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Contributions

Contributions are welcomed from all members. Articles and correspondence regarding the Bulletin Debate should be sent to Peter Hammond and all other contributions to Elizabeth Nokes.

Bulletin Press Dates

15 January for Spring issue; 15 April for Summer issue; 15 July for Autumn issue; 15 October for Winter issue.

Bulletin & Ricardian Back Numbers

Back issues of the The Ricardian and The Bulletin are available from Judith Ridley. If you are interested in obtaining any back numbers, please contact Mrs Ridley to establish whether she holds the issue(s) in which you are interested.

Isolde Wigram’s crucial role in the refounding of the Society was described in the Spring Bulletin, and I am very pleased to report that we have given her a celebratory tea at her retirement home in Hampshire to celebrate it. Isolde does not travel to meetings very easily now and it was important that we should take a part of our anniversary celebrations to her. We kept it small, but the President, a vice-president, members of the Executive Committee and Rita Diefenhardt-Schmitt from the Continental Group were there.

Indeed, our anniversary year is progressing nicely, a particular success having been the much oversubscribed seminar on military matters at the Tower of London. The four speakers were excellent and Chris Gravett even embellished his talk with a practical demonstration in fifteenth-century armour. Read more in Bill Featherstone’s review.

Our series of retrospective articles on events and personalities from the past fifty years continues. This time we focus on George Awdry and the unveiling of the Leicester statue in 1980. George was a unique character who will be well remembered by many members. Can it really be twenty-six years since the statue was unveiled by Princess Alice, Duchess of Gloucester, standing in for her son, our Patron? As we are told, time flies! In this issue, too, we are further reminded of the early days through the reminiscences of some long-standing Ricardians.

There is our usual mix of items and it is good to see articles by Marie Barnfield and Moira Habberjam about Queen Anne Neville in this, the 550th anniversary year of the queen’s birth. There will be more in the autumn with the second instalment of Marie’s article as well as a feature in the winter issue. Instead of the usual debate, this time we have three different views on the fate of the Princes in the Tower and we encourage you to respond. To coin a phrase, this one will run and run.

After having taken over from the ‘legendary’ Carolyn Hammond in 2001, Jane Trump is about to stand down as Society Librarian, and on behalf of everyone, I thank Jane for her sterling work during the last five years. Rising postal charges and easier access to information via the internet inevitably mean that borrowing has changed, and in light of this, together with advances in information technology, we are now looking at how best to make use of our invaluable library resource in the future. Meanwhile, we have a new librarian in Keith Horrey, and I welcome him to the team. He takes over later in the year.

Pilgrimages have been described as the ‘package holidays of the Middle Ages’, but there was more to them than that, of course, and in July there will be a modern ‘pilgrimage’ to raise money for Barley Hall, as well as other charities, with a forty-mile walk from Nostell Priory to York. After you have read more about it on page 36, I would urge you to sponsor members who are taking part. Barley Hall is a very worthy Ricardian cause.

Writing this at the beginning of May, I look forward to the next anniversary event, at Barnard’s Inn, when our Patron will present the prizes to winners of the schools’ essay and poster competitions. There will be a report of the evening in the Bulletin in September. In the meantime, you can see some entries on our much improved and impressive website.

Finally, I hope everyone will continue to enjoy the anniversary year, whether it be through events or the pages of the Bulletin and, depending upon whether you are north or south of the equator, may you have a warm summer or a mild winter.

Phil Stone
Society News and Notices

Membership Matters

Since taking over the membership roles in early February it has been a busy time. The increase in subscriptions for members, effective October 2005, has meant that about half the membership have needed to update their standing orders to reflect the increase and although many of these were in place by the time the subscriptions were collected this was not universally the case and reminders have had to be sent out. At the same time we have had to send out reminders to members actually to pay their subscriptions for the year. All this is an additional expense for the Society and it would be appreciated if members could ensure they pay their subscriptions on time, which is October, and pay the correct amount for their category.

Membership Category

If your membership category does change do please advise us. If you qualify to take advantage of the senior citizen concession we do need to be told as records are not automatically adjusted when members reach the age of sixty. Although we do hold the date of birth for recent members this is a comparatively new innovation and we do not have this information for the majority of members. A number of you in the senior citizen category have written to say that they thought they had been overpaying their subs for some years. However, the senior citizen concession was only reduced to 60, from 65, in 2005.

Direct Debit Payments

Another problem that has emerged is that although some members completed and sent in new standing order forms for payment last October, and these were received by the membership department, they consequently have either been lost in the mail to the relevant bank or the bank has not processed the instruction.

Several members have raised the question of whether they could pay their subscriptions by direct debit. The Executive Committee investigated this possibility a few years ago and came to the conclusion that it was not feasible. In order to offer the direct debit option, where the Society would be assigned the right to deduct subscriptions, and any revised subscriptions, directly from members’ bank accounts, members of the Executive Committee would need to provide substantial personal financial guarantees. The Committee felt that, as they are volunteers who receive no financial remuneration for their work, they were not prepared to undertake such guarantees.

The recent increase in the subscription rates has generated a lot of work with existing standing orders having to be cancelled and replacement ones completed. The direct debit system would undoubtedly simplify matters as the Society could implement the revised subscription

The 2006 Annual General Meeting of the Richard III Society will take place at 12.00 noon, on Saturday 30 September 2006, at the Merchant Adventurers’ Hall, York.

Nominations for the committee and motions for the agenda should be received by the Secretary not less than fourteen clear days before the date of the AGM - i.e. by Friday 15 September, 2006. All nominations must be proposed, seconded and accepted in writing by the member proposed. All motions must be proposed and seconded in writing.
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Membership Matters

Since taking over the membership roles in early February it has been a busy time. The increase in subscriptions for members, effective October 2005, has meant that about half the membership have needed to update their standing orders to reflect the increase and although many of these were in place by the time the subscriptions were collected this was not universally the case and reminders have had to be sent out. At the same time we have had to send out reminders to members actually to pay their subscriptions for the year. All this is an additional expense for the Society and it would be appreciated if members could ensure they pay their subscriptions on time, which is October, and pay the correct amount for their category.

Membership Category

If your membership category does change do please advise us. If you qualify to take advantage of the senior citizen concession we do need to be told as records are not automatically adjusted when members reach the age of sixty. Although we do hold the date of birth for recent members this is a comparatively new innovation and we do not have this information for the majority of members. A number of you in the senior citizen category have written to say that they thought they had been overpaying their subs for some years. However, the senior citizen concession was only reduced to 60, from 65, in 2005.

Direct Debit Payments

Another problem that has emerged is that although some members completed and sent in new standing order forms for payment last October, and these were received by the membership department, they consequently have either been lost in the mail to the relevant bank or the bank has not processed the instruction.

Several members have raised the question of whether they could pay their subscriptions by direct debit. The Executive Committee investigated this possibility a few years ago and came to the conclusion that it was not feasible. In order to offer the direct debit option, where the Society would be assigned the right to deduct subscriptions, and any revised subscriptions, directly from members’ bank accounts, members of the Executive Committee would need to provide substantial personal financial guarantees. The Committee felt that, as they are volunteers who receive no financial remuneration for their work, they were not prepared to undertake such guarantees.

The recent increase in the subscription rates has generated a lot of work with existing standing orders having to be cancelled and replacement ones completed. The direct debit system would undoubtedly simplify matters as the Society could implement the revised subscription
direct with the members’ banks. In view of the matter being raised by members the Committee has again discussed the direct debit option and a possible solution is being investigated. Watch this space.

Finally a big thank you to all members who have responded to our letters, for the donations that have been made and for all the good wishes and thanks for work undertaken by the Society’s volunteers.

Brian and Wendy Moorhen
Membership Department

New Vice President for Australasia

The Society’s Executive Committee has created the post of Vice President, Australasia, to provide an effective means of contact with the Ricardian membership in Australia and New Zealand.

The Australasian Branches have elected Rob Smith to the post. Rob is currently Secretary of the New Zealand Branch and has been an active Ricardian since 1990. Born in the UK he emigrated to New Zealand in 1964. He has been married to Helen for over forty years; they have three children and six grandchildren. A retired banker, Rob lives with Helen on a two-acre lifestyle property in the picturesque village of Greytown, eighty kilometres north of Wellington. Rob serves on the board of several organisations and is active in Rotary administration. In his spare time he enjoys growing fruit and vegetables for the extended family and sampling the choice wines grown in the area. On his periodic visits to the UK, Rob, a keen military historian, can usually be found tramping over the sites of past battles, particularly those of the medieval period.

NB
Rob is Registrar for the biennial Australasian Ricardian Convention to be held near Wellington in April 2007. He is hoping that Ricardians from the Northern Hemisphere will take the opportunity to enjoy a holiday in New Zealand and, at the same time, join their compatriots from down under in what promises to be a fun-filled weekend.

The Mortimer Trail

On 27 August Peter Brookes of the Gloucestershire Branch is walking this trail from Ludlow Castle to Kington and would be delighted if any other enthusiasts would like to join him. Peter is hoping to raise sponsorship money to be donated to the Logge Wills project, so even if a 30-mile walk is not quite how you planned to spend 27 August perhaps you would consider sponsoring Peter and thereby aid the Society with the Logge project? The walk will commence at 08.00 at Ludlow Castle and proceed to Kington where the walk will finish at between 18.00 and 19.00.

If you would be interested in joining Peter or sponsoring him, his contact details are: 5 Bath Street, Cheltenham, GL50 1YE, Phone: 01242 514469

Please would you make out cheques to Richard III Society Gloucestershire Branch, and we will forward one combined cheque to the Executive Committee.
Penrith Group ‘Trail’

As part of our anniversary celebration, members in Penrith have organised a ‘Trail’, taking in the various places in the town associated with the House of York, advertising it in the local Tourist Information Office. For more details see the Cumbria Group report on page 78. Another great initiative!

If other Branches and Groups have organised anything locally, please let the editor know.

Website – The Intranet & Some Help

The intranet, the members-only area of the website, is about to undergo a major re-development and whilst this is taking place the existing pages will be taken down and there will be no access to this part of the website. This will not effect the Society’s forum which is hosted by Yahoo.

If you have any ideas of what you would like to see on the intranet please let us know.

We will of course let you know when the intranet goes lives again.

We could also do with your help with regard to good quality photographs for the website, in particular the featured Ricardian sites and the Wars of the Roses battle sites. Websites lend themselves to use of images and this is an area where our site could be improved. If you think you have anything suitable please contact Wendy Moorhen (contact details back inside cover).

Neil Trump, Webmaster

Memorials of the Wars of the Roses

An occasional series devoted to notables who lived during this period and whose memorials were published by the late W E Hampton in 1979

Long Ashton
1483. SIR RICHRD CHOKKE, JUSTICE OF THE COMMON PLEAS, AND WIFE

Gules, 2 bars wavy argent.

Stone Effigies in canopied recess.

He m. 1, Joan, dau. of William Pavey of Bristol; 2, Margaret Morris, who survived him. He was summoned to parliament as King’s Sjt.-at.-Law, 1455, and thereafter summoned until death; appointed Justice of the Common Pleas, 1461; Trier of Petitions, England, 1483, and Gascony on several occasions; knighted, 1467. He was granted seven yards of red cloth from the royal wardrobe for the coronation of Richard III, but died the day before, on July 5, 1483. He possessed a notable collection of silver – his bequests included many silver vessels – and his will is that of a wealthy man making generous provision for his family, the poor, and the church.

NB: Sir Richard was a Logge testator. WM
From Mrs E Watson
*Sunday Express* 4 December, 2005: ‘Like many nursery rhymes, Humpty Dumpty was based on a real-life person or event. So, far from being an egg, he was in fact King Richard III, whose appearance earned him that sobriquet. After the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485, though, no one could help poor old Humpty back on the wall, or throne, again.’

Mrs Watson comments: ‘I’d be interested to know what other Ricardians think of it. One of my favourite words is “tosh”: is it appropriate here?’

**Editor:** see Bulletin, December 2002, Media Watching and Correspondence.

From Joan Stephenson
‘Whilst watching Channel 5’s American import, CSI-New York, I was astounded when the senior detective (Mac Taylor) answered a colleague’s comment about things not being what they seemed: sorting through the evidence and not looking up, he muttered, “like strawberries and Richard III.” Colleague looked baffled and moved on. The credits revolve so fast that it was not possible to see the studio’s name, but Andrew Lipsitz is shown as the writer, and Gary Sinise (Mac) is listed as a producer in a long list of associate and executive directors. Will there be future developments, and who is the friend in high places?’

From Shirley Stapley
From the April edition of the Dr Who magazine, written by Mark Wyman, previewing the latest Dr Who audio drama, *The Kingmaker*, written by Nev Fountain. It features a fairly unlovely illustrated ‘Richard’ but, ‘Richard’s always blamed for their disappearance, but perhaps we’ve given the definitive version here! “Richard, amazingly, was only 29 [sic] when he died” says Fountain, “so I’ve written him as quite the Northern firebrand. He was a blunt soldier and, like the other nobles, young and vigorous. … After doing my research, I worked lots of suspects in. There’s Tyrell and Buckingham, Richard himself … I want listeners to think ‘Did he or didn’t he?’ for as long as possible.” Did Fountain’s research give him a new perception of the notorious king? “Whether Richard killed any royal children or not, he did kill dozens of opponents – including minor noble’s children – early in his reign. So did Henry Tudor when he succeeded Richard. That alone doesn’t make them heroes or villains of their very violent times.” At any rate, it’s probable that the Fountain theory is not one that’s been advanced dramatically before now.’

From Margaret Fuller
A cutting from the Gloucester Citizen of 9 January 2006, by Martin Kirby from his ‘Gloucester born and bred’ column: *Make more of our rich history*, about the Society’s Gloucester plaque, with an illustration, captioned ‘Timeworn: the coat of arms of Richard III on St Michael’s Tower’. The article says: ‘For all its faults, Gloucester has one thing in abundance – history, yet so little is done to promote it. Take the Arms of Richard III, for example. Gloucester’s importance was demonstrated when, in 1155, Henry I granted a charter giving the city privileges equal to those of London. … these liberties were extended … culminating in the grant of the full freedom of self-government by the Letters Patent of Richard III. A reproduction of Richard’s coat of arms was presented to the city in 1983 by the Richard III Society to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the charter being granted, and is sited on the wall of St Michael’s Tower at Gloucester Cross. Yet hardly anyone I know is even aware that it exists, which is not surprising when you see how badly it has fared over the past 23 years. The strikingly vivid paintwork has flaked away and the explanatory plaque below it is starting to crumble. What a way to treat a gift
to the city! And now that the decaying tower no longer houses the Tourist Information Centre, it’s no place for the coat of arms to be. Let’s have this unique item spruced up, and find a more prominent position for it. Any suggestions?"

**Editor**: prompted by this, I contacted Gwen and Brian Waters, who were able to advise me of an appropriate City contact, to whom I wrote, and from whom I subsequently heard, advising that he had ‘heard … from the Building Conservation Officer, who is responsible for plaques in the City, that she will get the plaque restored and painted. Funding has also been identified to undertake the work. I hope that this will be done in the next few weeks. I am grateful to you for drawing my attention to this matter’ [21 March 2006].

Then Margaret sent me a further cutting from the *Gloucester Citizen* of 10 April 2006, in which Martin Kirby was self-congratulatory as having prompted the restoration: ‘After reading this column Councillor Paul James took immediate action and a local signwriter was commissioned to carry out the repainting. The result – funded by Gloucester Historic Buildings Ltd and a private donation from a member of the Richard III Society – looks fantastic. My thanks to everyone involved.’ The Society echoes this, while wondering why the Royal Label Factory, which created the plaque, was not asked to refurbish it.

**From Richard Van Allen:**
The Society’s *raison d’être* to secure a re-assessment of King Richard is a long and hard struggle but it appears to becoming popular to revisit the reputations of other figures in history.

As already reported, Macbeth is one but now it appears that another historical character, possibly branded as being the most infamous of all, Judas Iscariot, is having his character re-assessed, according to a long article which appeared in the *Sunday Times* recently. Under the title ‘Stitched up big time by the Galilee gang’ the article goes on to say that according to a papyrus recently unveiled by the *National Geographic*, which is purported to be an authentic copy of the lost Gospel of Judas, it has convinced a number of scholars that Judas emerges as a champion who was envied and resented by the other disciples, eventually becoming the symbol of treachery.

As one can imagine this has upset the sensibilities of the Christians and was possibly what the Archbishop of Canterbury was referring to when he talked of conspiracies damaging to the church, along with the *The Da Vinci Code*, during his Easter address. Defending Richard’s character has got to be a ‘walk in the park’ as they say compared to trying to defend Judas!

---

**Researching in the Rouen Area?**

A Ricardian couple have very kindly offered the use of their small flat in Rouen for the use of any Ricardians who are undertaking research in the area. The flat has two rooms, a kitchen and a bathroom.

