gerald, who brought about the downfall of the House of Desmond by his rebellion. I think that some of Elinor’s journeys have been transferred to Katheryn. It seems it is all a matter of attribution.

The Portraits
Some years ago, in Ireland, I visited Muckross House near Killarney. On a previous visit, I had seen a portrait of an old lady, described by the guide as ‘The Old Countess of Desmond, she lived for 140 years, grew three sets of teeth in her lifetime, and died as a result of a fall from a nut tree’. At that time I could not purchase a guidebook or even a postcard of her, it being very late and just before closing. On this occasion, however, I was able to buy a guidebook. On reading it, I was surprised to find that the portrait in the house was just a copy, the original had been given to the NPG in London, in 1927. I wondered why we had never seen this portrait.

On returning home I spoke to the late Joyce Melhuish about it. She had never seen the painting but, having a contact at the Gallery, would enquire about it. It seems the Gallery did not put it on view because, they did not believe it to be the Old Countess, but a copy of a portrait in the Queen’s collection at Windsor, which was attributed to Rembrandt (possibly because his name was on the back), and was thought to be his mother. Same time later at Knole in Kent, a National Trust property. I saw another painting, smaller, but looking familiar. I enquired, and yes, it was the Old Countess, this time her fall was from a cherry tree. Joyce again made enquiries, but this time it was not Rembrandt’s mother, nor yet the countess, it was a portrait by Van Dyke, of an elderly Italian lady.

There were paintings of ‘The Old Countess’ in many stately homes, Burghley, Chatsworth, Duplin etc but they were later thought to be just copies, mainly of the Rembrandt painting. In desperation, I telephoned the National Gallery in Dublin to ask if they had, or knew of, a portrait of The Old Countess of Desmond, in Ireland. When they stopped laughing, they said yes they had a likeness, but they were afraid it was Rembrandt’s mother again, and that they knew of no portrait of the Old Countess, in either public or private collections, in Ireland.

Someone, writing in the late nineteenth century on the subject, felt that one would have to exclaim, like that desperate monarch with whom the old lady’s history is associated: ‘I think there be six Desmonds in the field, Five have I slain to-day instead of her.’

I fear there are no portraits of the Old Countess of Desmond.

Further Reading
DNB under FitzGerald
Notes and Queries, chiefly from the first 8 series, 1856-1898
Complete Peerage, vol. IV, under Desmond
Richard Sainthill, Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, vol. 7, 1861
If you are familiar with my medieval paintings, you will appreciate the amount of research that goes into this work. Now I have taken that research one step further by donning a complete suit of armour and taking to the lists to joust and hopefully gain some further insights into what it was like actually to experience this magnificent medieval 'sport'.

To the cheers of hundreds of enthusiastic spectators, four fully armoured knights enter the arena, horses prancing, caparisons flowing, ready to joust against each other in spectacular and awe-inspiring action. It is a sight that gets my pulse racing whenever I see it; to be part of it is indescribable, an experience I would never have imagined possible two years ago.

Encased in steel, cocooned from the outside world and deprived of many of the senses we normally take for granted, I prepare for my first run. On hearing the commentator announce my name, I gently guide my horse towards the lance rack, where a squire waits with one of my bright red lances. Too rough with the leg aids and the horse will probably overshoot, have to be circled, and the precious mental build-up of both horse and rider will be disturbed. Calmness is the key. The horse starts to get excited and edgy – he knows what's coming. A few gentle words and a reassuring touch help quieten him. Check the bevor (chin defence) is locked; slam the visor down and make sure it has clipped shut – if not, it could well move and render me sightless at a critical moment. Now my only view is straight ahead, all peripheral vision gone. Remember to breathe; I am very conscious of my chest just touching the armour as I fill my lungs. My attention is now completely focused on my opponent at the opposite end of the lists. I reach out my right hand and the squire places my lance in my palm. I adjust my grip and, lifting it skyward, signal to my opponent. The signal is returned. Give the horse its head; on with the legs; we're away. I make subtle adjustments to the horse's direction, aiming to be as close as possible to the tilt rail that separates us. I thump the lance under my arm but keep the point up. Still focused on the armoured figure thundering toward me at a closing speed of around 50 mph, my concentration now shifts to a more specific target - his targe, the small shield strapped to his left side, and his chest, the highest scoring target for us today. (Originally, the head was the prime target, but we are not jousting in specialised jousting helms – and we value our necks!) As we converge, I finally lower my lance and the tip makes contact with its intended target. The impact reverberates through my arm and lance splinters fly high into the air. Simultaneously, I am vaguely aware of a cracking sound closer to home – this is the first time I've considered that I was also a target, my focus has been so intense.

We are still at full speed. I sit back and slow the horse, coming to a stop at the far end of the tilt. Looking up, I see that the last 3 feet of my lance has shattered and the commentator shouts 'a double break!' A squire takes my lance, I raise my visor and breathe in the cool, fresh air, and am once again aware of the crowd, cheering and clapping. The scores are announced – I am very satisfied with that run and start to prepare for the return. It is only then that the squire points out the splinter of wood wedged under my pauldron (shoulder defence), but the armour has done its job – I'm very pleased to have such a good harness.

The memories from my first two jousts are still fresh in my mind, but it has taken me nearly two years of specialist training to get to this stage, even though I have been riding
since childhood.

While most surviving fifteenth-century armour is either Italian or German, I have long been fascinated by the ‘English’ style that appears on tomb effigies in this country. The effigy of Ralph Fitzherbert will, I’m sure, be familiar to most Ricardians as it is the only surviving example to feature a Yorkist livery collar with Richard III’s boar badge, and it was this armour that I decided I wanted recreated. William West of the Englyshe Plate Armorie shared my enthusiasm and the result of his hard work and incredible talent is a unique armour that brings back to life something that has been lost for centuries.

The armour is made of steel and weighs about 4½ stone – quite a weight but well distributed. It fits me perfectly so is not too restricting, and the more I wear it, the more natural it becomes. The main problem is the heat retention, and this becomes really noticeable the more I exert myself.

Riding in armour throws up a whole new set of problems. For a start, you are holding a lance or sword in one hand, so steering is generally done with the legs and seat. Mind you, your lower legs are encased in steel, so you have no feeling there and, to top it all, when the helmet visor is lowered, you can’t see the horse either! It all has to become instinctive.

Inspired by my jousting activities, I have been working on a painting of the tournament held in Bruges in 1468 to celebrate the marriage of Charles the Bold with Margaret of York. As I paint Anthony de la Roche, ‘Grand Bastard’ of Burgundy, I like to think that I now have a little more idea of what is going through his mind as he launches his horse down the lists, 500 years ago.

[ Graham’s painting of the Bruges tournament has been followed in a ‘Painting Diary’ on his website – www.studio88.co.uk – and will soon be published as a print. Log on for an insight into his work, his jousting, or for information about the prints, cards and paintings that are available. Alternatively, phone 01296 338504 for a copy of his free colour catalogue. ]
Interesting evidence relating to two current issues – the location of the battle of 1485, and the ultimate fate of Richard III’s body – has recently come to my attention and may merit a wider airing. The evidence is to be found in a long narrative poem written by Richard Corbet in the first quarter of the seventeenth century.

Corbet, born in Surrey in 1582, studied at Oxford, obtaining his MA in 1605. He became a poet and divine. In 1629 he was consecrated bishop of Oxford, and in 1632 was transferred to the see of Norwich. He died as bishop of Norwich in 1635, and lies buried in Norwich Cathedral.

At some point during the period 1620-25, while he was living in Oxford, Corbet, with several companions, undertook a journey which led him to both Leicester and Bosworth. His Iter Boreale (‘Journey North’) is a verse account of his travels. The most accessible edition of the poem is probably that published by Octavius Gilchrist (London 1807) and it is to this edition that I shall refer.

The story that Richard III’s body was dug up at the Reformation and thrown into the River Soar, while totally unsupported by any contemporary evidence, and unheard of earlier than the mid seventeenth century, has again been publicised recently; conspicuously in Tony Robinson’s recent Channel 4 broadcast. I have sought to counteract this very dubious tale on a number of occasions, and most recently in a current article commissioned by the BBC ‘Legacies’ website.

It is very interesting to note that the lurid tale of Richard’s exhumation is apparently entirely unknown to Corbet. The latter observes what is indeed admitted by all, namely that at the time of his visit to Leicester Richard III’s memorial had disappeared. He goes on to parallel the disappearance of Richard’s monument with the absence of any Leicester monument to Cardinal Wolsey and draws the obvious moral lessons. It might be useful at this point to quote Corbet’s words relating to Richard:

And now we are at Leister.