If you would like to take advantage of this offer please contact the Research Officer (contact details back inside cover) with your name, proposed dates for your visit to Rouen and research interest.
News and Reviews

Release on DVD of LWT’s production for Channel 4’s *The Trial of Richard III*
Probably one the greatest achievements of the Richard III Society, or rather the achievement by our then chairman, Jeremy Potter, was the making by Channel 4 of *The Trial of Richard III* which was broadcast in 1984. Almost four hours of prime-time television was devoted to King Richard with expert witnesses giving their evidence for the prosecution and the defence as to whether or not the king was responsible for the alleged murder of the princes in the Tower of London. The verdict was ‘Not Guilty’. A VHS tape and the transcript are available from the Society’s library but the *Trial*, however, has now been released on DVD as part of the special edition release of Olivier’s film *Richard III*. See Geoff Wheeler’s review below.

The Richard III Foundation: Anne Neville – ‘A Most Gracious Lady’:
*Celebration of a Queen 1456-2006* – 17 June 2006
The Foundation’s celebrations will begin at 10 a.m. at the Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2Y 5HN. Their speaker for the day will be Mr John Clark, Curator of Medieval Artifacts. Mr Clark will provide a private talk on the artifacts in the medieval gallery. Afterwards, participants will have the opportunity to explore in-depth the objects, people, subjects and events that are in the gallery, not to mention some fantastic new games.

There will be a stop for lunch and then the journey to Westminster Abbey for a special service by the Dean of Westminster, Dr Wesley Carr. A bouquet or wreath of flowers celebrating the life of Queen Anne Neville will be presented by the Foundation.

To book your place for this event, please contact Mrs Mary Kelly, Vice President of the UK Branch, 77 Deacons Green, Tavistock, Devon PL19 8BN. The fee for the day is £7.00. Cheques made payable to the Richard III Foundation Inc.

The Richard III Foundation: The Battle of Bosworth – 19 August 2006
The Foundation is pleased to announce its Bosworth Conference to be held at the new conference hall at the Bosworth Battlefield Centre.

The conference will begin with registration at 9.30 a.m. and will conclude at 4 p.m. Tickets for the event are £20.00 for patrons and £25.00 for non-patrons. Tickets are non-refundable.

The speakers and their topics for the day include:
- **Glenn Foard** – Bosworth: Anatomy of a Battle
- **Professor Anne Curry** – Knowing Too Much, Knowing Too Little – Agincourt and Bosworth compared
- **John Austin** – Find Bosworth
- **David Baldwin** - Bosworth - One Battle or Two?
- **Mick Manns** – Mick the Fletcher – A demonstration of skills which illustrate life and experiences during the Wars of the Roses.

To book your place for this event, please contact Mrs Mary Kelly, address above. Cheques made payable to the Richard III Foundation Inc.
BBC London News, 21 February 2006
A report of the appeal by Luton Museum to halt the sale of the ‘Wenlock Jug’. The report includes an interview with the auction dealer who hopes to sell it to the Metropolitan Museum, New York, for £750,000. Originally believed to have a connection with Luton’s celebrated John, Lord Wenlock (killed at Tewkesbury 1471), it was pointed out that the rare English bronze ewer could be dated 1377-1469, and bears the crowned arms of Richard II (similar to the example in the British Museum from Ghana), as well as the inscription: ‘My Lord Wenlok’. It was originally sold at Sotheby’s in May last year, from the collection of Lord Hesketh of Eaton Neston, Northamptonshire. Available from the AV library. GW

BBC2 TV History Mysteries
Jonathan Foyle and colleagues investigate ‘The Man with two tombs’. This is an excellent short documentary on the two memorials to William Canynges in St Mary Redcliffe, Bristol. One shows him with his wife, as mayor of the city, the other in plain, uncoloured alabaster, as a priest. The trail to solve the mystery takes in visits to the Newport ship, Westbury church, as well as sites around Bristol, using documentary archive sources and archaeological evidence to tell his story, concluding with an imaginative reconstruction of his impressive medieval house. Available from the AV library. GW

Shakespeare in Cambridge
From 7-11 March, at the Cambridge Arts Theatre, the Marlowe Dramatic Society put on a production of Shakespeare’s Richard III, the Wednesday performance being preceded by a public discussion on the subject of King Richard and the play. The members of the discussion panel were Dr Rosemary Horrox, a historian and friend of the Society, Dr Janet Bottoms, a specialist in English literature, Tom Cornford, the play’s director, and myself, representing the Society. The meeting was chaired by Dr Jean Chothia.

After Tom had spoken about his interpretation of the play, we took it in turn to comment and to give our own thoughts about the play, its relevance at the time it was written and its relevance today. That it was written as propaganda was dismissed, since at the time that Shakespeare was writing, this was the story that was popularly believed to be true. Today, of course, we know otherwise. All agreed that the play was more a study of society and one man’s alienation from that society – the Richard of the play had set himself apart – ‘I am myself alone’. While this would not seem unusual to us today, when we all need our ‘own space’, such a concept would have been unknown in medieval and Tudor times. Given only half an hour for the whole meeting, there was little time to discuss anything in depth and things were just getting going when it was time to stop. However, the panel were able to come to a unified conclusion that Shakespeare’s play is a great piece of drama but it is not history.

There had been some questions from the audience, but these were mostly about previous performances, rather than the content and meaning of the actual play. After the discussion, the rest of the audience came in and a nearly full house sat down to watch the performance.

The young cast certainly gave it their all, and it was, for the most part, an enjoyable production. The text had been heavily cut, the play lasting just about two hours, which was disconcerting as one waited for well-loved lines which did not appear. The set was made of scaffolding poles and corrugated iron, relying on lighting for special effects, though it was difficult to work out the significance of the constant stream of smoke that drifted across the stage, whether the action was indoors or out. Costume was basically modern dress, with most people wearing dark colours. Elizabeth Woodville’s pale blue coat and the Duchess of York’s long white dress were exceptions. Also, there were few, if any, distinguishing props to help differentiate between the characters and with some people taking four or even five parts and with two young women playing the sons of Edward IV, there was great potential for much confusion at times. How people
who were seeing the play for the first time coped with this, it is hard to imagine.

Will Featherstone (!), who played Richard, made a fine fist of one of Shakespeare’s longest roles – and fist is probably apt. Throughout the entire performance, his left arm was bound up against his body, inside his shirt, leaving a dangling empty sleeve, tied in a knot.

The producer, Tom Cornford, formerly an assistant at The Globe and now freelance, had chosen to interpolate a number of flashbacks from *Henry VI, Part III*, and this may have been a mistake as it broke up the flow of the action. Even the best known ‘winter of discontent’ soliloquy was interrupted – twice. Throughout the play, these flashbacks, and others, were used to hammer home the message. Whenever one of Richard’s ‘crimes’ took place, the victim would recall the lines from Margaret of Anjou’s ‘wrangling pirates’ prophecy and then the queen herself would reappear to repeat them, too. Looking around the audience at half time, there was no-one who gave the impression of being unable to recall what had happened less than an hour before.

It was a very energetic production – even the dead of Bosworth were not allowed to lie still. Having been shot, they lay down and rolled to the back of the stage in order to rise and come forward to be killed again, and this was to bring us to the ultimate anticlimax, the death of Richard. Having offered to exchange his kingdom for a horse – it will be a very brave director who cuts that line – Richard disappeared, and a few moments later, the lights came up on the stage, and a bundle was thrown down from a platform above the action - the battle was over and Richard had become a roll of carpet! Having kicked it, Richmond gave his ‘uniting the white rose with the red’ speech and the play was done.

The play is a good bit of theatre, and it is fun to compare different producer’s ‘takes’ on certain aspects. I was pleased to have seen it. This production has some nice touches, as well as being well played. Certainly, the members of the cast deserved to take more than the single combined curtain call that they got.

My thanks go to the organisers for asking the Society to take part in the discussion panel and for letting us watch the play afterwards. It made for an interesting and enjoyable evening, and, as someone who had been in the audience for the discussion was to ask me afterwards, it was most definitely not one of the worst productions I have seen.

Phil Stone

**Olivier’s Richard III and Channel 4’s Trial of Richard III on DVD**

The UK ‘Network’ release of a ‘special edition’ two disc DVD set of Olivier’s *Richard III*, again boasts on the sleeve notes that it is a ‘full length digital re-mastered high definition version’ available for the first time uncut, since its original release in 1955, but as noted in the *Bulletin* (Spring, 2005, p. 19) parts are still missing, as this merely duplicates the USA version reviewed there. There is one notable difference: instead of the film related ‘extras’ on the second disc, this contains a 225-minute version of LWT’s *Trial of Richard III*, according to the notes ‘unseen since its first transmission in 1984’ (except, one is tempted to add, by several hundred members of the Society). Whilst grateful for this welcome reissue of a programme which originally generated much publicity and increase in Society membership, it will be interesting to see if it still maintains its appeal except amongst devoted Ricardians. Times and viewers’ perceptions change, and compared with the slick and fast paced productions today, it now seems rather ponderous and slow, with only occasional flashes of humour (by former Chairman, Jeremy Potter, and, unintentionally, Dr David Starkey) to lighten the mood. There are some notable absentees from the ‘Chapter List’ of persons appearing: the Society’s Patron goes uncredited for the ‘Introduction’, and other witnesses are unnoticed, though predictably the one famous TV name ‘acclaimed historian David Starkey’ features on the cover notes. Most people will think that at nearly four hours (thankfully the welcome intermission breaks have been maintained) it is long enough, but as with the Olivier film, comparison with the printed text shows some of the anatomical evidence was edited out of the original transmission, and an opportunity has been lost to restore it here. GW
Celebrating 50 Years: The Events – update

Members’ Weekend and AGM

Friday 29 September
Lecture at The Hospitium

The Committee felt that it would be rather nice, after the lecture on Friday evening, if we were able to move on to another venue for a drink and some time to meet, chat, renew old acquaintances and make new friends. The original intention was to find a private room at a local hostelry. This proved difficult but a solution was found. The President suggested we contact Barley Hall and they have agreed to take us in. Although we will be there on the Sunday as well, an evening in Barley Hall, lit by candlelight, is always special.

Saturday 30 September
AGM at the Merchant Adventurers’ Hall

The capacity at the Merchant Adventurers is limited and we will therefore need to issue tickets to members. All of you who have either booked for any of the events, i.e. Friday evening lecture, Minster tour, Gala dinner, Barley Hall or just written to say that you are coming will automatically be allocated ticket(s). We are sure, however, that many of you were just intending to arrive on the day and we therefore ask you to complete the booking form in the centre fold and send this with an s.a.e. to the events administrator, Jacqui Emerson. Requests will be dealt with on a strictly first come first service basis.

Refreshments on arrival (£2.25) and a light buffet lunch (£11) to follow the AGM have been arranged, and again please complete the booking form and forward your payment to Jacqui.

Our plans are advanced for the attractions in the Undercroft both before and after the formal proceedings of the AGM. If any branches would like to have a sales stall could they please contact the secretary, Elizabeth Nokes, as soon as possible to book space. The Yorkshire Branch have already booked their space and they have kindly agreed to man the reception desk.

Gala Dinner

There are still a few places remaining for what promises to be an enchanting evening. Dress is black tie/lounge suits for the gentlemen, cocktail/evening for the ladies and medieval for those who wish to take advantage of this truly beautiful setting. Booking form in the Winter Bulletin or write direct to Jacqui Emerson.

Chivalry, The Order of the Garter and St George’s Chapel Seminar at Vicars’ Hall, Windsor Castle – Saturday 28 October

There are still a very few places left for this unique event. Booking form in the Winter Bulletin or write direct to Jacqui Emerson.

2006 Anniversary Committee
The Schools Competition

As part of its 2006 anniversary celebrations, the Richard III Society decided to offer prizes to young people – and to their schools – who have something to show us, or tell us, relating to Richard III. The Schools Competition was divided into two sections: a writing competition and a poster competition.

The Poster Competition
The poster competition was aimed at the lower secondary (and upper middle) school age range. Between thirty and forty poster entries were received, from a wide geographical spread of schools in England, Wales and Ireland. There were entries from both boys and girls, and both sexes are represented among the winners.

The posters submitted comprised a range of techniques: drawing, painting, computer graphics and collage were all represented. They were also the product of a range of milieus. They came firstly from schools of different types (middle schools, secondary schools, state schools, independent schools). Secondly they represented different departments within schools. Many posters, of course, were submitted by art departments, but there were also entries from English and History departments.

Some of the posters were excellent, and judging them was not easy. The judges were looking for a good clear design, suited to a poster; some knowledge of Richard, his time and/or the places connected with him; evidence of originality and imagination, and a good quality finished product (however this was achieved).

The three winning posters were extremely varied. First prize went to Samara Sakayam of Linslade Middle School, Linslade, Leighton Buzzard, Bedfordshire. Samara produced a simple, but beautifully executed and enigmatic drawing of Richard, with his name and nothing else. This image leaves all the judgement to the spectator. Interestingly, students at Linslade recently took part in a Tudor re-enactment, which may have been an inspiration to Samara. (Linslade’s Tudor Day comprised a market with many and varied stalls, including candle makers, a barber surgery, leatherworking, an apothecary, and the manufacture of ink and quill pens. After the market, the day concluded with a banquet and dancing.)

The second prize winner was Ryan Byrne of Rathmore Grammar School, Belfast, who produced a fine poster which focuses on a real event of the jubilee year, and advertises it clearly and with some skill. The third prize was awarded to Francesca Onesti of Wells Cathedral School, Somerset, for a beautifully executed advertisement for the Bosworth Battlefield centre, with sensitive and accomplished drawing.

The Writing Competition
The theme set for the essays was Richard III: The Man and the Myth and we were delighted when twenty-three students took up the challenge, especially as we received essays from younger secondary school students as well as from older ones, which was an unexpected but very encouraging response. To be fair to all the students, we decided to split the essay competition into a Junior and a Senior section with equal prizes being awarded to each.

The judges enjoyed reading all the essays very much and were impressed at the variety of approach and at the overall high standard. We give below the names and schools of all the winning participants with a brief critique on each essay. The winning essays, themselves, are reproduced on the Society website under the Junior Ricardian Section.
Junior Competition

First prize was awarded to Sadie Jarrett from Glan Afan Comprehensive, Port Talbot. The judges all agreed that Sadie’s essay is an excellent piece of work. Sadie has an unusually mature and sophisticated approach to her subject with an interesting use of language. Her opening is extremely effective, with the two contradictory quotes and then Shakespeare and she is the only entrant to provide a bibliography. The main body of the essay is concerned with who killed the princes and if they were actually killed. This is thoroughly discussed but other points, like deformity, seem rather peripherally treated. However, Sadie has a scholarly sharpness which has picked up a great deal from her history lessons.

Second prize was awarded to Katie McCrudden from The Dragon School, Oxford. Katie’s essay is lively and well constructed, with an excellent, logical arrangement. Katie understands the use of evidence to prove her point, and how to build up an argument. She also displays an impressive use of parallels, sources and actual quotations, quoting from Shakespeare and not just summarising him. Katie has a genuinely enquiring mind and is challenged by the judgements confronting her. She writes with authority at times and has produced an extremely enjoyable essay.

Third prize went to Constance Meath Baker from The Dragon School, Oxford. Constance demonstrates her ability to think things through clearly. She is prepared to dig down and not just regurgitate knowledge. She also has a good understanding of propaganda, commenting that Richard was accused of murders even without evidence and more than was reasonable. She appreciates Shakespeare’s Richard as an anti-hero and that people wanted rowdy entertainment, not a history lesson. Unfortunately she gets side-tracked with the portraits and this unbalances her essay. The judges also felt that her conclusion could have been more definite although they did accept that it may have been what she wanted most to prove.

Senior Competition

First prize was awarded to James Fleming from Sir Thomas Rich School, Longlevens, Gloucestershire. James’s essay discusses whether Shakespeare’s portrait of Richard was distorted. It is well constructed with a mature treatment of sources, clearly set out with footnotes and an excellent bibliography. The judges were disappointed that James makes such a fundamental error in asserting that Edward IV was killed at the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471 (when it was Prince Edward of Lancaster who died). However, as the essay is of such high quality, they took it to be more carelessness and a lack of proof reading as opposed to a misunderstanding of historical fact. Overall this is an excellent and thorough essay.

Second prize went to James West. James produced an entertaining and well argued essay with a good bibliography. He discusses the impact of Sir Thomas More’s writing on Richard’s reputation. The judges liked his style and his descriptive language and his excellent use of quotations. They also thought he drew an interesting parallel with Henry II.

Third prize was awarded to Samuel Davis from the John Henry Newman School, Stevenage. Samuel produced a very literate essay with an excellent bibliography and excellent use of sources. However, he only assesses Richard’s reputation with regard to his appearance, and the killing of Edward of Lancaster at the battle of Tewkesbury in 1471, so the essay is unbalanced. Samuel covers the historiography behind Richard’s rehabilitation well. The judges felt that this is a scholarly piece but were disappointed that Samuel fails to mention the Princes which dominate Richard’s reputation.

The prizes awarded were:
First Prize: £100 to the student together with one year’s free membership of the Richard III Society, and £100 to the school together with a copy of Jeremy Potter’s Good King Richard for the school library.
Second Prize: £60 to the student and £60 to the school

Third Prize: £30 to the student and £30 to the school

Winning students will also receive books relating to Richard III and his times.

In addition to these prizes, certificates have been awarded to the three prize winners, and to those other competitors who, in the judges’ opinion, deserved commendation for their entries.

The originals of all the prize-winning, highly commended and commended posters and essays were on display in London, at Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn on 19 May, when HRH The Duke of Gloucester formally congratulated the winners and presented the prizes on behalf of the Society. They will also be displayed at the AGM in York, and can be seen on the Society’s web site.

John Ashdown-Hill & Jane Trump

Winner of the first prize in the poster competition: Samara Sakayam of Linslade Middle School, Leighton Buzzard

Third prize winner in the poster competition: Francesca Onesti of Wells Cathedral School

The poster for the second prize winner, Ryan Burne of Rathmore Grammar School Belfast was published in the Spring Bulletin, page 8 (left-hand poster)
Celebrating with Isolde: 
A vice-president is honoured

PHIL STONE

Fifty years ago, as John Saunders reminded us in the Spring issue of the Bulletin, a group of people came together and from their meeting, the Richard III Society was born, somewhat like a phoenix rising from the ashes of the Fellowship of the White Boar founded in 1924. One of the people at that meeting was Isolde Wigram, our senior vice-president and the last surviving member from those early days. Patrick Bacon, George Awdry, Joyce Melhuish – all names from that time – now gone but most certainly not forgotten.

In this year of celebration, the Executive Committee felt that Isolde should be thanked for all that she had done and for all the support that she has given since, and so it was that, on the afternoon of Sunday, 2 April, a beautiful sunny afternoon, a small gathering took place in Fleet, Hampshire, at the home where Isolde is now a resident. Sadly, try as we might with the dates, there were several people who would have loved to be there but could not be because of other commitments, but those present were the Hammonds, the Trumps, Elizabeth Nokes, Wendy

Isolde on the arm of her cousin, Gail Kyle. In the background Rita Diefenhardt-Schmidt, Carolyn Hammond and Howard Choppin
Moorhen, Howard Choppin, Beth and myself, and Rita Diefenhardt-Schmidt from the Continental Group, a group much supported by Isolde. Also with us were Gail and Tim, Isolde’s cousin and her husband. It was Gail who had acted as the go-between when we were making the arrangements with the home.

After a splendid tea, supplied by the home, Isolde was presented with a large bunch of flowers, mainly carnations, but also included were ten gold-coloured roses, which seemed a good alternative to white ones for celebrating a golden anniversary! Having told us that she wasn’t going to say anything, Isolde then proceeded to amuse us all with her memories from those early days, telling us about the first meetings and about some of the early events and members. We tried to draw her out about any possible scandals from those times, but Isolde wasn’t ready to be indiscreet.

After this, Isolde took us on a tour of the home, showing us her room which, surprise, surprise, contains a lot of books, as well as a number of rooms as yet unoccupied. We all picked out the one we would like when our turn came.

Eventually, it was time for us to leave and all agreed that it had been a lovely couple of hours. It had been good to see Isolde looking so well, especially knowing that her health had been a little fragile in recent months. We thanked Gail for her help and we thanked the staff in the home for making us so welcome.

Isolde, we thank you for what you did fifty years ago. Without you, there would be no Society, and without the Society four of us at your tea might not have met their partners, and we thank you for all the support that you have given us since. You may say that you have done little in recent years, but we have always known that you are there and willing to offer advice when asked. The Richard III Society thanks you.
The Warder who waited with us after our baggage check said, ‘He did it but he had every right to do so’ – a mixed omen to greet a party of Ricardians on their way to the first event to celebrate their Society’s 50th anniversary year. We then wound our way, collecting and discarding the odd bemused tourist seeking solace in the nearest conducted tour to hand, to the Education Centre where the seminar was to take place. It was good to see minds were already alert to historical heresies even if in the shape of the horned helmets of the giant Playmobil Viking figures on the stairs and we were soon enjoying our coffees in what might be horrifically but accurately called a ‘meet and greet’ time.

It was good to have a full house for this well conceived and interesting event and the seminar room, into which we filed, was sufficiently airy and comfortable that noddings seemed few; no doubt the speakers had something to do with this too. Chairman Phil Stone’s welcome quoted, as he said, ‘that well-known historian’ William Shakespeare (you know - that bit about ear-lending to get our attention) and who, Will that is, had used the legend of Julius Caesar being the builder of the Tower. Phil knew that today we would be listening to more informed historians. Wendy Moorhen’s housekeeping notes contained the advice that we should stay in the Tower precincts since, ticketless, we might have some trouble getting back in. As she remarked, this was not the usual way of things with the Tower! She then introduced the first of our distinguished speakers.

Strategy and Tactics in the Fifteenth Century: Agincourt 1415 revisited
Dr Michael K. Jones
So to our first talk by an historian familiar to many Ricardians. Wendy introduced him as a freelance historian, which is true, but it did set the mind on the English Companies and other mercenary bands that roamed the continent, but more of those anon. Dr Jones’ talk this morning had direct reference to his latest book, Agincourt 1415 and his theme could be summed up in the phrase ‘Sometimes you have just got to go for it’ (indeed there is an argument that the benefit of following such exhortation and the misfortune of not doing so were the leitmotifs of the entire seminar).

In his introduction Dr Jones had to touch again on Shakespeare who had immortalised this extraordinary story of triumph against the odds. Recent revisionists had claimed to see more ‘spin’ than heroism in the battle and suggested that the numbers on each side were even. Our speaker wished to return to the traditional account but nevertheless re-interpret the battle – he assured us he was not moving the battlefield. He then made some really striking and insightful points about the ‘savage intimacy’ of battle, that accounts reflected the small radius of action and paralleled the small unit interactions that were inevitable on the medieval battlefield.

Nevertheless there was a perspective provided to the leaders in fifteenth-century warfare that had been lacking before. The budding Renaissance brought with it Classical works of which De
Re Militari, rightly called by Gillingham ‘the Soldier’s Bible’, was the key text. It was clearly not a ‘coffee-table’ book for Richard III and Dr Jones felt the same to be true for Henry V. So there was a balance to strike between thinking and action – Sir John Fastolf was cited as a general who had thought too much and, in modern parlance ‘information paralysis’ (although Dr Jones did not say it, he was talking about a very useful modern acronym – KISS – ‘keep it simple, stupid’). What we were approaching was a view of what made up a successful fifteenth-century battle commander and we were next urged to see hunting as valuable experience in mastery of emotions and control of the adrenaline rush of action. Add the ‘chivalric mindset’ which provided the tools for inspiration (Dr Jones referred to his belief that a parade of royal regalia took place before both Agincourt and Bosworth).

There was seen to be a second parallel between 1415 and 1485. In the strategy of warfare Vegetius (De Re Militari) saw a battle as uncontrolled risk and something to be avoided. Henry V, however, had a ‘battle-seeking strategy’ because in 1415, as 1485, there was a need not just to win a battle but to win it well. An historical exemplar that would have been known to both Kings was Judas Maccabeus (from the Bible Apocrypha) who epitomised the precept that ‘if the cause is right get on and do it’.

Turning to the battle itself what is fashioned is an iconography by the winners but the actual tactics, in the confusion and stress of action, are essentially un-rememberable. Dr Jones saw no reason to doubt that the armies were of the order of 7,000 and 28,000 or that Henry’s knowledge of the science of warfare was used in key preparations – the moonlight reconnoitre, the archer ambush and the use of the main body of archers. Although doubt has been cast on the ambush the use of such a ‘forlorn hope’, perhaps edited out of the victor’s texts because it did not sit well with this chivalric victory, and the stress placed on it by Dr Jones, seems to feel entirely right to me. It is also clear that Shakespeare, for once, captured the inspirational role of Henry, reinforced by his action in being a conspicuous target during the battle, and the importance of getting the troops angry enough to fight and win (by use of the French to threats of archer mutilation whether they were true or false).

Dr Jones is perhaps on less stable ground in his reconciliation of the accounts of a forward move by English troops before the French advance. He felt the French should not be seen as stupid foes and were happy to sit on their chosen ground and wait the necessity of an English advance. It was, therefore, necessary to goad them from their position and so Dr Jones feels that parties of archers were sent forward to taunt with hunting calls, etc. the French and that this strategy ultimately worked. It seems to me that it is one thing to acknowledge that soldiers will be soldiers and that catcalls and other no doubt more crude signals were exchange by both sides but quite another for it to be used in the sophisticated way suggested. Moreover if the enemy was clever enough to sit it out and wait they were clever enough to see through the goading too. One does not have to be stupid to do rash things in battle and ultimately the French behaved rashly.

One very pleasing aspect of the seminar was the strong question and answer sessions that followed each speaker’s discourse. Space prevents reporting more than a few of the questions and answers in each instance. Apart from the revelation that civilised twentieth-century man is getting more and more fascinated by dirt (how true) I single out in this session a question about how much Agincourt could be seen as having nationalistic implications at the time. Dr Jones referred to the instances where Henry V was shown as having the ‘common touch’ or as the chronicler puts it ‘exalts the lowly’ (a more modern parallel would be Montgomery where the ability to inspire and convince the ordinary soldier that they are part of the same team as their commander overcame other human and military shortcomings). Some part of that was a sense of nationality and unity but he felt that unity – perhaps the brotherhood of arms is the hackneyed but best way of putting it – was far the most important factor.

A break for coffee/tea and cakes was welcome and it allowed a study of a recent acquisition by the Royal Armouries. In recent years there has been increased interest in the curatorial history of the Tower collections and this was a portrait of Charles Compton, a nineteenth-century civil
servant employed at the Tower. The interesting factor is that he is portrayed fully helmed and armed. A warning perhaps not to clothe history with our later day romantic veneer? Always a danger with Agincourt but not very likely with the campaign dealt with by our next speaker.

The French Expedition of 1475: What the campaign meant to those involved
Dr David Grummitt

Wendy introduced David Grummitt who is a researcher with the History of Parliament Trust, author and a regular contributor to The Ricardian.

Dr Grummitt started with a felicitous link to Michael Jones’ earlier themes and indicated that that of chivalry tempered by an appreciation of reality was shared with his own paper. Yet 1475 was the antithesis of 1415 and ‘one of the least glorious episodes of English arms of the Middle Ages’. He wanted to look at 1475 by its impact on five individuals through four historical documents and one that does not exist.

The five not so matching pairs were:

- Edward IV and the speech made by Bishop Alcock when he attended the 1472 Parliament in substitution for Bishop Stillington,
- William Worcester and the Boke of Noblesse, probably of 1451,
- William Ross, Victualler of Calais, Merchant of the Staple and resident there from the 1460s, whose account book is in The National Archives,
- Sir John Paston and his letters in 1475,
- William, Lord Hastings, and his receipt for his French pension.

Dr Grummitt acknowledged that reading motives and feelings into the dry text of documents is a stretching, indeed a dangerous activity, but he felt we would sense a real feeling of an opportunity lost as a result of which the York dynasty was permanently tarnished.

The 1472 speech was made at Christchurch Priory and could have had the catchy refrain ‘a successful reign equals foreign campaigns’ and in particular when this was in the cause of the rightful recovery of the Crown’s French dominions. It was emphasised that the best way to promote civil peace was by a foreign expedition and a war with the French was the ideal means of healing the divisions caused by the civil war (sentiments shared by the Argentine Junta in 1982). Bishop Alcock (and this was stressed in the subsequent instructions to the Sheriffs) also offered the enticing prospect of the expedition opening opportunities for younger sons to advance themselves as well as setting the ‘idle people’ in occupation.

In the summer of 1475 William Worcester re-did the dedicatory inscription of his work and presented it to Edward IV. To some it may appear ‘some echo of a vanished past’ but recent work has shown a commonality of ideas amongst writers in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. Edward III is seen as an exemplar whose achievements were gained by ‘Englishmen’. The resonances with Bishop Alcock were obvious. Dr Grummitt emphasised that once more the link was made between foreign war and internal stability and the significance of what William believed was expected of a king.

For William Ross 1475 meant ‘hard work!’ Ross had been busy in preparations for the campaign for a considerable time and significantly in providing the firepower for the army. As early as 1473 the account book entries refer to metal workers to make artillery and the Calais merchants contributed 273 pounds towards its cost. By 1475 the vast sum of 2,500 pounds passed through Ross’s hands specifically for the campaign. In addition to new artillery at least 13 pieces were fetched from the Tower. As our speaker made clear, however, all this impressive expenditure on the artillery park, which the Milanese Ambassador said was even finer than the Duke of Burgundy’s, was not just about military efficiency but about the display of the power and modernity of the English army. So the park included the Great Edward of Calais which cost 400 pounds, a sum that would have bought many smaller and more useful pieces. It requires no medi-
eval turn of mind to imagine the feelings of those involved when all this equipment returned without firing a shot in anger.

Sir John Paston had close links with Hastings and with the Calais garrison (he was a member of the Calais council). The garrison numbered 800 men at that time and Dr Grummitt, rightly, pointed out that it was a permanent repository of military knowledge and skill – very much the equivalent of a regular British Army regiment. It was not surprising therefore that Sir John’s letters in this period show a growing excitement and anticipation as the campaign approached. Sadly by the autumn of 1475 Sir John was ‘now creased again’, his tone matter-of-fact and his stomach pains, that had gone away during the adrenalin rush of the camp, had returned.

We get closest of all to the participant’s view of 1475 with Hastings. Here was a chivalric man of action who called the Calais garrison ‘my fellows’ and who refused to give a receipt for 1,000 marks of plate given to him by Louis (wanted as useful evidence that Hastings had been his pensioner) because ‘he did not want my receipts found in his counting house’. The guns, Sir John, and especially Hastings, had an opportunity for redemption in 1477 but again hopes were dashed. Disillusionment with the regime was complete and Dr Grummitt saw this as an explanation of why Hastings stood back from events in 1483.

What King Edward IV believed and expected of the campaign is hard to know or imagine but we do know what the people imagined would result from and be achieved by it. 1475 was a moment for aspirations to become a concrete reality; the fact that they did not was the start of a decline in commitment to the Yorkist dynasty culminating in 1485.

This was an interestingly structured and persuasive lecture and there were a number of interesting questions. Much of the artillery returned to England, some in 1481 for the Scottish campaign and eventually to the Tower (where any survivals probably became molten metal in the nineteenth-century fire that destroyed so many fine guns). Most of the weapons and armour bought in Calais were Brabantine and obtained through individual merchants. In 1483 the Calais garrison was a concern to Richard. With it, Hastings was potentially as powerful as Warwick had been. The garrison were certainly loyal to Edward IV’s son and so could be seen as a symbol of ‘doing the right thing’ in both 1475 and 1483. By the later fifteenth century guns were such a commonplace that unless they had a symbolic importance they were not necessarily mentioned in accounts of armed forces (as was the case for archers and bows in earlier periods).

With so much already to set the mind whirling the luncheon break seemed welcome and roughly on schedule. Reading previous visit reports there is a clear affinity between Ricardians and food, but some are of harder cast and the collections in the White Tower drew a number of us aside from such effete pastimes as eating. Having just moved to a shire county it was appropriate for an ex-Londoner to visit what he had not bothered to do during the many years he lived there. Certainly the rearrangement which has followed the opening of the Royal Armouries outstation in Leeds is impressive in both detail and spectacle but what is there for the late-fifteenth-century enthusiast?

In fact very little even if one includes the ‘bearing swords’ linked to an ‘early Lancastrian king’, whatever that means. In the superbly restored Spanish Armoury one passes from the wooden horse that bore the figure of Henry V to that of Henry VII without pause but that is the appreciation of ‘famous kings’ of an earlier era (they also identified a circa 1630s child’s armour as being that of Richard, Duke of York, romantic wish-fulfilment indeed!) So much has been lost, burnt or sold that such a dearth is hardly surprising but it seemed appropriate to our morning’s talks that the two genuine late-fifteenth-century items we found were a pair of handguns.

One cannot escape the shop at the end of the tour and ‘Prisoner in the Tower’ jigsaws are inevitable; at least one can eat a Yeoman Warder (chocolate) which seemed useful having heard one earlier lecturing on ‘the bones’ in St John’s Chapel. Then it was back to our studies with a plea from Wendy that we should vote in the ‘did he do it or didn’t he’ entertainment in the Bloody Tower since Richard was losing.
Armour and Weaponry in the 15th Century
Chris Gravett
Mr Gravett is now Curator to the Duke of Bedford but his career includes curatorships at the British Museum and Royal Armouries, being in charge of the Tower collections following the Leeds move. The author of at least 25 books, his latest on the Tudor knight is due out in May.