Is not th’usurping Richard buryed here,
That king of hate, and therefore slave of feare:
Dragged from the fatall field Bosworth, where hee
Lost life, and, what he liv’d for, - cruelty?
Search; find his name: but there is none. Oh kings!
Remember where your power and vastnesse springs;
If not, as Richard now, so shall you bee:
Who hath no tombe, but scorne and memorye.

The story of Richard’s ignominious disinterment would have been very apposite to Corbet’s moral, and it seems inconceivable that he would not have mentioned it if he had known of it. The conclusion ex silentio has to be that in the 1620s the tale of Richard’s exhumation had yet to be invented. A conclusion which agrees with other well-known evidence, such as Wren’s description of the state of Richard’s grave at about this period, and the fact that the exhumation story is only
recorded at a later date.

In speaking of Leicester, Corbet has already referred to ‘the fatall field [of] Bosworth’. Not only did he and his companions visit the traditional battlefield site after leaving Leicester; they were actually given a guided tour of the battlefield by a local innkeeper. Corbet’s account of the Bosworth visit runs thus:

p. 193
Mine host was full of ale and history;
And on the morrow when hee brought us nigh
Where the two Roses joyn’d, you would suppose
Chaucer nere made the Romant of the Rose,
Heare him. “See yee yon wood? There Richard lay
With his whole army: Look the other way,
And loe where Richmond in a bed of gorse
Encampt himself ore night, and all his force:
Upon this hill they mett”.
Why he could tell

The inch where Richmond stood, where Richard fell.

It is true that Corbet suspects his innkeeper and tour guide of inventing details, and suggests that he had been influenced by Shakespeare’s play, because of his ‘mustring up the ghosts’. Corbet’s conclusion is a somewhat back-handed compliment:

p. 194
Howere his talke, his company pleas’d well;
His mare went truer then [than] his chronicle.

What is significant, however, is not whether every detail of the innkeeper’s version of events was historically accurate, but the fact that, rightly or wrongly, in the 1620s local Bosworth people clearly had absolutely no doubt as to where the battle of 1485 had been fought.

Bosworth: The French Connection

DAVID JOHNSON

Michael K Jones’ Bosworth 1485, Psychology of a Battle reveals, amongst many radical and challenging insights, new evidence concerning the extent to which French military prowess provided Henry Tudor with victory. Dr Jones argues that a previously undiscovered eyewitness source describes the critical intervention of French pikemen in the defeat of Richard III’s cavalry charge. In briefly evaluating Dr Jones’ research it is the purpose of this paper to tentatively suggest that Sir William Stanley’s contribution to the founding of the Tudor dynasty may have been overstated.

The reference to the battle is taken from a 19th century transcription of part of a letter written, almost certainly at Leicester, on 23rd August 1485. The author is a French soldier based during the early 1480s at a military camp in Pont-de-L’Arche. Though the original letter has proved impossible to trace, part of the transcribed fragment contains two vitally important pieces of information. He (Henry Tudor) wanted to be on foot in the
midst of us, and in part we were the reason why the battle was won. The first half of the sentence indicates that Tudor dismounted in order to seek the protection of the French. This must surely refer to the way in which Henry attempted to save himself at what turned out to be the climax of the fighting. Dr Jones argues that these soldiers, armed with pikes, halted the royal cavalry in its tracks. Here, amid the French pikemen, Tudor remained until the King and his knights were overwhelmed.

Livia Visser-Fuchs (The Ricardian, March 2004, p. 117) argues that a full reading of Jones’ new source makes it clear the eyewitness in question is in fact an archer; and as a consequence there is no evidence to support the presence of French pike. However, Visser-Fuchs concedes that the archer belonged to a contingent divided into four categories of soldier, one of which carried pike. It seems to me highly probable that these pikemen played the decisive role speculated by Dr Jones, for a screen of archers would have been unable to withstand a cavalry onslaught. It will be recalled that at Bannockburn Robert Bruce scattered a force of unsupported English bowmen with mounted knights. Clearly French archers would have been swept aside by Richard’s cavalry.

Equally significant is the observation, contained in the second half of the sentence, that the French were only partly responsible for Tudor’s triumph. Dr Jones argues that ‘the other part must have been the intervention of Sir William Stanley’ (p. 195), and while this is perhaps the most obvious and plausible interpretation, I offer here an alternative explanation.

It is equally likely that our French eyewitness was in fact making reference to the inestimable contribution of the rebel commander, the earl of Oxford. This, if correct, is significant because it would imply, and given our present knowledge of Bosworth in effect confirm, separate and quite distinct phases of combat. While the earl of Oxford was defeating the main body of the royal army, it was the French who derailed Richard’s desperate attempt to engage Henry personally. It then becomes possible that Sir William Stanley played a less than decisive part in the fighting, so that the French may have all but defeated Richard and his entourage by the time Sir William intervened. This, of course, then begs the obvious question of Stanley’s precise involvement in all of this; surely the known evidence confirms Sir William as Henry’s saviour? Well not necessarily.

Paul Murray Kendall (Richard III, p. 383) comments ‘The King [Henry VII] is said to have felt that though Sir William saved his life, he delayed long enough to endanger it.’ Though Henry rewarded Stanley with office and land, Kendall makes the further point that Tudor gave him no title. In contrast Philibert de Chandee, commander of the French at Bosworth, became earl of Bath in the aftermath of victory (Jones, p. 173-174).

While this does not amount to conclusive evidence, it is sufficient, I would suggest, to place a fairly large question mark against the traditional account. It is entirely possible that without the French pike Stanley would have been too late to rescue Henry. And from Tudor’s position, terrified beyond reason, and perhaps only feet away from death, how would Sir William’s delayed intervention have been perceived? Greeted, no doubt, with an ecstatic sense of relief. But later, in the cold light of day, what then? Almost certainly, as Kendall intimates, a sobering and chilling realisation of just how close the new King had come to disaster.
Work continues steadily on the Logge wills project. By the time you read this, I hope to have finished checking up to no. 300 of our 385 wills, and to have sent them up to Moira Habberjam in Leeds for her to cast her eagle eye over them.

Points for the introduction are emerging in the course of the checking. When you read lots of wills one after the other, all sorts of trends and habits reveal themselves. One thing that has struck me forcibly is how very anxious medieval people were concerning the fate of their souls. It’s a rare testator who does not leave some money for masses, candles, gifts to the religious, or good works. Even clergymen blenched in the face of mortality and the perils of the soul: ‘all flesh is dust and we do not know the hour of our death’, cried Robert Ascoigh, archdeacon of Exeter, asking that 200 candles should illuminate his funeral and that each member of his household should have a gown of black cloth for it. He wanted to be buried in the ambulatory of Exeter Cathedral near the vestry door on the south side of the choir, which would place him today near the entrance to the cathedral shop.

In the Logge register we have the will of Ralph Shaa, ‘one of the residienciare of the cathdrall chirch of saynt Poule’, he who preached the sermon ‘bastard slips shall take no root’. He made his will on 18 August 1484 and bequeathed ‘my simple soule to almighti Jhesu’, ‘hole of mynd neverthelasse beyng pore in body oure lord Jhesu be thankyd in everywhere withine this vale of myserye’. A simple soul in the vale of misery probably just about sums up what he felt after the ‘bastard slips’ sermon.

One of the most interesting wills was that of a John Twynyho, made 29 September 1485 (in Latin) and proved the following February.
Dear Editor,

Referring to the debate on the use of cavalry at Bosworth I would like to refer Heather* to Michael Jones’s excellent book, where he details the alternative sites for the battle far better than I can.

However I stand by my original comment that wherever it was I simply cannot believe that it was on Ambion Hill. The numbers involved would simply have made it impossible. We know that warhorses were trained to withstand the sights and sounds of battle, much as police horses are trained now, but nature will out. Horses are essentially a ‘flight’ rather than a ‘fight’ animal, they follow the herd but particularly dislike being jostled by strange horses in their own personal space. We have all seen the scrum at the races when starting tapes were used. This makes control difficult and increases the risk of kick injuries to other horses and their riders. I cannot believe that Richard would allow himself to be confined in such a way, let alone have chosen the site.

No doubt the enemy had their own cavalry, but they were not cramped on Ambion Hill, nor did they attempt to use them in a charge as Richard did. Perhaps secure in their prearranged treachery they thought that they would not need to. Despite all their precautions they were certainly caught off guard when Richard took the initiative.

I thank Bill Featherstone for his kind remark. I share the feelings of surprise and disappointment expressed by the visitors he guides there. My reaction on standing there for the first time was ‘Is this it?’ rapidly followed by ‘surely not!’ Used to the fields around Towton, the whole thing seemed most unlikely and very cramped indeed.