This was an animated lecture in every way since it consisted of Mr Gravett being armed in full armour by his distinguished varlets – two of whom were from the Education Department and one the Curator of Edged Weapons. The suit was genuine, that is made from the right materials in the original way, modern and based a mid-fifteenth century suit of Italian style armour in the Burrell Collection in Glasgow. As such it was 50 years from the apogee of armour development but nevertheless the equivalent of a sports car in today’s terms in both style and price. We were talked through the process of arming in close and fascinating detail but Mr Gravett made the point that if necessary he could be armed and ready for combat in five minutes. He also said he had done it on his own in a Gents toilet cubicle when the need arose, so it wasn’t that difficult!

Questions flowed naturally through this most interesting display and only a selection is possible here. The points for fastening armour are either silk or buckskin but is it common knowledge that the use of the latter indicated the entitlement to shoot deer? Another common fallacy is that a lance-rest is for just that purpose – to rest the lance on, whereas it is in fact the equivalent of the recoil arrestor on a modern piece of artillery. Swords in this period are diamond section indicating they were suitable for both thrusting as well as cutting – something it took the British Cavalry 300 years to re-invent. Asked if this armour had replaced earlier forms during the Wars of the Roses Mr Gravett made the point that armour was cleverly designed to allow for replacement and repair. Being a high tariff investment it would be maintained to ensure a long life and often combatants would be wearing their father’s or even parts of their grandfathers’ armour. The best ar-
mourn was case-hardened iron-riveted armour stored greased.

Being now fully armed and weaponed, with sword and pole-axe, Mr Gravett demonstrated the lightness and flexibility of the armour by running up and down the aisles and across the front of the lecture hall. He was, he admitted, above the average age of a knight and not particular muscular but the 50 lbs of armour was so well distributed that it was quite easy to move in (he made the point that mail suits, such as that worn by the Normans, would have been far heavier on the shoulders). Having demonstrated how easy it was to wear Mr Gravett did acknowledge that re-enactors managed only about 10 minutes of strenuous combat before they were ready to drop. Allowing for the fifteenth-century knight’s higher musculature through training, he thought that 30 minutes might be an underestimate of their continuous fighting endurance but it was not too unrealistic. There is certainly some historical evidence for combatants ‘taking a breather’ from time to time. A further revelation from Mr Gravett’s exercise was that it is impossible to creep up on someone when wearing armour. If you read in fiction, faction or history about fully-armed men in ambush treat it with the gravest suspicion.

The recruitment, array, and training of troops during the Wars of the Roses
Professor Tony Goodman

And so without pause to our final speaker (it is worth noting that all the lecturers were with us for most of the day and were often the authors of some of the most pertinent comments and questions, which helped the day along considerably). Professor Goodman has now been retired for five years from the University of Edinburgh but was the author of classic works on the Wars of the Roses, and is currently working on the Borders in the late medieval/early modern periods and the Fair Maid of Kent.

This was a wide ranging, discursive, even provocative talk about the basic human commodity in warfare. Professor Goodman started by commenting that the archaeological investigation of the Towton battlefield site had revealed the grim face of the Wars of the Roses. Yet it was a battle demonstrating discipline in fighting, whereas Bosworth was more about the discipline in not fighting or in betraying. Both the earl of Oxford and Richard III were students of well-ordered armies and their conduct, but were limited by the material to hand.

The first of three major topics was ‘retinue’ and there was an echo of our earlier speaker’s themes in the comment that it was harder to recruit for civil wars than for foreign, a situation that had changed little by the start of the next civil war 150 years later. In 1485 Oxford’s retinue would include between six and ten knights and ten and thirteen squires. Since most of those who served were their people and not directly Oxford’s, a wide spectrum of tenants would be represented. Norfolk did not reach the target he had set himself to Richard and it seems likely that the allowance of 6d a day was not sufficient inducement to serve. In the 1460s the rate was 5d. It fell to 4d in the next decade but the rise to 6d in the 1480s had to be set against increases in costs of weapons, clothing, etc. and Professor Goodman asked, ‘was it worth it?’ Retinues had to be recruited, they were no longer a matter of service, and only the more traditional recruiting areas
such as the Marches were a reliable source (fuelled by poor harvests, a regular destructive enemy and trade wars). The professor averred that the English had a reputation as good rioters but not necessarily disciplined soldiers (this rather ignores the reputation of the disciplined ranks of the ‘English’ bowmen but it could be true of the hastily recruited retinue) and a march weeded out the tares by punishment or desertion. Is the secret of Bosworth that Richard did not have as far to march as Henry?

So to ‘array’, the handed-down tradition of the speedy response of those between 16 and 60 who were required to keep arms and be proficient in their use through regular training, something reliably etched by folk memory but with its apparent limitations. Service for more than a few weeks was difficult and in theory not outside the home shire unless against a foreign invader. Nevertheless, in our period, Norfolk levies got to Ludlow and those from Coventry to Exeter and York. All was certainly not as it seemed – the 201 mustered by Bridport in 1457 included women and the Rutland muster in 1522 contained few bowmen or billmen, even fewer had any armour and only three could bring a horse. The stage was being reached where the muster was evidence of a financial obligation and the array had found a better use in feeding the war chest.

The urban array was generally a very different matter with ‘well-set-up companies’ resulting from regular contractual arrangements with citizens or employed men-at-arms. They often performed well in the field, had specialist skills – such as siegecraft as was the case for the Norwich company – and they were still the backbone of an English army’s bowmen through to the Tudor period. The one limitation was that there were not enough of them. Numbers were constrained by the need for self defence and cost, London, for instance, preferred to give money rather than provide troops.

Finally to ‘training’ in a period when this related more to individual skills rather than ‘group fighting’. There was a lack of knowledge since there was no statutory provision for manoeuvres or collective weapons training (unless one counts poaching). Although domestic war could provide experiential training there was not enough of it for it to become a continuing tradition except in a unit like the Calais garrison. For instance by 1482 the decline in archery skills was being remarked upon and it was said people preferred football or handball to archery training. Professor Goodman identified one of the problems being in the decline of the richer peasant class, the yeoman, who earlier in the century had provided the sinew in and between the array and the retinue.

Returning to the differences between Towton and Bosworth, Professor Goodman said that at the former the Yorkists defeated the Lancastrian archers because of a miscalculation of the weather conditions; whereas at Bosworth the archers were not as effective as they should have been because of miscalculations about the terrain. Bosworth was a peculiar battle in that people seem more ready to admit treason than lack of competence. The dispositions lacked the familiarity and comfort of the traditional, and a charge was a novel experience whose effect might therefore be fatally weakened.

In the question session someone asked about the substitution of mercenaries to cover the scarcity of home-grown arrow fodder but it was pointed out that there were more men in ‘English Companies’ on the continent than foreign mercenaries in England (we had come round again to Professor Goodman’s comment about whether 6d a day was worth the effort). Skilled military forces were available at a price but not one that was justifiable in a civil war. The most interesting questions and answers related to the numbers involved. Professor Goodman said that the 12,000-14,000 troops raised in 1492 was the largest national force during the fifteenth century and even in the middle of the seventeenth century the 20,000 soldiers planned as the complement of the New Model Army had proved difficult to recruit. The 40,000-50,000 said to have fought at Towton was therefore an extraordinary number. It was pointed out that the estimate of 16,000 archers in the country should be set against the normal proportion of a population that would be part of the forces, 2% or 25,000 men in this period (it wasn’t clear if the archer estimate included the Welsh). Against this someone quoted the force of 44,000 taken in the 1540s to the Field of the Cloth of Gold and that one in ten men in Yorkshire took some part in war in the same decade.
(my county biases find that unsurprising).

And that was it, with plenty of time to wander further round the Tower if we wished or to vote at the Bloody Tower. After such a feast for the intellect the transition to the everyday, dodging the tourists, travelling home, is always a little flat and depressing but one needed a little of the mundane and ordinary for all the rich dishes laid before us to be filtered in and digested. It would certainly have been difficult to have taken in more information and insights. To me it seemed an immensely rewarding and worthwhile day.

Our collective sincere thanks go to all who had a hand in making the day such a smooth and successful one, and especially to Wendy who had a pivotal role in it all. The speakers ably played their part throughout the day and we are all grateful for the friendly and approachable way in which they shared their special insights on the theme of the day. And thanks also to the Royal Armours at the Tower for their hospitality and to the staff of the Education Centre, especially to Irene who spent her last day before retirement looking after a party of Ricardians: greater love …!
Over the past fifty years there have been a number of Ricardians who have played significant roles in the development of the Society. In recent issues of the Bulletin we have looked at the contributions of Joyce Melhuish and Isolde Wigram. In this issue we focus on George Awdry and in the Autumn Bulletin on Patrick Bacon. I am indebted to George’s niece, and fellow member of the Devon and Cornwall Branch, Veronica Chambers, for help in producing this article and for supplying the photographs.

George was born in 1916, the second son of the Reverend Vere Awdry, then vicar of Ampfield, near Romsey, and his wife Lucy. His brother, Wilbert, born five years earlier, grew up to become the Reverend W V Awdry, author of the Thomas the Tank Engine stories. George was educated at St Peter’s College, Oxford, and during his professional life worked as a librarian for the Institute of Mining and the National Liberal Club.

George was quite a striking person to meet, as his niece describes: ‘He was very tall, so slightly stooped. He became used to avoiding low lintels etc., and referred light-heartedly to other people as dwarves. I remember his shoes had to be specially made, and his shirts needed extra long sleeves.’ Of his character she recalls: ‘He always chose his words very carefully before speaking – so much so, that one might perhaps be forgiven for thinking that he had not heard the question – but his observations were always well informed and interesting, and he was a mine of information on all kinds of subjects.’ George was also a hoarder who rarely threw away anything that might one day be useful. His house in Clapham was full of books and ephemera, but he could always find whatever was needed at any given moment.

During the 1940s George made an important contribution to the war effort through his fluency in German. He was involved in debriefing activities, although he remained reticent throughout his life about the exact nature of this work.

In my article in the Spring Bulletin I outlined the events that led up to the refounding of the Fellowship of the White Boar in the first half of the 1950s. The formal launch took place in January 1956 and George’s involvement began shortly thereafter. On 21 April 1956 Gavin Brend wrote to the newly installed secretary of the refounded Fellowship, Isolde Wigram, ‘I have thought about the suggestion that I should be on the committee … I do feel that Awdry would be a better choice … he knows more about the subject and has gone more deeply into it than I … So will you please try him first … you can get him at the National Liberal Club of which he is the librarian.’ Isolde took up the suggestion and George served on the Committee from 1956 to 1989, with only one
year’s break in between, thirty-two years of service.

How did George develop his interest in the life and times of Richard III? In his own words, ‘At the second General Meeting of the Fellowship, not that I can boast much initiative in that. My case of Ricardianism was normal enough ... French History, smattered in connection with language degree work, suggested that help given to the Tudor there was somewhat less than disinterested. Coronation year 1936 brought talk of Stuart legitimates, I had the curiosity to look back at earlier descent. Then, other busynesses gave an excuse of sorts for not following that line of thought too far. Till in 1947 I came across Historic Doubts, and bored a great many people with my revived interest in the matter. One who was not bored was Gavin Brend, a solicitor and dedicated Sherlockian. It was he who got wind of the Sun of York and made contact with the Fellowship. Who took me with him to the second General Meeting. Who, invited to serve on the Committee, had to plead other obligations, but suggested my name instead. Set down in black and white my joining seems a passive enough process.’ The process of his joining may well have been passive but his contribution over the years was very much the opposite.

George’s position at the National Liberal Club proved very fortuitous for the Society, which was able to take advantage of that institution as a place to hold meetings. Indeed the Annual General Meetings were held there before Fortress House became the venue. Isolde Wigram recalls: ‘He was until his retirement the Librarian of the National Liberal Club, and in the early years of The Ricardian we used to meet there to prepare the copies (perhaps in the region of 300 then) for post, George scorning sponges and resolutely licking all the stamps. We also had a dinner there in 1971, the year that Patrick Bacon moved from Chairman to President and Jeremy Potter became Chairman.’ A reminder of just how labour-intensive routine Society work was before the days of information technology and outsourcing!

Over the years George assumed the role
of the Society's constitutional expert, and involved himself with various re-writings of the constitution which took place over the years. A significant role was in the major revision of the constitution that took place in 1970, the first revision since 1956. Another role that he was temperamentally well suited to was that of peacemaker – he was always a natural conciliator - often behind the scenes he acted as a mediator between conflicting issues and personalities within the Society. In the words of Winston Churchill he preferred ‘jaw-jaw to war-war’.

It was also George who suggested the wording that appears on the Society’s memorial in Sutton Cheney to the fallen of Bosworth which was unveiled in 1967. Similar wording of course also appears in the Society’s In Memoriam notices.

A singular service that George rendered the Society was his published history of its first fifty years from 1924, written in his own inimitable style. And here I write with a degree of vested interest: it has been a great help to have a precursor to clear a path through the plethora of Society archives. I only hope that my long awaited, and much overdue, first continuation of the Awdry Chronicle does justice to George’s work.

Longer-standing members, particularly those in London, will remember George’s hat. Over many years the hat was the repository for money collected at meetings to pay for room hire and refreshments. George’s hat became a London Branch institution, as Isolde Wigram recalls: ‘almost from the first it was always his hat which got passed around at meetings to cover expenses’.

One of George’s other great passions, besides the Society, was railways (both steam and model). And this brings us back to Thomas the Tank Engine and an unlikely alliance with the Rev. Teddy Boston, for many years until his death in 1986 the vicar of Sutton Cheney. Teddy also acted as the Society’s honorary chaplain and host of the annual Bosworth Day service, which he organised with George. They had in fact first met in 1948 and developed a friendship through their mutual interest in steam engines. Teddy was also a close friend of Wilbert Awdry and in later years moved to Leicestershire. That, together with George’s involvement in the Ricardian cause, brought them onto more common ground.

George’s library work was a great help in the evolution of the Thomas stories. He was able to pass onto his brother unwanted copies of the Railway Gazette. In these publications there was always a page called ‘The Scrap Heap’, which recorded off-beat incidents that had happened to railway engines, many of which formed the basis for Wilbert’s stories. He was also able to provide geographical, economic, political and social history for his brother’s fictional Isle of Sodor, by calling upon the knowledge he gained through his many years working in both the Institute of Mining and the National Liberal Club. He helped with the 1989 publication ‘The Island of Sodor’, an encyclopaedia on everything to do with the Thomas series with its history, geography and people. George was immortalised by his brother in the book as ‘Albert Regaby’ (6th Baron and 1st Viscount Harwick). George had his own model railway layout as well as helping Wilbert with his.

Teddy Boston himself was a fascinating character in the history of the Society. To have such a friendly vicar at Sutton Cheney was a great advantage; to have an enthusiastic
one too was even better. In his *Bulletin* obituary of his friend, George wrote the following: ‘To his friends – and no-one who knew him could be anything else – our Chaplain will always be ‘Teddy’. Musician, Ricardian, modeller, steam enthusiast, these were aspects of him added to his calling, not mere hobbies.’ As a vicar in rural Leicestershire, he acquired all sorts of railwayana which accumulated at his rectory in Cadeby. He eventually built a complete railway around the rectory, a very large shed for the model railway and found homes for over 20 diesels, steam engines and a traction engines. After his death, his widow kept Cadeby going for many years with open days to pay for the costs.

George’s long years of service were rewarded in 1989 when he was made a Vice-President of the Society. During his last years he was considerably handicapped by breaks in both his legs, which created particular problems in someone as tall as he. His restricted mobility inevitably limited his involvement, but for as long as he could he bravely continued to attend meetings and never lost his enthusiasm for the cause. He died on 27 October 1994, following a severe deterioration in his health, at the age of 78.

In his *Bulletin* obituary Isolde Wigram noted that: ‘Always very self effacing and diffident, it was some time before George made his mark, and it was only his constant support which gradually caused his worth to appreciated.’

I only knew George for the latter part of his time on the Committee. My abiding recollection is of him sitting quietly at the far end of the table, invariably smoking his pipe. He didn’t say much – which is no bad thing on a committee – but what he did say was always listened to, and that’s what matters. George was a unique character, a true gentleman who contributed much to the interests he pursued in life. As a Ricardian he was a stalwart of the Committee for over thirty years, and as our first historian and constitutional expert we all owe him a debt.

Veronica Chambers has a postcard of the National Portrait Gallery’s painting of Richard III sent to her by her grandmother, and on the back is written ‘For Veronica, because Uncle George admires him so much’. And George himself was equally admired by all who knew him.

George with Jeremy Potter, former Chairman of the Society, and Phyllis Hester at the unveiling of the Richard III Statute in Castle Gardens, Leicester 1880
... was Jeremy Potter’s idea and the appeal was launched to the membership in December 1977. As George Awdry put it, when Jeremy first became Chairman, ‘he was quite quiet for a little while, and then he started having ideas’. Whose idea it was to use James Butler as the sculptor I do not know, but I do recall that a large party from the Society visited his studio, and of course was able to see illustrations of his other work, such as the ‘Burton Cooper’. Various ideas were suggested for the design: initially it was desired to have an equestrian figure, until the cost of the horse was discovered – that shot that notion in the foot! A later maquette showed a standing figure, brandishing a sword, with a prone figure behind – this was liked, until an alternative interpretation was suggested – Richard having slain the prone figure, was now seeking his next victim – that shot that one down, too! Eventually we arrived by mutual consent with the actual figure, striving upward, with the crown in one hand, and a sword in the other. The sword was to give trouble later, and has now been transmuted into a dagger, as less attractive to steal. We were glad that we could answer to members’ frequent complaints about the loss of the sword that it was not the Society’s problem, as the Society had given the statue to Leicester city, and replacement of any missing parts was their responsibility. There had been some question that Richard should be represented as a law-giver, rather than as a soldier, but the Leicester site, with its Bosworth connection, seemed to preclude that, as well as member preference.

Having settled on a design, the next issue was to raise the money – some £20,000 needed to be found. Fund raising efforts ranged far and wide. I well remember the legendary performance by Patrick Bacon, hawking ‘Old Peculiar’ bottles (empties) round York, to reclaim money on them, closely followed by Bill Norman, then Treasurer. Branches held fund raising efforts, and the London Branch had a special not too little velvet bag, purchased for some reason, at a Yorkshire branch medieval banquet, specially for ‘statue fund’ monies, which it managed to make
total £1,485. But the most sterling efforts were made by Joyce Melhuish, galvanised into top gear (no – when was she ever in anything else?) and setting about to identify charitable funds which might make a contribution to the fund for the statue. She researched and identified numerous trusts and funds, and produced letters to send to them all, and, to maximise the cost-effectiveness of this approach, many were not posted, but given to local members to hand deliver. (Some confessed to defeat, and to using their own stamps to send the things.) As well as this Joyce organised the draw for one of the maquettes of an alternative design, quite apart from copious craft sale activity.

Jeremy had secured the patronage of the Duke of Rutland, descendant of Richard’s sister Anne, as patron of the appeal, and had himself generated much media interest, and contacted Leicester businesses.

While all this fund raising was going on, it so happened that a party from the London Branch visited the production of David Pownall’s play Richard III: Part Two, which combines historical scenes (wonderful sight-gag of Richard with apparent huge hump – which turns out to be a lute slung over his shoulder, under his cloak), with the modern day marketing of a board game about Richard III. At one point in this scenario, a character declared: ‘When I mention Richard III, I want you all to automatically put your hand in your pocket …’ and great was the cast’s bemusement, when the rows occupied by branch members fell about with laughter. Why is that so funny? – because only days earlier, Jeremy Potter had used almost the same words in soliciting funds for the statue.

When it looked as if Richard was perhaps going to be flat on his back – no plinth – a Leicester member on the staff of Sir Robert McAlpine and Sons Ltd persuaded them to provide the plinth and site work free of charge.

Finally the great day came, and the statue was completed and ready to be installed. To the
horror of gardeners and park-keepers in Leicester’s Castle Gardens, where the statue was to be installed, heavy lorries drove onto the site, across the grass, scouring deep ruts in the turf, shortly before the unveiling, in the presence of royalty, was due. However the delivery of the statue by lorry enabled Geoffrey Wheeler to take some close up photographs of it: a suffering Christ-like impression, and still some of my most cherished Ricardian images.

The Duke of Gloucester was to have unveiled the statue, but, matters of state intervening, he was sent abroad to represent his country (the French sent three battleships: we sent the Duke of Gloucester), and so we were ably substituted by ‘Mama Duchess’ – Princess Alice – on 31 July 1980. Jeremy was coached that he should not put out a hand to support her from the dais unless she really seemed to need it – else she would resent it. I was armed with a bouquet of flowers to present to her – happily I have pictures of that too. Some three hundred members attended, including representatives from America, Australia and Japan. The Chairman, Jeremy Potter, thanked all contributors, outlined the reasons for the statue and the appropriateness of its site, and spoke in praise of Richard. Princess Alice then read a message from the Duke of Gloucester, which included his comment: ‘I would like to see this statue as … proof that if a man strives his utmost to help his country by leading it towards a system of justice and peace then his virtue will eventually be acknowledged ...’ After Princess Alice had unveiled the statue, the ceremony concluded with the laying of a wreath by Phyllis Hester, and the Lord Mayor of Leicester held a reception in Leicester’s medieval Guildhall, where Princess Alice joined the guests and talked with a number of members of the Society.
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In the next issue of the Bulletin

The autumn issue will feature the National Portrait Gallery Exhibition which took place between 27 June and 7 October 1973. The period was a landmark in the Society’s history when the membership rapidly expanded as a result of the exhibition and the interest it generated.

If you attended the exhibition and have memories of it, please write to John Saunders (contact details back inside cover) so that your remembrances can be included.
When the Richard III Society was re-formed in the mid-1950s several Yorkshire enthusiasts joined. A few years later the 500th anniversary of the Battle of Wakefield came round in December 1960, and some of them got together and organised a commemoration, and then another for the Battle of Towton in the following March. These were advertised in the local press, and other members came and made themselves known. The acknowledged leader was Mr R J A Bunnett of Harrogate, a member since the earlier days of the Society; Roy Halliday was another leading Yorkshire member. There were five or six others, from Bradford, Otley and Leeds. What came out of those early meetings was a resolve to organise members from all over the county into a single branch, to be known as the Yorkshire Branch, and to hold suitable activities open to all Yorkshire members. The Branch has continued to the present day, and still serves as a focus for Ricardian activities in the county. A few of the members who joined in the early days are still active in the Branch.

Mr Bunnett was a Vice-President of the Richard III Society and was the first Chairman of the Yorkshire Branch. To publicise the Society he gave talks in Harrogate Public Library, and these were well-attended. I had joined the Society as a student in 1965, and came to Yorkshire the following year to work for Leeds City Libraries. As I lived in north Leeds it was relatively easy to get a bus to Harrogate, and so I attended some of Mr Bunnett’s lectures. I remember little of those occasions, save a large room full of people, and an old man. Mr Bunnett was in his late eighties then, and shortly afterwards resigned from the chairmanship.

The other members of the Branch Committee were four keen and energetic people, forming what might be called the Bradford-Otley axis. David Murgatroyd came from Baildon, and Dorothy Appleyard from Saltaire, both in the Bradford area. Anne Middleton and Sylvia Munro lived in Otley. David (always called simply Murgatroyd) became the new Chairman. Before I had attended more than half a dozen of the meetings held at Mrs Appleyard’s house, I found myself on the Branch Committee too, and bussing out to Otley or Saltaire on a regular basis.

Apart from the Chairmanship, offices circulated. At different times, Anne Middleton, a science teacher, Sylvia Munro and Dorothy Appleyard acted as Secretary. Sylvia’s friend and later husband M.A. Too (always known as Too) then joined the Committee and became Treasurer. Because I was interested in palaeography (reading medieval documents in the original) I was dubbed Research Secretary. On this topic, as on others, Murgatroyd was full of ideas, among which was a scheme to search through all the archives and records in the country for lost nuggets of information on matters medieval. I tried to explain that this was a tall order but, undaunted, Murgatroyd wrote off to Record Offices. We did come up with a long work in verse supposedly written by ‘The Shepherd Lord’ – the Clifford who lay hidden throughout the Yorkist period and came out in Henry VII’s reign – but as it was all about alchemy, the Shepherd Lord’s passion, we did not feel it added much to our understanding of the Ricardian era. However, I faithfully transcribed the document and have it still, somewhere.

In the first few years of Murgatroyd’s chairmanship there were lots of other initiatives of more lasting value. We began having regular coach trips to places of Ricardian interest, both in summer and in spring; we began to hold dinners in medieval costume, and we started a magazine. The trips were ambitious, and in those pre-tachograph days we started early and finished late – sometimes very late. A pick-up at Saltaire at 7 a.m. was common, with a return at 11 p.m. or even later. Once we went down to Ludlow to see an open-air production of Shakespeare’s Richard III (of course) in the Castle, and came back the same day (or it could have been the early hours of the following morning). Another time we aimed for Carlisle, with its castle, via Penrith
and the Gloucester Arms inn. Unfortunately, Bolton Castle was on our route, where we had rather a long lunch. So was Barden Tower, which we reached just in time for tea and scones. I think Penrith was reached just before the Gloucester Arms opened at 6 p.m. It was on that day that we took note of the pole-like monument by the roadside, not near anywhere in particular, recording Lady Anne Clifford’s last meeting with her mother (early 17th century and not our period, but never mind). It was immediately dubbed by Murgatroyd Lady Anne Clifford’s Bus Stop.

Our spring trips were always on Palm Sunday, to commemorate the Battle of Towton, and we decided to alternate between visits to the battlefield and short excursions into Yorkshire, year and year about. Occasionally the changing of the clocks caused long waits for late sleepers and the March or April weather was sometimes rather unforgiving – as were those who waited on windy streets for an elusive mini-bus to turn up. We went to places like Spofforth (castle), Pickering (lovely church and a castle), Holderness and Spurn Point (very cold). Sometimes we searched for chapels, like Lead, Huddleston and Lotherton. Huddleston’s was part of a farm, and we were only allowed to peer through the keyhole at the most enormous bull we had ever seen, whose home it now was. Visits to Townton itself always involved a stop at the Dacre Cross and a trek across the field to the edge of the wooded slope leading down to Cock Beck. We were always the only ones there in those days.

The first Medieval Dinner in York took place in 1968. The Branch held one a few years earlier in Bolton Castle, and legends about this event were numerous. Like when Murgatroyd had come into the firelight in the Great Hall in the character of Friar Bungay (typical), and frightened one of the attenders, a girl who had gone as Anne Neville, into hysterics. When another medieval dinner was planned, common sense prevailed and York’s Merchant Adventurers’ Hall was chosen, rather than an inaccessible half-ruined castle halfway up Wensleydale.
In the years up to about 1970 a number of others joined the Yorkshire Branch and quickly became noticed by Murgatroyd and pulled onto the Committee. John Audsley, Arthur Cockerill and Pauline Routh later became well-known names in the Society. They were all from Leeds, and enlivened the Committee meetings to quite an extent. Murgatroyd was at the time Headmaster of a school in Bradford, and we sometimes met in his study there. On one occasion he reached for his telephone and made a trunk call to some public body (at 8 or 9 o’clock at night, remember) to verify some detail or other which had come up in a particularly frank, not to say acrimonious discussion with Arthur. Arthur Cockerill was not a Yorkshireman, but he spoke his mind just like one. Once we met in Murgatroyd’s house in Baildon, in a room at the top of the house which he had decorated to his own taste in medieval style, in dark wood, with red curtains. I remember one of the items casually lying around was a skull.

Quite early on, the Leeds quartet (including myself) became more influential. One year, the AGM was held in the Merchant Taylors’ Hall in York on the same day as the medieval dinner, to boost attendance. The Treasurer, too, was finding the job burdensome and resigned. Without any warning John Audsley found himself elected to the post, and was immediately handed a bag of cash and a list of names — those who were coming to the dinner in the evening, and the half-crown deposits they had paid. Being conscientious, he immediately started getting to grips with it all, realised that he did not know many of the people listed, and consequently spent a far from pleasant evening worrying how he was going to collect the rest of the money. It was an experience, he says, which he has never forgotten. Eventually Murgatroyd was lured away from Ricardianism by the attractions of fighting the battles of the Civil War in the company of the Sealed Knot. Not long before, we had managed to change the Branch Constitution to prohibit the Chairman from holding office for more than (I think) three years in succession, and perhaps this had shown him that others were willing, not to say eager, to take over the running of the Branch. In any event, Arthur became Chairman, giving place to John Audsley when the Constitution’s prohibition came into play.

They continued the activities of the Branch which Murgatroyd had launched, including the magazine. Ours was the first after The Ricardian, so we had a clear field of choice. Blanc Sanglier was the name chosen, this being the medieval French for Richard III’s favoured heraldic badge, the White Boar. At first the technology available was not equal to the task. The first few issues were home-produced — in other words, in Murgatroyd’s school. They were irregular, badly duplicated and even worse bound. After a few years Arthur and Pauline took over the editing and production. They found a professional printer and settled on a format. We began publishing three issues of Blanc Sanglier each year, and have continued doing so ever since. Pauline became sole editor for six or seven years, and set the standard, with articles that were scholarly or light-hearted (or both). Some disapproval of the existence of a branch magazine was expressed in London, on the grounds that it kept suitable articles out of The Ricardian. But this was to misunderstand Blanc Sanglier’s function, which was to publish articles on any medieval topic, from church monuments to cookery, and from reviews of branch events to outlets for members’ wit and humour. Any contributor with something worthwhile to say on Richard or his time would be urged to go to The Ricardian.

In those early days being in the Yorkshire Branch was great fun, as you never knew what idea Murgatroyd would have next. He was never averse to stirring muddy waters just to see what came to the surface. He liked (dare I say it?) goading the Society Committee, who often found the Yorkshire Branch a thorn in their flesh, particularly that time when they were treated to Branch members’ histrionics at the AGM. It was all a long time ago now, and we are rather more sedate — but of course just as enthusiastic in our Ricardianism. Many goals have been attained, such as Arthur Cockerill’s dream of seeing Harleian Ms 433 in print. We ourselves have our publishing programme and Branch imprint, Rosalba Press, under which we brought out Peter Foss’s book on the battlefield of Bosworth, The Field of Redemore. The Yorkshire Branch has grown in numbers, in confidence, and in reputation, since its beginnings 45 years ago. Long may it last.
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It has been good to hear from some of you and to learn of your early memories. Leading the field at the moment are two members who joined in the 1950s. Sandra Howard joined when still at school in the 1950s but lapsed after a few years and rejoined after she married. Sandra writes that her ‘son was born on 2 October and used Richard III (including my notes from the 50s) to obtain his BA (Hons) in History.’ Although Sandra no longer makes it to Bosworth each August she spends a lot of time in Middleham and York.

JC Knights, referring to old diaries, has found that he joined early in 1958 and writes ‘I had always been enormously ‘pro-York’ and simply did not accept all the ‘R3 monster’ nonsense that we were taught at school. Also of course The Daughter of Time was a big influence. Nothing much in the way of memories I fear. I remember Joyce Melhuish and her early trips, of course, and her very dismissive ‘Not you again!’ when I had the temerity to cancel two in a row due to the Brighton trains (or lack of). But she was a lovely lady. I went to Sun of York at the Royal Court and enjoyed it, although I would not call it a great play. I knew Lesley French slightly through his taking the (non-dancing) title role in the ballet Everyman with International Ballet who were one of my companies. I have enormously enjoyed my membership over the years and only regret that I shall not be here for the hundredth anniversary!’

Valerie Giles joined as early as 1961 when her name appears in an attendance book for Society meetings. Val recalls reading about the Fellowship of the White Boar’s unveiling of the plaque to Anne Neville in Westminster Abbey but by the time she joined we were the Richard III Society. Val’s ‘career’ with the Society has included being assistant secretary to Isolde Wigram and then she became secretary in her own right and was followed in the role by the late Phyllis Hester. Val recalls the ‘do’ at Crosby Hall when Patrick Bacon had written a song about a failed ENSA girl and the Hundred Years War which Val was persuaded to sing but having been liberally ‘doctored’ by a glass of Olde Peculiar, had to lean on the piano whilst performing! Val has also been known as Valerie Ray and is now known as Val Alliez. I’m sure members recall her fascinating walking tours of the city of London and Southwark.

Shirley and Roy Linsell joined the Society c. 1963 when Patrick Bacon was chairman, Muriel Cater was treasurer, Isolde Wigram was secretary and Olivia Wigram presided over the tea. This took place at Crosby Hall where she met Carolyn Hammond, then Carolyn Hicks. Each year they did the Bosworth trip, clambering under barbed wire to avoid cows and the odd bull while Isolde explained the battle positions. Shirley was involved with raising money for the Leicester statue and recalls how moved she was when it was unveiled. She continues ‘over the years the society has changed and of course one adjusts, but the early days were fun and of course we were young and enthusiastic. I still give talks on Richard and last year tried to persuade members of the U3A to rethink their thoughts with some success. The Society has been, for my husband Roy and myself, a great joy, we have made very good friends and the Croydon Group weekends are legends in their lifetime. There is a theory that when Ricardians die they rush up to Richard and say, ‘well, did you?’ For me that doesn’t matter, it’s all been wonderful’.

Gwen Millan joined the Society in 1968 although her interest had been sparked in 1958 when she attended an Olivier film season in Edinburgh and was told that Paul Murray Kendall had written his revisionist biography. Two years later she learned from a librarian that there was a group of supporters of Richard III, but it was not until 1968, whilst buying a copy of an I Spy book on battlefields in Oxford, that she found a contact name and address and wasted no time in contacting Isolde.

Please keep the reminiscences coming as we would like to feature some more of you in the next issue of the Bulletin.
News from Barley Hall

Barley Hall’s Medieval Pilgrimage

The Barley Hall Trust is delighted to be associated with the York Mystery Plays, being presented in 2006 by the Guilds and Companies of York in authentically medieval fashion on mobile pageant wagons. The Mystery Plays take place this year on 9th and 16th July and will once again bring a real taste of the magic and spectacle of the original medieval mystery plays, which in centuries past were presented each year in York for the Festival of Corpus Christi.