I will say nothing about the early attempts to purchase a different site, after which Ambion Hill was bought as a sort of consolation prize, but when I read Michael’s book it was like a light coming on in a dark room. John Austin’s recent very interesting article about new discoveries in the Merevale and Atherstone areas will hopefully prompt further investigation around there.

We know that Richard was an excellent commander and horseman, who had very many stud farms in the Yorkshire dales for the specialist rearing of horses – on many walks around Wensleydale over the past three years uncounted numbers of modern stud farms have been seen, with doubtless many more not yet found. There is no evidence that Richard was likely to have left anything to chance (the pike square formation being unknown to him before that time he could hardly guard against it) and I cannot believe that so careful a commander would make so elementary a mistake as to expect large numbers of expensively bred and carefully trained horses to be wasted, struggling on Ambion Hill.

Lynda M. Telford

*Apologies to Heather Falvey for a letter in the Summer Bulletin being attributed to her. It was in fact written by Heather Coleman.

Editor

Dear Editor,

I have lately been reading Jeremy Potter’s Good King Richard? (Constable, 1983, pbk. 1984) also an essay ‘John Lingard’ by Christopher Hollis in Great Catholics (Nicholson & Watson, 1938). Hollis writes that Lingard (1771-1851) had ‘determined early on the necessity for making a great renunciation. No man was ever better qualified than he to expose the Glorious Revolution of 1688 for the cads’ ramp that it was. Yet he saw that there was a limit to the amount of exposure that the British public would tolerate from one priest. His prime task was to expose the Reformation. Even such an exposure was to the English mind so great a paradox that, careful though he was to write in studied moderation and understatement, yet, even as it was, Macaulay was able to dismiss him with a ‘Dr
Lingard, a very able and well-informed writer but whose great fundamental rule of judging seems to be that the popular opinion on historical questions cannot possibly be correct'. Lingard felt that, should he go forward and attack 1688 as he had attacked the Reformation, however irrefutable both attacks might be, the force of both would be diminished' (p. 332).

Now Potter writes: 'John Lingard has been called 'the only considerable historian of this period who clung to the Tudor historical tradition' (p. 192).

It would seem that Lingard, from his respect for Thomas More as martyr, overlooked the point that martyrdom is no guarantee of reliability as a writer of history. Potter writes that in Lingard’s third volume ‘Note B is an attack on those who seek to exonerate Richard III from the murder of the princes’ (p. 192). My own theory, more or less as Potter suggests (p. 128), is that on the eve of Bosworth Richard, to save the boys from Henry VII, sent them to London in the care of a trustworthy gentleman to be shipped to Margaret in Flanders and that all three died in the current epidemic. V H Lamb suggests this in The Betrayal of Richard III (Mitre Press, 3rd edition, 1968, p. 121).

Muriel Smith

Dear Editor,

Re: Bosworth, Merevale and Atherstone, 1485 by John D Austin, Bulletin Summer 2004 (p. 25-27). Just to show how easy it is for even a seasoned historian like Mr. Austin or even Dr Jones to miss the simplest of references I would just like to refer you to paragraph two of John Austin’s article. He (and, by inference, Dr Jones) states that ‘Through evidence of place names Michael Jones suggested that King Richard III camped by King Dick’s hole and his troops on Royal Meadow’. Reading Francis White & Co.’s History Gazetteer and Directory of Warwickshire for 1874, I turned to ‘Hemlingford Hundred – Atherstone Division – Atherstone’ (p. 1292). There the author recounts that: ‘In 1485, the Earl of Richmond, previous to the Battle of Bosworth Field, entered the town on the 20th of August, encamped with his forces in a meadow, north of the church, still called Royal Meadow: and took up his quarters at an ancient inn, now the Three Tuns, where he passed the night. The chair which he occupied is now in the possession of D.S. Baxter, Esq. There he had an interview with the Stanleys, and concerted those measures which secured him the victory in the ever memorable battle on the 22nd, and terminated the wars between the houses of York and Lancaster. He is said to have taken the Sacrament of the Mass in the church here the day after’.

They couldn’t have both been on Royal Meadow, could they? It would have been like the prelude to the cup final at Wembley, and just as noisy! 

Denis Cash

Dear Editor,

I recently visited Wigmore in Herefordshire and had the chance to compare two issues of the guide to the parish church. The one printed in the 1970s states that a sculpture of the crowned head of a young boy rests on the windowsill in the vestry. The current church guide has this reference deleted. The earlier guide suggests it could be Edward V. Would any member know the whereabouts of this sculpture?

Secondly, the New Inn at Pembridge, close to Mortimer’s Cross, is reputed to have been the location of the signing of a treaty after the battle. Can anyone enlighten me regarding such a treaty, it being the first reference I have come across?

Neil Cain

Dear Editor,

In the Summer 2004 edition of the Bulletin there appeared three letters concerning the review of Dr Michael Jones’s book Bosworth 1485: Psychology of a Battle, and one letter plus the author’s rejoinder to the review of Dr Ann Wroe’s book Perkin: a Story of Deception, both reviews having been published in
Dear Editor,

I have never written to the Bulletin before even though I have been a member of the society for about thirty years. However, this is something that I feel very strongly about and would like to express.

Last year I was thrilled to find that someone had taken the trouble to write a new book about Perkin Warbeck, and what a book! It was an awe-inspiring amount of research presented in a captivating way. Dr Ann Wroe had created a finely crafted and beautiful vessel for her prodigious learning and I was deeply moved and inspired by it. Not since Barbara Tuchman’s A Distant Mirror had a history book made such an impact on me.

I was therefore horrified to read Dr Hannes Kleineke’s review in The Ricardian. I had not expected such negative criticism. I applaud Dr Ian Mortimer’s comments on this review. He said it all. (I would like to add that I also enjoyed his powerful book The Greatest Traitor). History is an art and I feel that is in danger of being forgotten, bearing in mind the number of unreadable ‘scholarly’ works now being produced. Maybe this is something my fellow Ricardians would like to debate – what sort of history books do we really want? With the necessary knowledge and determination facts can be gathered but then what to do with the harvest if the gatherer is not blessed with the talent to present it well? Dr Wroe has that talent in abundance and I feel she has given us a great book that deserves to be read and discussed for a long time to come.

In conclusion I would like to say that I have been a life-long student of history and I have a degree in art history (mostly Renaissance studies) so I do know a good history book when I read one.

Cherie L W Stephens, BA
Perkin in The Ricardian. Dr Wroe has every right to speculate on the mind of individuals involved. Any classical study of any individual in history, be it Richard III at Bosworth or Churchill at Dunkirk is speculative. I do think such criticism was totally unwarranted, whilst to dismiss Dr Wroe’s work the way Dr Kleineke did is highly unfair. I would unreservedly recommend Perkin to any of my ‘A’ students studying Tudor history as essential and most enjoyable reading. I would do the same if they were studying an undergraduate course in early Tudor history. Dr Wroe’s valuable contribution must be appreciated and protected. I would urge The Ricardian to allow Dr Ann Wroe the right to present the summation of her thesis, in order to create further debate on this great enigma of history.

Paul C Doherty, BA, DPhil,[Oxon], FRSA

[*Editor – see ‘Booklist’ for full citation]

Dear Editor,

When Dr Kleineke’s unpleasant review of Dr Wroe’s Perkin appeared in The Ricardian 2004, I read it with increasing disgust, and I intended then to ‘break a lance’ for Ann Wroe. However, increasing ill-health made this impossible. Fortunately, Dr Mortimer’s splendid letter in the Bulletin, Summer 2004, contains most of what I feel. He has my gratitude.

Perhaps it is ‘the scholar’s self-imposed restraint’ - which Kleineke insists that Dr Wroe lacks - which accounts for the failure of successive scholars, including Arthurson (who has Kleineke’s approval, and whose book possesses merits) to spot, much less examine, at least one of Dr Wroe’s most important and intriguing finds. This she examines most thoroughly. I must not reveal this, but I have in fact known of one reference to that matter for decades. I wondered, but did nothing. Dr Wroe is, so far as I am aware, the only scholar to tackle that mystery. A fascinating story she reveals, most thoroughly researched.

I must commend, also, Dr Wroe’s spirited defence of her work. Her penultimate paragraph is a delight. Oddly, Dr Kleineke criticises Dr Wroe’s refusal to commit herself as to the identity of Perkin/Richard. We can never, on the evidence which exists, be absolutely sure of the young man’s true identity, and Dr Wroe is too honest to make any such assumption.