To celebrate this ‘medieval mystery’, Barley Hall is organising a Medieval Pilgrimage, which will take the form of a sponsored walk – will start on Thursday July 6th from Nostell Priory, near Wakefield, as this was the monastic house once situated here which founded and built the building we now know as Barley Hall, way back in 1361. Over the following days, it will move on via Pontefract, Towton and Tadcaster to the outskirts of York. Finally, on the morning of Sunday 9th July, the ‘Pilgrims’ will make their way through York to finish at the Minster in time for the start of the Mystery Plays at 12 noon.

The Barley Hall Trust invites all history-loving walkers to join in on the Pilgrimage. Events along the route will enliven the proceedings and bring the medieval past to life for as many people as possible. All Pilgrims are encouraged to get themselves sponsored – at least half the money raised will go towards the work of the Barley Hall Trust, and Pilgrims are invited to choose a second charity for part of their money raised as well. You may like to invite people to sponsor you in half-day or daily units.

Pilgrims are invited to take part in any part of the Pilgrimage, whether it’s just half a day or the full distance. We do hope for a really good turn-out on the Sunday for the final trek into York, however, so please join in this part if you can. The walk will be done as far as possible on old roads and paths. We would like to encourage pilgrims to dress in late medieval style if this is something with which they feel comfortable. Certainly for the last walk into York on the day of the Mystery Plays it would be splendid to see a real medieval-looking crowd of pilgrims making their way through the city. But all walkers are welcome and there is no compulsory dress code.
The first day (Thursday) will take us from Nostell Priory via Pontefract Castle and [around five miles] up the Roman Road towards Tadcaster: total distance will be around 11 miles on this day. We will start from Nostell Priory at around 12 noon and aim to finish walking at around 7 pm.

The second day (Friday) will take us on via the site of the Battle of Towton to Tadcaster. This is a long day – likely to be around 15 miles walking.

The third day (Saturday) will take us from Tadcaster to Goddards, the National Trust property on the outskirts of York via Copmanthorpe, following the old Roman road as much as possible. This will be around 11 miles again.

The final day (Sunday) is a gentle 3-mile walk up the Tadcaster Road, through Micklegate Bar into the medieval city of York, and so to the Minster. We aim to arrive about 11.30 am, in time for the start of the Mystery Plays at 12 noon.

There is a registration fee for Pilgrims wishing to take part, so that the Barley Hall Trust can cover the initial expenses of the project. The registration fee is £5. Registration and sponsorship forms are available from me (address inside back cover). Alternatively you might like to sponsor me, as I intend to walk the whole distance from Nostell to York. A sponsorship form is included in the centre pages. All monies raised will go to Barley Hall.

Lynda Pidgeon, Society representative, Barley Hall Board

Friends of Barley Hall

The Friends have undergone several changes since inception. Originally the Ricardian Friends, interest among visitors was such that it was opened up to a wider membership and became simply The Friends of Barley Hall. However the Richard III Society retains a special relationship with Barley Hall, not only having its own Trustee on the Board but also sponsoring a member of the Barley Hall Guild of supporters.

It has been some time since an AGM was held and it was thought that the Society’s AGM weekend in York would provide a suitable opportunity to rectify this. So that we can gauge interest and arrange a suitable time and place could Friends and potential Friends please complete and return the questionnaire in the centre pages.

Thank you

Lynda Pidgeon

Ancient and Medieval history books (c.4500 BC - c.1550 AD)

From historical fiction to academic works.
Please send SAE to : Karen Miller, Church Farm Cottage, Church Lane, Kirklington, Nr Newark, NOTTS NG22 8NA.
The Biographical Index

IAN ROGERS

When he was asked to write this piece Ian asked me if I would briefly introduce it. I am delighted to do so. He and I have corresponded about it from the beginning, and I can say that over the years in its various forms it has been very useful indeed. Please do look at it. Peter W Hammond

For the past thirty years or so I have been compiling biographies of people who lived in the fifteenth century. This was done originally to provide a background for a novel set in Richard III’s time. However, it wasn’t long before the research took over, and the novel was put to one side.

As time went on, and the work continued, I started to put my work on computer. Last year I made the latest move, and started to put it on the internet. Now that my webspace is in place, I would like to make my work available to all members of the Society.

The webspace is at www.girders.net. As the name suggests, it is still work in progress, and, hopefully, I will continue to add to it most days.

There are, at the time of writing, over 21,400 biographies on the site, arranged alphabetically in 49 sections for ease of looking up. Some are brief, some comprise several pages. Most entries are referenced. There is a separate list of printed sources; web references are quoted within the text. The scope is wide; the only deliberate omissions are some people about whom books have been written. There are, inevitably, duplications of some people, particularly where alternative spellings have meant they slipped through the net, or where I have been uncertain as to whether two references are to the same person or not. In the latter case, I have created separate entries, in the hope that future research may result in their being combined, or will make clear that there were two different individuals. I have erred on the side of caution; with several people with the same name living in the same places at about the same time, I have tried not to jump to conclusions.

You will find reference numbers at the end of some entries – please ignore them as they are part of an old system which is being phased out. The date at the bottom of the entries tells you when they were last updated.

If you are particularly interested in someone who is not included, please keep checking from time to time. As I have said, I am adding new people almost every day; there are another 2,000 in the pipeline. If you want to see if I have information on someone who is not yet on the site, e-mails to ian@girders.net will reach me and I will try to respond as quickly as I can. I would also appreciate any constructive comments you may wish to make, and suggestions for people to include.

I hope that members will find my work of interest – who knows, it may start others researching. Be warned, though – it’s like a drug; once you start researching you may find it hard to stop!

Hopefully, there will be something in this for everyone. Whatever your level of interest, I hope that you will enjoy reading what I have put together.

In conclusion, may I also draw your attention to what I call a Diary of the events of Richard’s lifetime, which also may be of interest. Don’t worry, I haven’t forgotten 1485!
The first known motto associated with Richard is *Tant le desiere*, 'I have longed for it so much'. Richard wrote it along with his signature into his copy of *Ipomedon*, one of four romances that he owned, which tells of the adventures of a perfect knight. The story dates from the twelfth century and the fact that it was still being read in the fifteenth century demonstrates both its appeal and relevance to the aristocracy. It was a book that was thought suitable for the education of a young nobleman, being both a chivalric and moral story. The motto along with Richard’s boar also appears in a manuscript of heraldic beasts of English nobles and knights dating from the fifteenth century. The manuscript, discovered in the eighteenth century by John Fenne, was dated to 1461-1470.

Richard’s adoption of this motto may have been an affectation of youth, appealing to his aspiration to become a ‘chivalric knight’, alternatively it may be a motto he thought suitable for use in tournaments and courtly entertainments. The point of the story of *Ipomedon* was to strive to achieve great deeds and win renown, usually for the love of a lady, which was also a common theme for tournaments. The meaning of this motto does present some small difficulty though. If the translation above is correct the chivalric ideal has been attained, whereas the point of the ideal was in a continual quest for it. However if it was an achieved ideal then it could not possibly relate to a desire for the crown, as the motto is too early. Its true meaning therefore remains open to speculation.

A motto attributed to 1472 was again written by Richard, with his name, into a book, his copy of the New Testament: *A vous me ly* (I am bound to you). It is thought the ‘vous’ refers to Anne Neville, hence the date. This appears to be confirmed by the discovery of a round metal plaque at Middleham. The motto *a votre plaisir* (at your service), is engraved around the plaque and in the centre are the engraved letters RA, Richard and Anne. However there are two other couples, also associated with Middleham, with the same initials, Richard Neville and Anne Beauchamp, and Richard Neville and Anne Montague. The two mottoes are similar and have a personal connotation. Both are the type of motto that courtiers and knights used for love and courtly games, and they appear regularly in romances, for example Christine de Pisan’s *Book of the Duke of True Lovers*.

Richard’s best known motto is of course, *Loyaulte me lie*. This can be more firmly dated to May or early June 1483 when it appears on a piece of parchment also signed by the Duke of Buckingham and Edward V. This may have been idle ‘doodling’ but it also appears on an official document, a charter granted by Richard to the Waxchandlers Company on 16 February 1484.

Loyalty was another common theme in mottoes, e.g *Tousjours loyal; Humble et loyal; Amour avec loyaulte; Loyal a mort*, referring not only to loyalty to a beloved lady but to faith and love for a lord. Loyalty was a knightly virtue. In his *Breviaire des nobles* (book of prayers for noblemen) Alain Chart-
ier (1390-1430) lists twelve virtues which a noble should possess. The first was fidelity, the second loyalty. Chartier defines loyalty as a virtue which makes noblemen deserve the high honour they receive. It implied fulfilling obligations not only to superiors, but to inferiors by defending them and their dependents. Loyalty is generally associated with truth, reason and justice and the motto could therefore also be translated as ‘justice rejoices me’, such double meanings were the essence of a good motto. Loyalty was a theme used regularly by the Yorkist family. Richard, Duke of York, used *bien ama loyaulte sans envye*. It is possible that it is Richard’s motto that George Brown is referring to in 1483 when writing to John Paston. ‘Loyalte Ayme. Hyt schal newyr cum howte for me’. Brown joined Buckingham’s rebellion so obviously did not feel bound in loyalty to Richard. If it is Richard’s motto that he refers to then it suggests that the motto was being officially used by Richard and had become widely known. However because of the ubiquity of ‘loyalty’ in mottoes it might equally refer to any other noble.

The three mottoes might be seen as reflecting the various stages of Richard’s life. First as a hopeful young knight, with stories of chivalric deeds filling his thoughts, a motto to suit tournaments would have been appropriate. He may also have experienced the splendid tournaments and entertainments at the court of Burgundy when he was sent into the care of Duke Philip in 1461 and been inspired. Later when he married he adopted the chivalric theme of courtly love and finally when he assumed the throne he took on a motto that summed up his aspirations as king, to dispense justice and defend the poor.

**Lynda Pidgeon**

**Prestyn House**

The Devon and Cornwall Branch has been meeting at Prestyn House in Plymouth for the past few years. It is located at the back of St Andrews Church. The house has been described as Plymouth’s finest medieval building and was built in the early 1490s. At one time it was called Yogge’s House after the merchant Thomas Yogge who owned the land the house was built on. However evidence found in earlier medieval deeds and records show that there were in fact originally two separate houses on the land. It is believed that the original Yogge’s House which has not survived would have stood roughly where the nearby Abbey Pub now stands.

These deeds confirm that Thomas Yogge owned the land and provide information about previous owners. In 1395 William Benteleghe was granted a tenement in Sutton Prior situated to the south of the church and by its cemetery to the north. Later owners included William Cheke and his wife Christina. In 1437 Christina, then a widow, granted the lands to William Grene, a chaplain. He in turn disposed of it to Walter Peterfield he held the land till 1487 when it was sold to Thomas Yogge and his wife Margaret.

The present house, built on Thomas Yogge’s land, became known as ‘Prestyn’ or ‘Priest’s House’. It is known that at one time not long after it was built 12 Augustian Chantry priests lived there. They had come from the nearby Plympton Priory to officiate at St Andrew’s Church and may also have used the house as a chantry school. It was this association that undoubtedly gave the house its name. There is little information about the house in subsequent records. In 1491 we know that a high rent was charged and that the building was freehold and not owned by the town itself. Thomas Flete, a priest, was granted a lease in 1538 in consideration of his having paid for the repair of the house’s kitchen. However following the dissolution of the monasteries the priests moved out and the building served many purposes including acting as a wine store and merchant’s warehouse. When the Church of England eventually gained possession of the house it was found that the interior had been much blackened as a result of bacon curing. Whilst St Andrews and much of the city was badly damaged during the blitz, Prestyn House survived.

The Yogge family were not Yorkists, so it is a nice irony that nowadays the local branch of the Richard III Society meet at the house built on his land.

**Shirley Stapley**
The Debate:

WHO MURDERED THE PRINCES?

In the nineteenth century antiquarians sometimes published books with titles such as ‘Materials towards the History of’ and the debate this month can be regarded as materials towards a debate on the Princes. What happened to them, were they murdered, if so who did murder them and if no one did was either of them later known as Simnel or Warbeck? Please feel free to send in your ideas on any or all of these questions to Peter Hammond at the address in back inside cover of this Bulletin.

From Peter Hammond:

Was one of these the guilty party?

The question of who, if anyone, murdered the sons of Edward IV is clouded by the other question of whether they were murdered at all. We have no positive evidence that they were killed in the summer of 1483 or later and if you accept that Perkin Warbeck was the younger of the two princes then obviously they were not both murdered. However that is the question being dealt with below. For now we will assume that they were murdered and consider who might have done so, or at least who might have ordered it, we are not accusing anyone of doing it themselves.

In the classic detective story a murderer is found by considering who had the motive and the opportunity to kill someone. In this case I think we have to say that whoever it was they would have to be in a position of power and influence because no one else would dare to order such a killing. This rules out anyone except those with independent authority and really excludes anyone except a king because no one else would dare to take such a decision. For this reason I do not intend to discuss such candidates as Margaret Beaufort or John Morton. However for another view see the letter from David Johnson in this issue. In this piece I therefore intend to discuss Richard III, Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, John Howard, Duke of Norfolk and Henry Tudor.

Firstly then Richard III. Whatever we may think of him he undoubtedly had the opportunity and the authority to order the death of his nephews, more than anyone else. He also had a motive in that if his nephews were alive there would always be the possibility of a group who wanted to restore to them their rights. He or his advisors may have considered that the only way he could be secure would be if his nephews were dead, the logical action after deposing a king is to kill him and of course to let everyone know he is dead. The Princes were not certainly seen again after the summer of 1483. Markham’s supposition that the ‘Lord Bastard’ reference in Harleian Ms. 433 could be Edward V is ruled out by the fact that the bastard son of Richard III was called this. The near unanimity of the later chronicles that they were dead by 1485 and this shows the contemporary belief. Belief is all that it is though and there is no proof. Indications, from Richard’s known character, the actions of Elizabeth Woodville in allowing her daughters to live in Richard’s court and above all Henry VII’s failure to accuse Richard openly of the murder all point to the possibility of Richard’s innocence. Richard was of course accused of the murder by Sir Thomas More and others in the well known story of the burial of the bodies under a stair at the Tower but this story has so many flaws in it that it is not now accepted in its entirety by any serious historian.

Our next suspect is the duke of Buckingham. The case against him is rather tenuous...
and rests on little except that as Constable of England he had undoubted opportunity to give himself and his agents access to the Tower (although this over estimates the independent powers of the Constable) and as, (presumably) an ambitious man of royal blood he had motive to further his own plans by eliminating some claimants to the throne. As with Richard some contemporary chronicles state or imply that Buckingham may have murdered the Princes but are ambiguous and in fact mostly indicate that he played an advisory role rather than an executive one. For example the London Chronicle published in 1981 says the Princes were put to death ‘bi his avis’ which could mean either by the advice of the Duke or under his direction. This may mean that he suggested it or that he carried it out and either meaning probably implicates Richard. Kendall in his biography of Richard puts forward the case for Buckingham as murderer but it is not convincing.

Our third candidate for murderer in the lifetime of Richard III is John Howard, the duke of Norfolk. It is only worth mentioning here because the accusation still surfaces from time to time. It is based on little more than the entry in his account books listing a payment for two sacks of lime for use in the Tower. The original editor of the account books immediately jumped to the conclusion that this was to help dispose of bodies. In fact the ‘Tower’ referred to may have been Howard’s house of that name (the payment is in his private accounts and he was never Constable of the Tower of London) and in any case is dated 21 May 1483 which is nearly a month before Richard of York arrived in the Tower of London. There is a possible motive in Howard’s desire to obtain the estates of the Mowbray Dukes of Norfolk but he got those by grant anyway together with the Norfolk title before Richard’s coronation on 6 July when there is no real doubt that the Princes were still alive.

We now come to the final possible murderer, Henry Tudor. If the Princes were still alive once he had become king he undoubtedly had the authority to order their death. Once he had made them legitimate again by repealing the act Titulus Regius which bastardised them he had an overwhelming motive. Of course if Henry did himself have the Princes murdered it seems most likely that he would have accused Richard of having done so but he never did. The reference in Richard’s attainder to the ‘shedding of infants blood’ may be such an accusation but it could mean that Henry did not know what had happened and the phrase was just an insinuation against Richard which could be true. That Henry did not know what had happened seems to be shown too by his behaviour during the Perkin Warbeck affair. Tyrell’s ‘confession’ mentioned by Sir Thomas More and never published by Henry could show that that Henry ordered the murder and blamed Richard but this is not a convincing theory.

In the end it does appear that we cannot show that any of our ‘murderers’ did in fact commit the crime, despite motive and/or opportunity. It is safest to admit that no one now knows who did commit the murder or indeed if there was a murder at all.
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There is an excellent summary of the evidence against the four subjects discussed here (together with several others) in Helen Maurer’s ‘Whodunit: The Suspects in the Case’, originally published in the Ricardian Register and now available on the American Branch website at:
http://www.r3.org/bookcase/whodunit2.html

From Lesley Boatwright:
Unsuccessful Self-Help?

Truth may be the daughter of time, but obfuscation can well be the bastard brat of art. The image generated by hearing the words 'the Princes in the Tower' is usually that of a pair of apprehensive children nervously holding hands at the foot of a stone stairway, their golden hair lighting up the surrounding gloom as a metaphor for innocence beset by the powers of darkness. Sir John Everett Millais obviously knew about the bones discovered at a stairway's foot in 1674 when he painted his romanticised view of the princes which now hangs in Royal Holloway University of London at Egham.

A pair of children at the mercy of the wicked world is a common folk-lore archetype. Think of the Babes in the Wood, of Hansel and Gretel, of Romulus and Remus. The Princes in the Tower fit nicely into this category, but without an animal saviour to rescue them. We feel so sorry for them in their helplessness.

Millais might well also have seen the stained-glass window in Canterbury Cathedral depicting the same golden-haired stripplings, this time robed gorgeously in ermine and wearing heavy gold coronets. The boys do not look quite so vulnerable here.

The elder boy, Edward, was born at the beginning of 1471, and was thus 12 years old in June 1483. At 12 years old, he was by no means a helpless child. A 12-year-old was responsible before the law. All males aged 12 and over who were settled and resident in villages where a homicide had been committed were required to attend the inquest [TNA JUST 1/874]. The thirteenth-century law-book known as Bracton [ii pp. 251-2] deals with the age of majority, saying ‘if [the heir] is the son and heir of a sokeman [he is of age] when he has completed his fifteenth year. If he is the son of a burgess he is taken to be of full age when he knows how properly to count money, measure cloths and perform other similar paternal business.’ That is, majority is a matter of maturity rather than calendar years.

Some young kings, such as Edward III and Edward VI, began their reigns as pawns in the hands of powerful factions led by their nearest and dearest. On the other hand, when no desperate rivalries sought to manipulate him, a young king might find himself exercising his own power. Richard II was born on 6 January 1367, and inherited the throne, aged 10, in June 1377. There was no regency, as only his uncle, John of Gaunt, had the status to become regent, but was a controversial and unacceptable figure. Young Richard was given possession of the Great Seal and the actual government was carried on by a series of Councils acting for him, until in January 1380 they were regarded as responsible for a naval defeat in the Channel. At that point, Richard, aged 13, was given the right to choose his own advisors. [Nigel Saul The Three Richards, pp. 51-2] This effectively put the running of his kingdom into his own teen-age hands.

It has always seemed to me that Edward V might well have taken some action of his own accord, with or without helpers, when he realised that his succession to his father’s throne was in jeopardy. The first jolt came at Stony Stratford. Edward must have been surprised (startled? alarmed?) at the removal of Anthony Woodville, the uncle he knew well, by Richard of Gloucester, the uncle he hardly knew at all (for how often did Richard go to Ludlow, or Prince Edward to his father’s court when Richard was also there?) Richard and Buckingham escorted him to London. Was he reassured by their conversations on the way? To be lodged in the Tower was quite proper, the arrival of young Richard of York perhaps a relief (how well did the two brothers know each other?) – and less than a week later Ralph Shaa preached his sermon on the text ‘bastard slips shall take no root’. Who broke the news to the boys that they were no longer royal princes, and when exactly was this done? And is it likely that Edward took no thought for more active measures than the ‘daily confession and penance’ which his doctor, John Argentine, reported to Mancini [p.93], to meet the crisis? A daily meeting with his confessor could have been set up as his way of communicating with the outside world: no third party would be able to over-
hear what they said.

Ann Wroe [Perkin pp. 67-73], lists a wide variety of rumours current at the time concerning the boys. Just about the only theory not advanced was that they had been abducted by aliens. As well as a wide range of murder methods, there are rumours about their removal, smuggled abroad or to the North, or that they had fallen into the Tower moat and been washed out to sea.

Set aside all the theories about who killed the boys, what might have happened, what a particular piece of evidence may mean, where a particular deduction might lead. They all have their own possibilities and weaknesses. A plausible motive can be found for just about anyone, from Richard of Gloucester himself down to the lowliest Tower guard who thought to please someone of importance by taking out these inconvenient ex-princes on his behalf, like the four knights thought to please Henry II by taking out Becket. There is absolutely no evidence that would stand up in a court of law for any of these theories. The court of history should be no less stringent.

Are there any real facts in the case? Is there anything at all we can build on? I can find five points, the first two of which might just possibly change over time:

1. There is no sustainable evidence that the boys were seen, alive or dead, after the late summer or early autumn of 1483.
2. No unequivocal written record of their survival has turned up.
3. No bodies (genuine or false) were ever exhibited as theirs.
4. Their mother, Elizabeth Woodville, made the best of a bad job and got back on some sort of terms with Richard after he took the throne.
5. Henry Tudor in his Act of Attainder against Richard III had to resort to the vague ‘shedding of infants’ blood’ rather than a firm accusation of regicide.

These facts seem to me to add up to the possibility that no-one, neither Richard III, Henry Tudor, nor anyone else in a position of authority ever did know exactly what happened. I think this may well point to an escape attempt which went wrong.

There was some sort of plot some time in July 1483. David Johnson wrote about it in the last Bulletin. Michael Hicks [The Ricardian vol. IX no. 114, September 1991 pp.106-9] unwove it: Pamela Tudor-Craig first pointed to the letter of 29 July from Richard to his Chancellor to try ‘certaine personnes of such as of late had taken upon thaym the fact of an entreprise’; Rosemary Horrox wrote about John Stow’s report of a plot in which four rebels against the king, Robert Russe, sergeant of London, William Davy, pardoner of Hounslow, John Smith, groom of King Edward’s stirrup, and Stephen Ireland, wardrober of the Tower, and others, were in communication with Henry Tudor and planned to divert the authorities’ attention by arson attacks in parts of London while they rescued the Princes from the Tower. They were caught, tried and executed. A French account by Thomas Basin seems to confirm this, but neither legal records nor London chronicles know anything about it. Whether Henry Tudor or Margaret Beaufort were implicated is not really known either.

If there was such a plot, and Edward and Richard had been forewarned – and it would have been unbelievably inefficient not to have done so – Edward at least must have been ready for action. In the confusion, perhaps the princes attempted to escape. And were never seen again, dead or alive.

From Wendy Moorhen:
Did the Princes Survive?

As Richard III was plagued by rumour of the murder of his nephews, so was Henry VII to be similarly blighted by rumours and events suggesting the Princes, or at least one of them had survived. My brief was to examine any ‘evidence’ for their survival but ‘evidence’ is a commodity sadly lacking in this case and I must therefore turn to circumstantial evidence to offer any support to claims that they outlived their uncle.

Firstly, I will examine what we can regard, as contemporary rumour and then later reports of such. The first example actually pre-dates the death of King Richard and although it confirms that there were rumours of the Princes’ murder the author adds ‘However, many people say – and I agree with them – that they are still alive and kept in a very dark cellar.’ The author was Niclas von Popplau writing about his 1484 visit to England.

Next, the Great Chronicle, during the mayoral year 1492/3, reports that there was secret talk of the Duchess of Burgundy ‘keeping’ the duke of York. The context makes it difficult to decide when the rumour was current and it should be remembered that ‘Perkin Warbeck’ made his first visit to Ireland in October/November 1491. The final contemporary example comes from Molinet who in a poem wrote ‘I saw a son of England, called Richard of York, who they said was dead and eaten up in the earth’.

Reports of the survival of one or more of the Princes can also be found in the works of Henry VII’s two court historians, Bernard André and Polydore Vergil and later in Francis Bacon’s history of the reign. André, circa 1500, wrote ‘... the report went out that Edward [IV]’s second son was crowned king in Ireland.’ Vergil, writing a few years later, noted ‘the fact that among the people there were those who suspected that the sons of King Edward had migrated secretly to some other country’. Bacon in the early seventeenth century wrote ‘And all this time it was still whispered everywhere that at least one of the children of Edward the fourth was living, which bruiz [rumour] was cunningly fo-

mented by such as desired innovation.’ Curiously the pattern begins to emerge that just one prince survived.

It should, of course, be noted that the Tudor historians did not believe the Prince(s) were alive, only that it was rumoured they were, and when the challenges to Henry VII were made the ‘official’ historians wrote of impostors and not pretenders. With the reversal of the Titulus Regius Henry could not afford to have pretenders, they had to be imposters in his eyes and those of his subjects.

Two final documents have provided speculation that the Princes survived, one suggesting that they may have been sent north under the supervision of the earl of Lincoln. A reference in the ordinances setting up the King’s Household in the north, dated 24 July 1484, twice refers to the ‘children’. After Bosworth, it is known that at least two children were at Sheriff Hutton, the earl of Warwick and Elizabeth of York, but there has been considerable speculation, although no evidence, that this northern nursery housed, variously, the remaining daughters of King Edward, King Richard’s illegitimate children John and Katherine, Warwick’s sister Margaret, and the Princes. The other document is a warrant for clothing for the ‘Lord Bastard’ but it is now generally assumed this refers to King Richard’s son, John.

Moving away from documentary sources it is now necessary to look at the actions of the imposters/pretenders and to consider if they could have been who they said they were. The Lambert Simnel conspiracy in 1487 is complex, particularly as there is some uncertainty as to who was actually supposed to have been crowned in Ireland. Was it Edward, Earl of Warwick or the elder missing Prince? It is not possible in this short article to review all aspects of the affair and readers are directed to Michael Bennett’s book and Gordon Smith’s article on Lambert Simnel (see notes 4 and 5 below). The conspiracy, however, cannot simply be dismissed as the machinations of an ambitious priest manipulating a low-born Oxfordshire lad or an excuse for the Irish to invade England. The unique ritual of a coronation was performed, a religious service, undoubtedly to impress
the Irish with the importance of the venture and its ‘veracity’. The ceremony was supervised by no less a person than King Richard III’s heir, the earl of Lincoln, who was gambling his entire future. Vergil reported that Henry was furious that Lincoln had been killed at the battle of Stoke as he wanted ‘to learn more from him concerning the conspiracy’.

The career of the imposter Perkin Warbeck or pretender Richard of York was an altogether more serious matter as he attracted the support of several European rulers and posed a threat to King Henry for several years until his capture in 1497. There is no doubt that he was used by these monarchs for their own ends but the question has to be asked that surely it would have offended their regal sensibilities to be so intimate with a son of a Tournai boatman? The matter of Perkin Warbeck’s identity has recently been examined by Ann Wroe (see n. 3 below), and whilst she does not necessarily support his identity as that of the younger prince her analysis of the Tournai connection raises serious doubts that he was part of the Tournai Warbeck family.

It is not inappropriate to mention two latter day hypotheses regarding the Princes’ survival. These are perhaps ideas that Ricardians want to believe but which need to be approached with great caution. The first is a Tyrell family tradition that ‘that the princes and their mother Elizabeth Woodville lived in the hall [Gipping] by permission of the uncle’ reported by the late Audrey Williamson in her 1978 book *The Mystery of the Princes*. The obvious conclusion is the Princes and their mother lived here quietly at Tyrell’s home in Suffolk during part of Richard’s reign. Prince Edward, from a young age, had his own household in Ludlow and it is difficult to conjure a circumstance when the boys and their mother lived together in a ‘hall’, particularly with an uncle’s permission, other than in 1484/5. The other hypothesis is that of the late Jack Leslau, who believed that the Princes were living in Sir Thomas More’s household and were those known to history as Sir Edward Guildford and John Clement. Jack believed there are clues in the Rowland Lockey painting of the More family which substantiate his theory. To draw to a conclusion, it is perhaps because of Ricardians’ belief that Richard did not cold-bloodedly order the murder of his nephews and the lack of evidence to support the guilt of the other candidates that we look so eagerly to their survival. This, of course, does not pass muster with historians, nor should it. History is about trying to establish what happened, initially on hard evidence, and followed by whatever else we can sensibly use. Conspiracy is a powerful concept and the disappearance of the Princes is one of this country’s most compelling. Conspiracies can be hoaxes, such as the dossier secret relating to the *Rennes le Chateau* affair but I would like to leave you with a few questions about the events after the alleged murders in 1483.

- What was Tyrell’s secret mission in 1484?
- Where did Elizabeth Woodville live after she came out of sanctuary in 1484? Despite two recent biographies about her no further information has been forthcoming.
- John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln may not have been with King Richard at Bosworth, although he was with him in Nottingham immediately prior to the battle. Where else could he have been?
- Why was Elizabeth Woodville stripped of her possessions and sent to Bermondsey during the critical Sheen council meeting convened to discuss the Simnel crisis? Was it believed by the king and council that she supported Simnel?
- Is it a mere coincidence that Warbeck/York accompanied Sir Edward Brampton from Middelburgh to Portugal in 1487, the same year as the Lambert Simnel affair?
- What did Henry VII expect to learn from Lincoln if he had been taken alive at Stoke?
- Why did the Archduke Maximilian consider Warbeck/York as a husband for his daughter Margaret?
- Why was the Archduke Maximilian so
keen to rescue Warbeck/York from Henry, even as late as 1498?
• Why was Warbeck/York included in the chapter of secret ciphers reserved for the Pope, the Emperor, Kings and other persons of royal blood and used by the Spanish sovereigns in correspondence with their ambassadors unless Ferdinand and Isabella believed him to be the duke of York?
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The disappearance of the Princes in the Tower will be the subject of the Society’s 2008 Triennial Conference

Coats of Arms of some Ricardian Contemporaries
by Lawrence T Greensmith (first published in The Ricardian June 1973)

The Leopards’ Faces of the De La Poles
It is said that when a heraldic lion looks at you (as do the royal lions of England) you are safe in calling it a leopard. If you accept this, then its face certainly looks at you. It is not always vigorously drawn; a good example, but that is also crowned, is in the arms of the Heraldry Society: that is a single face, but you often find them in threes. The blazon for the famous de la Pole family is: Blue, a fess between three leopards’ faces all gold.

The first three Earls of Suffolk were all dead by 1415. Two Dukes, and others, followed.

William de la Pole (1396-1450), prominent in Shakespeare’s Henry VI, was the fourth Earl and first Duke of Suffolk. He arranged the marriage with Margaret of Anjou. Because of that, of his diplomacy (which led to the loss of the war against France) and of much else, he was unpopular; and King Henry VI, in an attempt to prevent worse, had to banish him; Suffolk had barely left when he was brutally murdered: some believed that the York faction were instigators.

John (1442-91), his son and second Duke, had married the sister of King Edward IV and assisted at his coronation. He also supported King Richard III at Bosworth; but swore fealty to King Henry. The new king trusted him despite the defection of his son, John Earl of Lincoln (?1464-1487) who – heir presumptive of Richard III – was killed at Stoke. His (believed youngest) son Richard, exiled pretender to the Crown and known as the ‘White Rose’, was killed at Pavia in 1525.

Margaret Pole (1473-1541), daughter of George, Duke of Clarence and sister of Edward, Earl of Warwick, married into another family whose arms were quite different.

8. For a resumé of Jack Leslau’s theories see Phil Stone’s article in the autumn 2005 issue of The Bulletin
Early on the morning of 30 April 1483 the new boy king Edward V was seized at Stony Stratford by his uncle Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham. The news of Edward V’s capture reached his mother Elizabeth Woodville, widow of Edward IV, in London a little before midnight 30 April – 1 May. Most sources agree that on receiving the news, the queen, her family, and important followers sought sanctuary in Westminster Abbey.

To the Woodville call to recapture Edward V some lords were irresolute, some hostile. ‘Some even said openly,’ remarks Mancini, ‘that it was more just and profitable that the youthful sovereign should be with his paternal uncle [Richard] than with his maternal uncles [Anthony Woodville, earl Rivers, and Sir Edward Woodville] and uterine brothers [Thomas Grey, marquess Dorset, and lord Richard Grey].’ According to the Crowland chronicler this Woodville-Grey group was criticised by the foresighted members of the royal council.

Following the failure of their plans, the guard that the Woodvilles had been gathering to rescue Edward V became one with which to defend themselves. This change made other lords feel threatened, and prompted them to go around with followers, either in support of the queen or in self-defence. It is against this background that one should judge the story that Richard informed Hastings of the coup at Stony Stratford, and the latter sent reassurances to the queen via the lord chancellor Thomas Rotherham, archbishop of York, and had those reassurances rejected.

Early sources only mention the queen receiving news of the coup. Kendall seems to be right, however, in assuming Richard sent a courier to Hastings, because More says that Hastings’ man met Rotherham at the archbishop’s residence at York Place shortly after midnight. Yet if Hastings had received news from Richard at about the same time as tidings reached the queen, he could have sent a message to her directly, before the call-up to recapture Edward V began in earnest and made communication hazardous.