I must stop. In conclusion, may I urge members to read Dr. Wroe’s book. They would learn much. I did.

W E Hampton

Dear Editor,

Hail to the Chief! A plain man looks at the Michaelian hypothesis

Poor Tony Robinson. He presents two prime time television programmes at a prime time of year for capturing an audience, and publicly they seem to sink without a trace! It must have been a disappointment for him. He offered a well argued proof, in the presence of Michael Jones, which seemed to indicate that the current UK royal family may well be a bunch of imposters who have little legal title to their position, nor probably most of their inherited wealth and possessions. How is a plain Ricardian supposed to react to that information, and to the identification of a legitimate line of succession – and a Plantagenet one at that – which offers us a contemporary King Michael I living at ease with himself in a country unknown to Europe in 1485?

Supporters of a revolution (and that is what happened in 1485 – Fidel Castro and Henry VII have a lot more in common than is first apparent) come to line up with one faction or another for many and complex reasons, but several major identifiable motivations for taking a side are features common to all revolutionary struggles. Amongst the obvious are:

- The Ideologues: persons strongly driven to do what they perceive to be ‘right’
- The Self seekers: persons who join the revolution for persona, financial or political gain
- The loyal: those who are bound by an instinctive loyalty to (usually) an individual, family, group or cause
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You can find all of the above on both sides at Bosworth, and spend a happy hour with the elements of both armies, easily classifying families, individuals and political groupings under one or other of the headings: but I am not going to ask you to do that.

I am going to ask you to look to yourself. Where do you stand, with revolution once more in the air?

Many Ricardians have preached a very simple gospel for years, and that is, ‘Richard the Third was the last true legitimate king of England’. It has been preached with hope from the 1890s and now with conviction in 2004. For years now, research – often driven by the Society or its sympathisers – has filled out our understanding of the period of the Plantagenet wars. It has forced us again and again to reappraise the key players, their motivations (almost always base, unfortunately) actions, achievements and failures.

Robinson’s Channel 4 television programmes now face us with the ultimate reappraisal. For today’s adherents of Richard III a largely unnoticed, but crucial Rubicon has been crossed: the illegitimacy of Edward, and the consequently enhanced legitimacy of Richard, has moved from historically possible (we’ve debated it for years), to the historically probable. The Rouen document has changed everything.

Is it important that many Ricardians were right all along, and that Richard was the last legitimate king?

David Fiddimore, Edinburgh

Dear Editor,

One common complaint amongst writers on the battle of Bosworth has been the dearth of actual archaeological ‘finds’ over the area of the ‘traditional’ site, apart from a few cannon balls, which are difficult to date with any precision, and most of the artefacts at one time displayed as relics in Leicester’s Jewry Wall Museum have been dismissed as spurious, or of doubtful provenance, by, amongst others, Peter Foss, in his Appendices to The Field of Redemore (1990). However, a recent article by Bob Martin (Medieval History magazine, No. 6, February 2004) on the Battlefield Centre, published a photograph (from which the accompanying illustration on p. 50 is taken) of a recent discovery, which may prove a notable exception. The two small heraldic pendants, probably originating as part of a horse harness, display arms which have been identified as belonging to the families of Wake and Bagot, members of which are known to have taken part in the battle. Roger Wake (married to William Catesby’s sister Elizabeth) fought for Richard III and was attainted. He survived until 1504, and is commemorated by a memorial brass, on an elaborately carved tomb-chest decorated with the family arms on shields and badges of the ‘wake knot’, at Bosworth, Northants., while Richard Bagot was killed at Bosworth, fighting for Henry Tudor.

Therefore it seems that these two small artefacts may be significant as evidence for the encounter of at least some forces around the ‘traditional’ Ambion Hill/Battlefield Centre site. One further interesting point: contrary to John Ashdown-Hill’s reference to the ‘degradation’ of the enamel, due to burial, on the so-called Bosworth crucifix (Bulletin, Summer 2004, p. 30): it has been the survival of the enamelled details on these pendants that has provided means for their identification. Perhaps one of our archaeologist/museum staff members can comment on this seeming anomaly?

Geoffrey Wheeler

Dear Editor,

The letter from Bill Featherstone in the last issue of the Bulletin (page 35) implies that there is something odd about calling a clergyman ‘the Rev. Mr. Young’. Let me quote from Debrett’s Correct Form, page 135: ‘the form ‘the Reverend Smith’ is incorrect and should never be used’. The correct form of address is to use the Christian name, e.g. ‘the Rev. John Smith’, but where this is not known a further title has to be inserted. Nowadays, of course, the vicar might well be the Rev. Ms. Smith.

Lesley Wynne-Davies
The Barton Library

and Society member

A - Books Library

JEFFERY, Paul:
For the first time in my term as Librarian I have decided to offer non-

Please send your bids to me: Mrs Jane Trump, Gorsedene, Bagshot Road, Knaphill, Woking, Surrey GU21 2SF or email them to me at: neil.trump@btinternet.com to arrive before Wednesday 29 September 2004. If you wish to be reassured that I have received your postal bid(s) please enclose a stamped addressed envelope. Please do not send any money now.

The successful bidders will be notified by post and the cost of postage added to the invoices, unless you would like to collect the books from Knaphill in person or you can pick them up at the AGM on 2 October 2004. It would be very helpful if you could add a note to your bids saying if you expect to be at the AGM and giving me a phone number for contacting you to check.

**PETERS Ellis:**
Vols 1 -
Vols 18 & 19 in large paperback
Vol 20 in hardback
Reserve price for set: £25.00

**PLAIDY Jean:**
10 volumes in hardback
Reserve price: £30.00
Complete: 79 (December 1982) to 159 (December 2002). All have
- Complete: 100 (March 1988) to 157 (June 2002). There are no Individual

Ricardian Non-Fiction

ASTON Margaret  The Fifteenth Century: The Prospect of Europe 1968 £4
(Paperback - good condition but some browning to the pages.)

BENNETT HS  The Pastons and their England 1922 (Fair condition -
some browning to pages and feathering around the edges.) £5

BENNETT Michael  The Battle of Bosworth 1985 (Plastic cover - beautiful
cover.) £10

BINDOFF ST  Tudor England 1978 (Paperback - No. 5 in The Pelican
History of England series - tatty at edges and text has
been underlined on several pages.) £3

BUCK Sir George (editor
G Kincaid)  The History of King Richard III 1982 (Good condition, no
dust jacket.) £10

CHEETHAM Anthony  The Life and Times of Richard III 1972 (Dust jacket
slightly tatty.) £8

COOK David R  Lancastrians and Yorkists: The Wars of the Roses 1984 £4
(Paperback in the Seminar Studies in History series -
good condition.)

DREWETT Richard & REDHEAD Mark  The Trial of Richard III 1984 (Paperback, cover slightly
worn.) £5

DREWETT Richard & REDHEAD Mark  The Trial of Richard III 1984 (Paperback)  £6

DOCKRAY Keith  Richard III: A Reader in History 1988 (Paperback - good
condition, some browning to the pages.) £5

* EDWARDS Rhoda  The Itinerary of King Richard III: 1483-1485 1983 £2.50
(Paperback) I have 6 copies.

FRASER Antonia (editor)  The Lives of the Kings & Queens of England 1975 (Good
condition - some browning to the pages.) £8

FROISSART (ed GC Macauley)  The Chronicles of Froissart 1904 (Fair condition - some
browning to pages feathered around the edges.) £6
HALLAM Elizabeth
(general editor)
The Chronicles of the Wars of the Roses 1988 £10

HAMMOND Peter
& SUTTON Anne
Richard III: The road to Bosworth Field 1985 (Excellent condition.) I have two copies in this condition each £8

HAMMOND Peter
& SUTTON Anne
Richard III: The road to Bosworth Field 1985 (Good condition but dust jacket slightly damaged in front.) £7

HAMMOND Peter
& SUTTON Anne
Richard III: The road to Bosworth Field 1985 (Good condition but dust jacket torn at back.) £6

I have two copies in this condition. each

I have two copies. each
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*POTTER Jeremy  

Good King Richard? 1983. I have three copies £5 each

&

COX John (editors)

--

WORKMAN P, CARTY R

I have three copies.

SERIES)

T

b

I have two copies.

Exh

Series - a

(Reduced)

Ricardian Fiction

CAMPBELL-BARNES

Margaret

The Tudor Rose 1972 (Paperback - reasonable condition. £3)

EDWARDS Rhoda

Some Touch of Pity 1977 (Paperback - good condition but browning on pages. £3)

Rosemary

Rosemary
Rosemary

Rosemary

Rosemary

Rosemary

Rosemary

Rosemary

Cynthia

n
Good luck with your bids.

Jane Trump

Artifacts recently found at Bosworth, see Geoff Wheeler's letter on p. 42
Bookseller

A service to members from the editor detailing fiction and non-fiction historical books that have recently been published, or will be published in the near future. From The Bookseller 23 April – 9 July 2004 inclusive.


COLETTI, Theresa, ‘Mary Magdalen and the Drama of Saints: Theater, gender and religion in late Medieval England’, Univ. Pennsylvania Press, £42.00, June 2004

DAVIDSON, Clifford, (Editor), ‘Dramatic tradition of the Middle Ages’, AMS Studies in the Middle Ages, No. 26, AMS Press, USA, £56.95, June 2004

EMERSON, Catherine, ‘Olivier de la Marche and the rhetoric of fifteenth-century historiography’, Boydell Press, £45.00, May 2004

FRAZER, Margaret, ‘The Bastard’s Tale’, Hale, £18.99, April 2004 (medieval crime fiction series)

GILLESPIE, Vincent, ‘Looking in Holy Books; essays on late medieval religious writing in England’, Religion & Culture in the Middle Ages Series, Univ. Wales Press, £45.00, June 2004


KAUFMAN, J E, ‘Medieval fortresses, castles, forts and walled cities of the Middle Ages’, Da Capo Press, pbk., £15.50, June 2004


STARKEY, David, ‘Monarchy Volume One: the early kings’, Chatto, £25.00, June 2004 (Linked to Channel 4 series Monarchy, from 410 to the fall of the House of Lancaster in mid – fifteenth century)
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W e reported in the last Bulletin that the American Branch had received a $1.4 million bequest from Maryloo Schallek for graduate study at the Medieval Academy of America, and that after consultations it had been decided to spend some of the money on five annual awards of $2,000 each to North American students working on medieval England. Sharon D. Michalove has now sent us the names of the first five recipients, and their fields of study.

Proposals were evaluated on their originality, methodology, and the likelihood that it would make an important contribution to medieval studies.

The awards were given to:

(1) **Paul J. Patterson** (Department of English, University of Notre Dame), for a critical edition with commentary on ‘A Mirror to Devout People’, a Middle English devotional text for women. He will use the manuscript at the University of Notre Dame (the only other one extant is in Cambridge). He says, ‘Relying on wills, legal documents and textual evidence from original archival sources, the commentary centers the edition within current scholarly debates on the role of vernacular theology in the fifteenth-century English book trade’. He will then move to the broader issues of lay female readership and the implications of vernacular theology in late Medieval England.

(2) **Kathryn Kelsey Staples** (Department of History, University of Minnesota), for her study ‘Daughters of London: Inheritance Practice in Late Medieval London’. She will look at the experience of daughters in an urban setting and examine inheritance patterns, looking at a series of wills in London’s Court of Hustings between 1300 and 1500. She writes, ‘[this] will illuminate women’s experiences before they became nuns, wives and widows. At many points in their lives men and women, and perhaps women to a greater extent, were defined by and identified themselves with the position they held within their family. Therefore it is important to consider the lived experiences of medieval people at every point along their life trajectory.’

(3) **Frederick J. Poling** (Department of History, Catholic University of America), for research into ‘Villagers in Court: the Hierarchies of Rural Life in Later Medieval England’. He will look at records of local court jurisdictions, where medieval villagers would have been most likely to have encountered church law in relation to their own lives, and study three courts, creating a database and making a statistical analysis of villagers’ participation in the courts. He says, ‘The records in this study ... provide an opportunity of examining village-level social control both before and after the Reformation.

(4) **Mary Hayes** (Department of English, University of Iowa), for a very difficult and demanding topic: ‘Still Small Voice: Silence in Medieval English Devotion and Literature’. She will examine how devotional silence functioned in sacred environments and how it was represented in medieval literary texts, saying, ‘[this] affords insight into medieval religious practices themselves ... silence allowed the divine voice to be “heard” ... although silence can characterize mystical, dumbstruck awe, even such pious reverence admits the voice’s inadequacy. God’s silent voice pervaded devotional settings and, implicitly, all sacred speech. Thus, devotional silences enact a paradox about the voice’s potential that pertains to all religious discourse.’

(5) **Rebecca A. Davis** (Department of English, University of Notre Dame) will study ‘Piers Plowman and the Books of Nature, Letter from America
discussing the concept of nature (‘kynde’) in the books. Langland identified God with ‘kynde’, whereas earlier writers had seen nature as ‘a female goddess who acts as God’s vicar’. She will investigate Langland’s notion of the relationship between God and creation, and demonstrate how ‘Langland’s familiarity with other discourses of nature will contribute in some part to scholarly efforts to place the elusive poet in a more specifically defined intellectual and historical context’.

**Book Review**

As promised in our last issue, we will be publishing the occasional review of new (or newish) novels in the *Bulletin* and so here is a review (perhaps also a warning) of a book which was published several years ago. The review has been written by Anne Painter, the Fiction Librarian, who, we are very pleased to announce, has agreed to act as fiction reviews editor.

**The Beggars Throne**
By David Falconieri
San Francisco 2000 Hardback £24:00

The story takes place between the Battles of Wakefield and Tewkesbury. It opens with a priest at the court of Henry VI desperately trying to conceal a letter from Margaret of Anjou concerning the parentage of her son. He gives the letter to Katherine, a Lady in Waiting to Margaret, who, realising the danger of the letter, conceals it in a statue of the Virgin Mary belonging to Elizabeth Woodville with whom she shares a room. Katherine then escapes from court knowing she is not safe from Margaret of Anjou’s vengeance.

The story then moves on to the Battle of Wakefield where the lives of Samuel Miller, a guard in the Percy Household, and Oliver, a page in the service of Edmund earl of Rutland, become entangled when Samuel saves Oliver from being killed along with Edmund by Lord Clifford after the Battle of Wakefield. Because Samuel saved Oliver he is made a member of Edward IV’s body guard.

From then on, the lives of Samuel, Oliver, Katherine, Edward IV, Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou are interwoven.

The historical accuracy is very sketchy. No sooner has Edward gained the throne than he moves the bodies of Richard of York and Edmund from Pontefract to Fotheringhay, then marries Elizabeth Woodville by whom he had two children, Elizabeth of York and Edward Prince of Wales.

Edward IV is captured at the Battle of Edgcote by Warwick and held prisoner at Warwick Castle. He is freed by Lord Hastings as he is being taken to Middleham Castle, and flees to Burgundy and his sister “Maggy” (*sic*). (I have never heard Margaret of Burgundy called Maggy before). Warwick then places Henry VI on the throne once more and we have the usual tale of Henry Tudor being introduced to Henry VI, this time with Henry asking who he is and being told that he is the son of Edmund Tudor who was beheaded by the Yorkists for fighting for the House of Lancaster.

The book finishes with the aftermath of the Battle of Tewkesbury and Richard of Gloucester stabbing Henry VI in the back as he prays in St John’s Chapel.

The letter which causes such trouble in the book comes to a very poor end. Elizabeth Woodville never discovers the secret her statue has been concealing.

Should any member wish to read the book there is a copy in the Barton Fiction Library.

Anne Painter
Report on Society Events

Westminster Abbey and Lambeth Palace – 22 April 2004

On a sunny spring morning twenty-five Ricardians met outside the Westminster Abbey gift shop for what was to prove to be a fascinating day. We went first to the Westminster Abbey Museum. This is situated in one of the oldest surviving parts of the Abbey, the undercroft of the monks’ dormitory, dating from 1070. It now houses an exhibition of funeral effigies and artefacts of royal figures and a few other notables, from Edward III to Lord Nelson. Many date from the seventeenth and early eighteenth century when the Henry VII Chapel was the royal mausoleum. From our period, we had the surviving upper portions of Henry VII’s and Elizabeth of York’s effigies.

The effigies were made to be life-size, as they would be dressed in the person’s clothes – Elizabeth’s surviving arm was hinged to make dressing easier. The faces were also supposed to be a likeness, and Henry’s and Edward III’s had been modelled on their death masks; Edward’s even shows the facial contortion caused by his final stroke. Most of the effigies of Henry and Elizabeth were destroyed in the war, but until then Elizabeth’s effigy had measured 5’11” tall. Croyland described Elizabeth and Anne Neville, as ‘being of like complexion and figure’, and so it was interesting to speculate how tall Anne might have been. Continuing the funereal theme, the funeral achievements (helm, shield and saddle) of Henry V were on display. A little of the blue lining of the shield still survives: the silk was apparently imported from China by special order – a fifteenth-century example of globalisation.

Reassembling after lunch we walked across the river to Lambeth Palace. After a quick look at the garden, we had a guided tour of the palace. Our guide, Quentin, injected some welcome gentle humour into his account of Lambeth Palace as the headquarters of the Church of England and the world-wide Anglican Communion. The palace was first built in the thirteenth century, sited just across the river from the seat of government at Westminster. The palace was largely rebuilt in the nineteenth century, but some medieval parts remain. The red brick Morton’s Tower, built by Archbishop John Morton, was where Thomas More supposedly slept when he was in Morton’s household, in the 1490s. More was to return in less happy circumstances. In 1534 he was summoned here to swear an oath to deny papal supremacy; having refused he was sent down river to the Tower and eventual execution. Richard III’s grand-nephew, Reginald Pole, briefly restored Roman Catholicism to Lambeth two decades later. However, his only legacy to have borne lasting fruit was his fig tree, still flourishing in the garden.

The Library was the highlight of our visit to Lambeth. Archbishop Bancroft founded it in 1610, by bequeathing his own collection of books and manuscripts. It was England’s first public library and contains thousands of works, many of them medieval. A special display had been set up for us of items related to Richard III. We saw the Register of Archbishop Bourchier, open at the page with Richard’s coronation oath and a copy of De Regimine Principum that had been inscribed ‘the most illustrious book of the Prince, the Duke of Gloucester’. Richard’s Book of Hours was also on display, though an inscription there marked Margaret Beaufort’s later ownership. Other books also showed the changes in Richard’s fortunes. A manuscript of Dictes des Philosophes showed the famous illumination of Earl Anthony Rivers presenting a printed copy of England’s first printed book to Edward IV, Queen Elizabeth and Prince Edward, with the figure in blue and ermine in the background, supposedly being Richard. In the margin below was later written ‘This Erle was the most lernd, valyant and honorable knight of the world …’ and what may have been Richard’s signature had been scratched out on the flyleaf. Another manuscript, William of Worcester’s Collections on Normandy, had been dedicated to Richard and his ‘most couragious princely disposcione’; but the dedication looked as if it had been later rather crudely
altered to a more acceptable Edward IV instead.

Books about Richard were also on display. A 1603 edition of the Polydore Vergil’s *Anglica Historia* and a 1651 edition of Thomas More’s *The History of Richard III* were on show. These hostile works were balanced by a first edition of George Buck’s biography – published in Parliamentarian London in 1647 as Henry VII’s heir tottered on his throne. Opposite the title page were illustrations supposedly depicting Richard’s bed and house. The latter was a simple half-timbered dwelling rather than the Middleham or Nottingham that might have been expected. Needless to say, I was a little dubious about these homely little touches.

This was a very interesting and thought-provoking day. Many thanks are due to Rosemary Waxman for negotiating with Lambeth Palace and organizing and leading the visit.

Howard Choppin

Visit to Ely

On Saturday 19 June 2004 twenty-two members of the Society met inside the Grand Galilee porch of Ely Cathedral for a guided tour of this exceptional building. This event had been advertised in the *Bulletin* and thus we were able to welcome participants from outside the Mid Anglia Group, who joined us from London, Peterborough, King’s Lynn and Newmarket.

Ely Cathedral encompasses more than a millennium of history, architecture and art, and we enjoyed it all, even though our interest naturally focussed on the fifteenth-century links. Our guide, Christine, a lady of great knowledge and equally great good humour, steered us through it all with wit and style. We began with a wry look at the less favourable aspects of the cathedral – namely the unimpressive Victorian glass (omnipresent due to the destructive zeal of protestant reformer, Bishop Goodrich, who ordered all the medieval glass destroyed, along with any sculpted images and the shrine of St. Etheldreda) and the somewhat incongruous Victorian painted ceiling in the nave – apparently the work of two successive artistically gifted amateurs, who had offered to do it all for free. (Given this dubious premise, the results are not as bad as one would have feared.)

The oldest remaining item in the cathedral is the base of a Saxon memorial cross of the early eighth century. There is also an impressively carved Norman doorway, far more ornate than the plain and massive Norman pillars and walls of the nave and west tower.

The greatest feature of Ely Cathedral is the Octagon which took the place of the Norman central tower when the latter collapsed in 1322. The Sacrist Alan of Walsingham, who was then in charge of the cathedral fabric, conceived a great lantern tower made of wood, lead and glass. It rests on eight huge pillars, giving the structure its octagonal shape. The construction has a total weight of some 400 tonnes, is 72 feet in diameter and 60 feet high. It is unique in Europe, a work of undisputed engineering genius and a supreme example of medieval craftsmanship.

At about the same time as the Octagon an unusually large and spacious Lady Chapel was built parallel with the choir on the northern side. It resembles a glasshouse due to the vast area of window glass, now all plain, but originally coloured, just as the walls inside used to be painted. Some of the original colour on the stonework can still be seen: vivid blue and red. The extravagantly-carved wall canopies show scenes from the life of the Virgin Mary. Sadly all the figures are now headless and mutilated, thanks to the purge of images conducted by Bishop Goodrich.

There is not much building fabric in Ely Cathedral which dates from the fifteenth century, except for the unusual, highly ornate, carved ‘angel’ roofs of the transepts on either side of the Octagon. The cathedral is linked with our chosen period mainly through certain people from its history.

Thomas Bourchier (Bishop of Ely, 1444-1454) moved on to become Archbishop of Canterbury and, as such, crowned three successive kings: Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII. As a grandson of Edward III, he was related to the royal family. He died in 1486, and lies buried under an ornate, high tomb in the choir of Canterbury Cathedral.

John Morton needs little introduction, and his mention provoked the expected hissing noises.
Bishop of Ely 1479-1486, he succeeded Bourchier as Archbishop of Canterbury, and died in 1500. Consequently he too lies buried at Canterbury—mostly at any rate, for his head, purloined by a naughty choirboy, enjoyed a peripatetic existence before coming to rest at Stonycroft College. Morton’s effigy in the crypt at Canterbury, as seen last summer, is somewhat defaced and his tomb is battered and unspectacular. Poetic justice?

There is now no trace of these two great prelates in the present cathedral at Ely, except for their names and coats-of-arms which appear on embroidered kneelers in the choir. However a third bishop, John Alcock (Morton’s successor at Ely, 1486-1501), has left his mark on the cathedral in the shape of the most extravagant chantry chapel. Alcock was at one time chancellor to Edward IV, and also tutor to the prince of Wales (Edward V). The official guide book calls his chapel, in the north east corner of the choir, ‘an almost vulgar piece of virtuosity in stone’. The richness of the lace-like carving inside is quite extraordinary. A recurring theme of this carving is the bishop’s rebus: a cock sitting on an orb, representing the world, and meaning ‘all’. This device is also repeated twice in stained glass flanking the entrance.

Finally there is the Tiptoft monument, a grand, triple-canopied tomb chest on the south side of the choir, with effigies of John Tiptoft, first Earl of Worcester, resting between two of his wives. Our guide was unable to say which two wives, though, as he had three in all, the first being Cecily Neville, sister of Warwick ‘the Kingmaker’. The carving is beautiful throughout, and although the tomb is so high that little of the sculpture is visible from below, we were able to admire the distinctive aquiline profile of the earl, and see the tame-looking lion on which his feet rest. The wife to his right wears a long mantle and a coronet, and all the figures have their hands folded in prayer.

John Tiptoft, Constable of England under Edward IV, and infamous as the ‘Butcher of England’ because of his ruthless persecution of Lancastrians, is not actually buried at Ely Cathedral. His family owned wide estates near Ely, and thus he originally provided for his tomb in this cathedral. However, he was eventually buried at the Church of the Blackfriars in London, following his execution on Tower Hill in October 1470, after his capture during the short-lived Lancastrian restoration. He was condemned by John de Vere, Earl of Oxford, whose father and brother Worcester had himself sentenced to death in 1462. Our guide recalled the story that when Tiptoft’s head fell it was remarked that ‘with that one blow more learning was destroyed than was left in the heads of the surviving nobility’. Indeed, it came as a surprise to many of us to hear that Tiptoft had a great reputation as a man of learning and a Latin scholar, and that he was one of the first Englishmen to bring the learning of the Italian Renaissance to this country. His own translation of Cicero’s De amicitia was printed by Caxton in 1481.

The positioning of Tiptoft’s tomb at Ely reminded me of that of Henry IV at Canterbury and that of King John at Worcester: right next to the shrine of the cathedral’s saint. The most coveted and prestigious location, and the most desired position to be in to gain saintly favour if one had something to atone for. Coincidence or deliberate intention?

The visit was greatly enjoyed by all present, and we hope to welcome everybody back again on future occasions. Thanks to John Ashdown-Hill for organizing it all so well, and to everyone for being such good company.

Kerstin Fletcher
**Future Society Events**

**New Announcements and Forthcoming Events**

**Requiem Mass 2005**

The annual requiem mass returns to London for 2005. It will be held on Saturday 12 March at St Etheldreda’s Church, Ely Place, followed by a buffet at the City Temple and an afternoon visit to Queen Anne Neville’s tomb at Westminster. Booking form in the Winter Bulletin.

John Ashdown-Hill

**Triennial Conference – 15/17 April 2005**

The next Society Triennial Conference will take place at Queen’s College Cambridge on 15-17 April 2005. The theme of the conference will centre around East Anglia with an emphasis on the great families of the locality – the de la Poles, the de Veres, the Mowbrays and the Howards. Papers will be presented by Rosemary Horrox, James Ross, Rowena Archer and Anne Crawford. David Dymond will talk about the late-medieval gilds of East Anglia and Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs complete the line-up of distinguished speakers with a paper on Richard and the city of Cambridge. Further details and booking form will be in the Winter Bulletin.

Wendy Moorhen

**Bookable Events**

**Norfolk Branch Study Day - Saturday, 13 November 2005**

The theme for this year’s study day will be *Death of Kings*, and will be held at the Elizabeth Fry Building, University of East Anglia, Norwich.

**Programme:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30 - 09.55</td>
<td>Refreshment on arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.55 - 10.00</td>
<td>Welcome to the Study Day - Chairman David Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 10.50</td>
<td>The Deathbed of Medieval Kings by Professor Carol Rawcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50 - 11.15</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 - 12.05</td>
<td>Edward II by Alison Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20 - 12.55</td>
<td>The Death of Richard Duke of York: A Yorkist King in Waiting by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Michael K Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.55 - 14.15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.15 - 15.05</td>
<td>Perkin Warbeck by Dr Ann Wroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.05 - 15.30</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 - 16.20</td>
<td>First Catch Your Asp by Dr Phil Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.20 - 16.50</td>
<td>Summing up by Dr Michael K Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.50 - 17.15</td>
<td>Questions and Vote of thanks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme subject to change if circumstances dictate. If you wish to attend please complete the booking form in the centre pages.

Please note that from 2005 the study day will be back in the Assembly House, Norwich. Will all those who wish to be on our mailing list please contact: Annmarie Hayek, Tel. (01603) 664021

Annmarie Hayek

Christmas at Fotheringhay - Sunday, 12 December 2004

It is time to make your booking. As usual, lunch will be in the village hall, with a choice of starter, hot or cold, and for the main course there will be jacket potatoes with a cold turkey buffet. A vegetarian option will be available for those who let me know. The choice of desserts includes Christmas pudding. Also included in the price is a glass or two of wine or a soft drink, as desired.

The Carol Service, in Fotheringhay Church, begins at 3.00 p.m. Similar in style to the festival of nine lessons and carols, it is shared with members of the parish, some of whom take part. The music will be led, as ever, by our friends, the wonderful St. Peter’s Singers.

This event has long been accepted to be one of the highlights of the Ricardian social calendar. It is a great chance to meet up with old friends, and to make new ones, too. For many, it is a delightful start to the Christmas season.

As usual, there will be a coach from London, leaving Charing Cross embankment at 9.30 a.m. and getting back between 7 and 7.30 p.m. There will also be pick-ups in Bromley and Wanstead for those who let me know. On the way, there will be a comfort stop in Cambridge, though this is not usually repeated for the return journey.

If you wish to join the party, either on the coach or using your own transport, please advise me as soon as possible whether you will require:-

a) lunch and a place on the coach - total 45 available
b) lunch after making your own way to Fotheringhay - total 35 places
c) just a place in the church (so that we can estimate the seating required)

The costs, which once again are unchanged, will be as follows:-

a) £23.45 to cover hire of coach, the driver’s tip, lunch, choir, admin., etc.
b) £14.00 for lunch, choir and administration, etc.

Please complete the booking form and return it to me as soon as possible.

Phil Stone, Fotheringhay Co-ordinator

New Ricardian Index

The index to Volume 12 of The Ricardian (March 2000 - December 2002) is now available. The index costs £2 which includes postage and packing.

Please order from the Sales Liaison Officer
Miss Sally Empson
42 Pewsey Vale
Forest Park
Bracknell, Berkshire
RG12 9YA
or e-mail sally.bracknell@virgin.net
Invitation of the Continental Group

This year the Continental Ricardians will come together for a meeting. It will be held in D-Oberems/Ts. on Saturday 6 November 2004. We meet in a room of our former guild hall in the village centre. We start at 11.00 a.m. with a little service in honour of Richard and his relations in the little Oberems old Protestant Parish Church. After that a provided lunch will be served at our meeting place. We also plan a little historical sightseeing tour through the Taurus mountainside after the meeting, or on the Friday before, or on the following Sunday morning. On the evening of 6 November we will attend a medieval banquet with animation in a nearby locality. Price for that event is * 40.00 per person.

Accommodation for this weekend can be booked as usual in our little village hotel with restaurant ‘Deutsches Haus’. B&B between * 35.00 and 38.00 per person per night. Fellow Ricardians are always warmly welcomed! So if you are interested, don’t hesitate to come over! Attendance should be announced as soon as possible. For further details please write, call or fax to the Group’s contact person: Rita Diefenhardt-Schmitt, Am Eichpfad 8, D-61479 Glashütten-Oberems-Taunus (Hessia), Germany, phone: 06082-3-91-20, fax: 06082-92-96-94. In hope for a pleasant meeting, we remain with Loyauté me Lie.

The Continental Group

Devon and Cornwall Branch

The Branch celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary this year. We have had a successful year with many members attending our bi-monthly meetings. In May 2003 we watched a video on the life of Margaret Paston which led nicely into the July meeting where Sue Taylor gave her one act play Lady of Paston. In September the second Robert Hamblin Memorial Lecture was given by Peter Hammond who spoke on Edward of Middleham. This was another very successful meeting with many members and ex-branch members attending.

The AGM in November was held in our new meeting venue, the 15th century Prysten House in central Plymouth. We believe we are the only branch to meet in a 15th century building, where we now have much more space than our old meeting room. December saw us enjoying a very good Christmas lunch at the Moat House hotel after our original choice burnt down. In January we had a fascinating talk by our Chairman John Saunders on the Battle of Stoke. The year ended in March with a visit from Ann Wroe who spoke on Perkin Warbeck, concentrating on his connections with the two counties. We look forward to further celebrations of our twenty-fifth anniversary as 2004 progresses.

Anne E Painter

Gloucestershire Branch

Our much valued Secretary, Mickie O’Neill has decided to relocate north to Ludlow. We will all be very sad to see her leave but wish her and Sean the very best of luck and happiness in their new home. In moving, Mickie will relinquish her secretary’s role. At the time of going to press we have yet to appoint a successor but will announce the ‘victim’ in the next Bulletin. Fortunately, Mickie will remain a branch member and has promised to maintain an active participation in future events and attend meetings where this proves practical. She has also very kindly agreed to continue producing and supplying our regular branch magazine News and Views. The publication has greatly prospered under her direction and it is really good to know that we will continue
to enjoy both the progressive quality of this publication and her lively and enthusiastic presence at future meetings.

Our summer field visit proved very successful. We ventured into the Black Mountains of Wales – spectacular landscape and scenery. We first made a very welcome return visit to Tre-tower Court, the fortified manor house of the Vaughan family. The house has been superbly restored and the site retains the architecturally interesting shell tower of the earlier castle and an established and well tended medieval garden. Later in the day we tackled the precarious climb to the remote and beautiful Patrishow Church before concluding the day at Llanthony Priory.

Peter Hammond gave us his talk on Edward of Middleham in July. The event had been eagerly awaited and we were not disappointed, the content and presentation proving excellent. It was also really good to see Peter and Carolyn again.

Future Events:

- Saturday 4 September  Branch AGM
- Friday 17 September  Bristol Group AGM
- Saturday 9 October  Llanthony Priory, talk by Gwen Waters (Branch)
- Friday 15 October  To be announced (Bristol Group)
- Saturday 6 November  Annual Lecture (see below for details)
- Friday 19 November  Video and slide evening (Bristol Group)
- Saturday 4 December  Wales in the late medieval period, talk by Suzanne Doolan (Branch)
- Friday 10 December  Christmas Dinner (Bristol Group)

Keith Stenner

Richard III Society
Gloucestershire Branch
Annual Lecture
‘Music in the Age of Richard III’
An audio-visual presentation, complete with music by Tim Porter

Saturday 6 November 2004, 1.30 p.m. to 4.45 p.m.
(including a mid-afternoon break for refreshments and conversation)
Leckhampton Village Hall, Church St, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire

Cost: £5.00 per person, to include a mid-afternoon tea. Tickets and information available from Keith Stenner, 96 Allerton Crescent, Whitchurch, Bristol. BS14 9PX Tel. (01275) 541512

All Ricardians and their friends are most welcome to join us at what should be an excellent afternoon.
Mid Anglia Group

Non-members of the Mid Anglia Group are most welcome to attend any of our events (details below). For further information please contact John Ashdown-Hill

Saturday 18 September
Visit: Meet 13.50, south door of Southwold Church. We shall go on to visit Blythburgh Church and Leiston Abbey, with tea at Snape Maltings.

Saturday 20 November
Meet 14.00: Group AGM followed by talk ‘The Black Death’, by Norfolk Group member Frances Sparrow. Pykenham’s Gatehouse, Northgate Street, Ipswich.

Saturday 12 February

Saturday 2 April
Meet 14.00: Talk: ‘Perkin Warbeck’, by Dr. Ann Wroe. (Joint meeting with South Essex Group, venue to be announced).

Saturday 7 May
Visit: Thaxted & Little Easton. (To see a fine church, completed by Edward IV, and the tomb of Richard III’s aunt, Isabel of York.)

John Ashdown-Hill

Worcestershire Branch

We have had a good few months. The visit to Hellens at Much Marcle near Ledbury was very enjoyable. While not a great stately home it is an interesting moated manor house set in beautiful countryside. The local church, St Bartholomew’s, was also worth visiting, even if only to see the 1,000-year-old yew tree in the church yard. The tree is so huge the trunk has twisted in on itself and now contains a bench, and the outer branches are supported by ex-Gloucestershire Council street lamps. The tree is very much alive and growing.

Our tour of Hereford went very well with our guide David Whitehead who is very knowledgeable about his home city of Hereford and led us on an interesting walk around the city, through the castle grounds and across the river before ending up at the Cathedral, for a tour followed by a visit to the Mappa Mundi and chained library. David spoke to us in March about the marcher castles of Hereford.

In April we held our AGM in Cauldwell Castle in Kidderminster, the last remnants of a medieval building that stood on the site, the tower complete with battlements and blue plaque, and inhabited. The owner kindly let us use the basement room, which is his dining room, to hold our AGM, by candlelight. Following the AGM at which our committee remains unchanged, we went on a tour of the Tower.

June saw two events, the re-enactment of the battle of Mortimer’s Cross near Leominster and our visit to Hellens. The re-enactment was on a new site closer to the real battle site, but there were not as many visitors as last year. This was a shame as so much work had gone into the event.

In July we had our now annual stall at Tewkesbury, in the same tent as Graham Turner, so in the slow bits we could gaze on his beautiful pictures.

In August we visited the Armoury museum in Evesham.
Programme

Saturday 11 September  All-day visit to Astley, Nuneaton, Merevale and Haveston
Saturday 9 October  Business meeting followed by three short talks
Saturday 20 November Guided visit to The Shakespeare Centre Library, Stratford upon Avon

Full details of our programme are available from Val Sibley, secretary, 01564 777329

Jane Tinklin

Yorkshire Branch

The Branch has had another busy year going about its traditional activities such as the annual spring lecture and various visits to Towton and Middleham (including our Bosworth commemoration at St. Alkelda’s) as well as local group meetings, but this year has also seen the revival of our commemoration of the Battle of Wakefield, at the duke of York’s statue at Sandal, and another of our famous medieval banquets – this time at a new venue, though still in York, and one which promises to be an excellent choice: the Black Swan, Peasholme Green.

At our lecture on 12 April 2003, Dr Christopher Knüsel of Bradford University spoke on Bones, Battles and Plagues – Evidence from Medieval Graves and illustrated his talk with numerous details arising from recent research at Towton battlefield as well as civic sites.

During the summer, members visited Sandal Castle, Castle Bolton and Harewood church. At the last named our guide was Richard Knowles, FSA, a former branch committee member, who was involved in the extensive restoration work on the notable alabaster effigies in the church and is thus the ideal person to tell us more about the Gascoignes and Redmaynes commemorated there.

Our Branch AGM took place in York at the beginning of September. Our committee for 2003-4 remains the same as last year, with John Audsley as our Chairman. Autumn activities continued with the banquet at the end of October, while on 30 December we went to Sandal to remember Richard of York and those who fell with him in his ill-fated sortie from the castle.

The speaker at one of our Airedale meetings this winter was Sean Richardson, who is currently working at Sheriff Hutton castle, excavating, charting and restoring structural remains at this impressive building, one of the places where Richard III’s Council of the North would meet. The work is an ongoing project which has already had some interesting finds.

Angela Moreton
New Members

UK 1 Apr 2004 — 31 Jun 2004

Charles Blackwell, Egham, Surrey
Penelope Cumpson, Trowbridge, Wilts
Norma Doleman, Christchurch, Dorset
Anne Feather, Stamford, Lincs
Judith Ford, Loughborough, Leics
John Henney, Redditch, Worcs
Patricia Jones, Sale, Cheshire
Margaret McQueen Crossland, W Sussex
Jacqueline Nouwens, Abbots Barton, Hants
Joseph Slater, Kingswinford, W Midlands
Ruth Swaby, Louth, Lincs
Jennifer Watson—

Michael Cawley, Chorley, Lancs
Jack De Cordova, Rochester, Kent
Anne Evans, London W4
Patricia Fleming, Chepstow, Mon
Anne—
Marette Hickford, London SW16
Anita Long, Telford, Salop
Michael McRae, Birmingham
Yvonne Sawmy, Truro, Cornwall
Philip Stevens, Basingstoke, Hants
Margaret Warrington, Bucks

—

John Frid, Ontario, Canada
Stephen Watkins, New Mexico, USA

—

Ronald L Cline
JoAnn Drew Dworman
Kirsten J Giroux
Carrie Harlow
Robert Jacobs—
Betty B Lewis
Al Pickett
Andrea M Quinn
Robert L Siegel
Neil Wellam

Marion Davis
Karyn Errington
Jennifer S Hall
Susan Higginbotham
Beth Egan O’Keefe
Carolyn Preston
Daniel James Rudary
Mary Ann Vissers
Lewis C Whelchel
Obituaries

Madeline Tomlins  Dorset Group is very sad to announce the death of Madeline. I first met ‘Maddy’ when the Group started meeting at our late president Patrick Bacon’s home overlooking Poole Harbour about twenty years ago, and we quickly became friends. She enjoyed so many things in spite of being visually impaired – the company of her many friends, classical music, her dog Ellie, all wildlife, especially the birds in her garden, and of course our local Richard III meetings. Despite her quiet demeanor she was very knowledgeable and had a wonderful sense of humour. We will all miss her very much. Our condolences go to her brother Derek and all his family.

Babs Creamer

Ruth Thompson  The Croydon Group is extremely sad to report the death of Ruth Thompson, a staunch member for over twenty five years. She was a great friend of Maura Wells and died just over a month after Maura, whose obituary was printed in the last issue of the Bulletin. Ruth came from the north east of England and loved that part of the world, although she spent most of her life in London and the south east where she worked as a history teacher. Her historical knowledge was extremely comprehensive and she brought the medieval period alive to the youngsters she taught. One of her special Ricardian interests was Perkin Warbeck and she has entertained the Croydon Group on many occasions with detailed accounts of why she believed he was ‘the younger prince’. The Group was particularly pleased that both Ruth and Maura Wells were present at the group’s 2003 Christmas celebrations. That was the last occasion on which the two friends met and as they parted Maura commented to Ruth ‘whichever of us gets to the pearly gates first must find the answer to the historical mystery which has fascinated us for so long’. We in the Group have visions of these two extremely determined ladies joining forces and embarking on some serious heavenly sleuthing.

Ruth loved her family and was proud that four generations could be represented in photographs. She also had a wide circle of friends and following her death her family received countless tributes from children she had taught and their parents.

The Group feels Ruth’s loss deeply and extends its sincere sympathy to her family and friends.

Anne Walters

Maureen Jones and Gordon Lauder  The Lincolnshire Branch is very sad to report the death of two its members. They were stalwart supporters of the Branch. Gordon was one of ‘life’s gentlemen’, a very clever man, with an infectious laugh. Maureen was a very special lady, incredibly knowledgeable and a lovely, bubbly personality. They will both be sadly missed. We extend all our love and sympathy to their families.

Marion Moulton