Rotherham was told, according to More, that Richard and Buckingham had moved Edward V from Stony Stratford to Northampton. To reach Hastings in time, however, Richard’s messenger would need to leave immediately after the capture of Edward V at Stony Stratford, early in the morning of 30 April. One has to assume that Richard had already decided on the move to Northampton, conveyed his intentions to Hastings, and Hastings divulged them to the queen’s supporter Rotherham. This unlikely sequence of events casts doubt on Richard’s letter to Hastings.

The news of the move also seems contrary to Hastings’ assurance to Rotherham that all would be well. The archbishop retorted, ‘I assure him, bee it as well as it will, it will never bee soo well as wee haue seene it’. The content of this exchange between Rotherham and Hastings’ messenger seems banal, and the word-play on ‘will’ and ‘well’ might suggest More had invented it. That Rotherham should have thought it worth personally carrying such a trifling assurance of Hastings to the queen seems incredible.

When he arrived at Westminster Abbey, Rotherham found Elizabeth Woodville sitting dejected amid the chaos of the move into sanctuary. Kendall follows Mancini in having the Woodville faction attempting to gain support for rescuing Edward V before seeking sanctuary when the attempt failed. Support apparently collapsed in a shorter time than it
took Rotherham to take action following his early warning from Hastings. This looks highly improbable. It seems more likely that, unnoticed by Mancini, some move into sanctuary started as a precautionary measure on receiving the news from Stony Stratford. When support collapsed, the move would have rapidly been intensified, but the rapid change could have been interpreted by Mancini as the beginning of the move.

Rotherham tried to comfort the queen, according to More, with the message from Hastings, but she retorted that the chamberlain was ‘one of them that laboureth to destroye me and my bloode’. Rotherham then suggested crowning Richard, duke of York, Edward IV’s second son, if anything should befall Edward V, and handed her the Great Seal. More says that Rotherham left the queen ‘in the dauninge of the daye’, and therefore Rotherham’s visit appears to have lasted four or five hours.

Yet Rotherham had ridden from York Place with his whole household, ‘euerie manne weaponed’, which suggests that armed groups were already forming. This would imply that his visit started much later, and fits the move into sanctuary being in full swing when he arrived. This could mean that Hastings’ man arrived at York Place later, and that Hastings had received no news direct from Stony Stratford. Probably Hastings’ action was prompted by the Woodville call to arms from which, as old enemies, he and his friends were excluded. Contacting the queen in such a situation Hastings would need a go-between like Rotherham, who was acceptable to both sides. The link between Hastings and Richard apparently disappears.

More says that returning to York Place at dawn, Rotherham ‘might in his chaumber window, see all the Temmes full of bootes [boats] of the Duke of Gloucesters seruantes, watchinge that no manne shoulde go into Sainctuary, nor none coulde pass vnserched’. More’s assertion would only be possible later, in mid-June, but on this Mayday morning Richard’s men, like many others, were probably trying to find out what was happening.

But what was happening? What seems certain is that Hastings contacted the queen through Rotherham, but hardly on More’s assurance that all would be well. Armed men had begun to divide along party lines, either supporting the queen around Westminster or Hastings in the city of London. As such a situation unfolded, Hastings’ message could more plausibly have been to try to stop the armed escalation. He seems to be concerned with reaching a rapprochement with the opposing Woodville faction, rather than furthering the cause of his supposed ally Richard, duke of Gloucester.

The rapprochement seems inconsistent with Hastings being a friend of Richard, a relationship which Richard’s enemies needed to show how viciously Richard betrayed Hastings by having him executed on 13 June. Faced with such an embarrassing inconsistency More might well have sought to disguise it in one of his unlikely stories.
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My report this time is rather different, a piece adapted from the report I gave to the Research Weekend in York at the end of April on my progress in preparing the text for publication.

In a way I have been functioning like the mills of God. I have been grinding slowly, but I’ve been having to grind exceeding small.

I have read through the entire text about twenty times, looking for particular points. It was comparatively easy to spot typos in the Latin text, as Latin is spelt consistently, but there was no way I could pick up any typos in the English wills, where the spelling may be so wild and original that typos may lurk unseen amid their convolutions and flights of fancy. Nevertheless, I did mark some words for further investigation. Many of these I checked with Moira Habberjam, who has a complete set of photo-copies of the wills at her house. Others I checked in the Logge Register itself. That entailed quite a palaver at The National Archives. Because it is on microfilm you have to get special permission to see the original. The first time I asked for it I was told that I would have to wait three days, as it now lives down a salt mine in Cheshire, but then they discovered that it wasn’t one of the documents that had been sent to Cheshire, but was still living at Kew. The Register itself is a very large book, 16½ inches by 12 inches, heavily bound in leather with metal fittings, and has to be propped carefully up on special cushions, but the writing is so much clearer than the photocopies that it is a joy to read.

I have also had to go through and standardise translations, spellings, and turns of phrase, and such mechanical but necessary things as how much a paragraph was indented, and that Latin words in English wills, and English words in Latin wills, were in italics.

All this is now more or less complete. What I also wanted to do was to identify the testators further, if I could, and add notes after each will, where possible, setting out other details of the testator’s life. This makes the will so much more interesting. Some of our testators are A-list celebrities, like William, Lord Hastings, and Anne, Duchess of Buckingham; others are B-listers, like some judges and bishops, Sir Richard Roos the Lancastrian poet, and Thomas Betson, he who in the Stonor Letters is recorded as telling his betrothed to eat her meat so that she would grow big and strong. Some of these have entries in the new Dictionary of National Biography, and plenty is known about them. Others are much more obscure, but may be found in such sources as the Letter Books of London, Wedgwood’s History of Parliament, Harley 433, the records of Oxford and Cambridge alumni, and the various Calendars of Close, Patent and Fine Rolls.

One example is William Mynte (will 309). He was a wheelwright of London, and the Calendar of Letter Books of London (volume L) tells us that he was given exemption by the Mayor and Aldermen from serving on juries in 1478 at the request of the Queen, ‘on whose business as well as that of the Prince he was daily occupied’. But it wasn’t simply that he spent all his waking hours making wheels for Elizabeth Woodville. He also turns up in the Patent Rolls, appointed to take workmen and materials for the king’s ordnance, and in Harley 433, given a grant of a ship and money for a chariot.

Another testator who appears in the London Letter Books is Dame Agnes Forster (will 84), who was famous in her day as a prison reformer. The articles on prison regulation drawn up at her ‘request, praiser and desire’ include the regulation of fees paid to gaolers by prisoners for bed and board, and the appointing of Visitors to hear complaints and
keep an eye on the almsbox and the water supply.

We also see from Harley 433 that some of the London tradesmen whose wills are in Logge were suppliers to the Royal Household. Richard Kelet, poulterer of London, was paid over £28 for fowls. Sir William Heryot is said by the History of Parliament to have been one of Edward IV’s city partners in trading ventures, and Harley 433 records that Edward owed him £97 3s. 1d.

Besides going through as many of the primary sources in print as I could lay my hands on, I have also used the National Archives’ on-line Catalogue to see what documents they held on our testators. I limited the search to the years 1400 to 1550, but not to any particular class of document, and then typed in the name of each of the 378 testators in turn, with wildcards to cope with spelling variations. Many of our testators appeared in the Chancery classes, especially C 1, which contains the records of the equity court of Chancery. That is, when people had a grievance for which there was not a recognised writ to take them to the Court of Common Pleas or the Court of King’s Bench, they would appeal to the Lord Chancellor to do something about their case, and to send his writ instructing their opponents to appear before him in Chancery. I found some really good things here, disputed wills and disputes about the property some of our testators left, and quarrels in their families. The most intriguing Chancery case so far is that in which Oliver King, described as a clerk, confronts the executors of Sir Thomas Hille, mayor of London, about the embezzlement of plate ‘during the complainant’s imprisonment in the Tower by Richard, late Duke of Gloucester’. The trouble with most of these Chancery pleadings is that they usually can’t be dated accurately, just by the name of the Chancellor they are addressed to. This one is attributed to the period 1486 to 1529, when there were three Chancellors, John Morton, William Warham, and Wolsey, so I don’t really understand the dating. Oliver King, I take it, is the man who was Edward IV’s secretary. Does anyone know why Richard clapped him into the Tower?

Exchequer files at the National Archives contain an indulgence granted to one of our testators and his family, Robert Lowth of Hertingfordbury (will 332), with his wife Edith and children Giles and Alice. They also contain the account book of John Elrington (Treasurer of the king’s house, will 74) for the reburial of the Duke of York.

Finally, I have been searching to see if there are Inquisitions Post Mortem for our testators. I should perhaps explain these documents. They are not at all the same as today’s post mortem examinations. When anyone who held land or other tenements from the king died, a writ of \textit{diem clausit extremum} (which means ‘he has closed his last day’) was sent by the Chancery to the county escheator, the official whose job it was to hold an inquiry into what property the deceased held from the king in his county, to ascertain the date of death and the heir, and return this information to the king. These writs of \textit{diem clausit extremum} are listed in the Calendars of the Fine Rolls, and I extracted all those for our testators, I then wanted to find the reports of these inquiries, which are the Inquisitions Post Mortem. Just because there may be a writ of \textit{diem clausit extremum} doesn’t mean to say there will be an IPM. A lot seem not to have survived. It is quite easy to find out if IPMs survive for inquiries held in Henry Tudor’s reign, because these are in print in calendar form, but the ones for the reigns of Edward IV, Edward V and Richard III have not been printed, and you have to order up the original documents and work from them. Some of them are in a very good state of preservation, others are dogs’ breakfasts. I am still slogging through this work, but hope to have it finished in a few weeks’ time.

Testators do not give their age when writing their wills, but an IPM can be helpful here. They don’t generally give the testator’s age, but they always give the age of the heir, who will be the eldest son if there was one. So an heir aged 40+ gives you a testator of about 60+, but an heir aged 8 could mean a much younger testator, a person dying in the prime of life.

One thing I was rather surprised to discover was that William Hastings, Lord Hastings,
had proper writs of *diem clausit extremum* and inquisitions post mortem. The writs went to the various counties on 20 July 1483. The inquisitions are in a pretty bad state, much rubbed and faded, but all those I saw gave his date of death as 13 July in the first year of the reign of King Edward the Fifth the Bastard. As far as I could see, all the inquisitions were held in the various counties on 20 October 1484, which I think must be a legal fiction as I don’t see that such things would have been synchronised. His heir is always his son Edward, Lord Hastings, said to be aged 17 years, 11 months and 19 days on 26 November last. I don’t know why 26 November 1483 should be chosen as the operative date, and I haven’t worked out when his birthday was, though it could be done. It doesn’t come out to 20th October, though. Anyone who can think of reasons why these two dates should matter, please let me know.

So that is what I have been doing to get Logge into shape for publication.

Finally, I have had four responses to my requests for help in the last *Bulletin*. Ralph Waggett of Richmond, Yorks, remembered that in the minute book of one of the Richmond trade guilds one Thomas Lodge was made free in 1596 to use the trade of trimming hats and retailing untrimmed hats ... and to sell caps brought from London sipsees and sipresse bands of all sorts. He discovered that sipresse here referred to cypress, a thin transparent textile of silk, or silk and linen, originally from Cyprus. It was usually black and a piece of cypress was used as a sign of mourning. As Mr Waggett says, though, it is not evident that you could link a chain, still less a chair, with this.*

Celia Parker, Assistant Archivist at Rotherham Archives, emailed to suggest that perhaps the equus sanatus ("cured horse") should really be read as equus sauatus. As she truly remarks, -n- and -u- are very confusable letters when written by hand. From there she suggests that sauatus might be a variant of sellatus, or saddled; that is, a riding horse rather than one used for traction.

And now I have a terrible confession to make. The third suggestion came written on a very pretty card and I have lost it. I had a birthday about then and put all the cards up and then took them down and recycled them and I think I must have put up that card by mistake with them and so recycled it. Please, dear correspondent, do not be offended with me, but could you bear to write in again with your good idea?

Finally I have had an interesting e-mail from Alison Hanham in New Zealand, who writes: ‘I enjoyed your puzzles and ‘Grave Matters’ in the spring *Bulletin*. Someone better up in the liturgy than I am – or with better reference works – can no doubt confirm that a mass *rorate celi desuper* was one of those appropriate to the Annunciation (‘Drop down dew, O heavens … let the earth be opened and a saviour spring to life’ (Isaiah 45,8). But your query reminded me of the story told, I think by Gerald of Wales, about the lady who was desperate to have a son by Henry I and paid a priest (somewhat blasphemously) to sing that mass daily. Her disgruntled servant woman, forced to attend, finally complained in English (my modernisation): ‘You can roar all you like; it won’t do a bit of good!’ I can’t remember for the moment which of my documentary acquaintances said in his will that he was to have a tomb stone like his wife’s, only larger! Keep up the good work.’

*(I wonder if Dick’s hat-band [Letters, Winter 2005] could have been made of cypress?)*
Some thoughts on the marriage of the Duke of Gloucester to Anne Neville

Though interested enough to learn that Richard and Anne’s marriage dispensation had at last been brought to light, I never doubted that one must certainly have existed. Even Michael Hicks’ attractive declaration in 1986 that Richard’s carelessness in failing to secure a dispensation actually proved that he wasn’t already planning to usurp the throne when he ‘married’ Anne never persuaded me to change my opinion – though I was pleased that Hicks had declared Richard innocent of at least one of the crimes imputed to him. Unless intending to marry well below his own station in life (a shameful idea to anyone but Edward IV), no member of the higher nobility at that time would have entered into marriage without first securing a dispensation from an ecclesiastical court. Richard, who was intelligent and practical, would be well aware of that, and now we have proof that he wasted no time in initiating a process, which might well have taken many months, if not years, to bring to a satisfactory conclusion. Since, as we have learnt recently, the dispensation was acquired as early as April 1472, it is probable that the marriage plan was decided upon shortly after the death of Anne’s husband at Tewkesbury, perhaps at the time when Clarence lost the control of her person to his brother Richard.

A dispensation in their case would have been necessary. Long before that time the Church had succeeded in bringing marriage almost totally under clerical control by elaborating a concept of holy matrimony, which had been absorbed into official Christian theory and ritual along with the legal and social institutions governing it. And among the Church’s many regulations, restrictions and prohibitions was a rather eccentric list which defined all those who could not legally be married to each other without the Church’s intervention. Anne and Richard, like most of the royal couples of Europe, would certainly have fallen into the category of those prohibited from marrying on grounds of consanguinity, i.e. too near kinship, unless a special licence or dispensation had been obtained previously from the clerical authorities. It had become a matter of routine for the nobility to do just that before embarking upon a marriage, and Richard would certainly have been aware of the grave disadvantages of entering into a marriage which might later be declared illegal through lack of such a dispensation. For one thing, the children of the illegal union would be bastards that could not inherit, and, worse still, the husband would not be entitled to enjoy his ‘wife’s’ possessions.

This was serious business. Both Richard and Clarence had agreed that they should hold their share of the Neville inheritance by right of marriage and not by royal grant, so it was imperative that the legality of Richard’s marriage be assured by the Church, as Clarence’s already was. It has always seemed unfair to me that Richard should be charged with marrying Anne solely with the unworthy aim of getting his hands on her share of the Neville lands, when it is clear that he could certainly have succeeded in doing that without having to take her along too. King Edward had good enough cause to justify the attainer of Warwick for treason, to assume control of the Neville land, and hand it over to anyone he favoured. In which case, it is probable that Richard would have become the main, if not the sole, beneficiary.

But there was Clarence to be considered. Already married to the other Neville heiress, George would quite reasonably have pre-
ferred to claim her property through his sure and certified marriage rather than linger over the difficult question of treason, forfeiture and royal grants that might be cancelled by the King at any time in the future. It was, after all, only a year or so since Clarence himself had played a major part in Warwick’s treachery. All of this must have been discussed at some length by the three royal brothers. Perhaps it was the youngest, the peacemaker, who understood that having Anne Neville as wife could prove a valuable asset to himself as the new lord of the disaffected northern territories? There is certainly no real evidence, as far as I know, to suggest that Richard’s choice to marry Anne was made reluctantly, or that he ever regretted it – rather the opposite.

Which leads us on to the problem over the reference in parliament concerning the agreed settlement of the Neville lands. Here the use of the word ‘divorce’ in relation to Richard and Anne seems to have caused disquiet to some Ricardians, but only, in my opinion, because the modern meaning of ‘divorce’ has wrongly been attributed to it. There was, of course, no divorce as we understand the word in the medieval church, since nothing but death alone could end a true marriage. At that time ‘divorce’ meant an annulment, a judgement by the church authorities that a so-called ‘marriage’ had never been a true or valid marriage, and therefore had never existed. So, if we read into the word ‘divorce’ the meaning of an annulment of this sort, rather than that of a modern divorce, whenever the term is used in the parliamentary record, the intention becomes clear.

Let me quote the exact words which appear on the 1474 enrolment in parliament, without any tampering, though I have modernised the spelling somewhat:

‘It is ordained by the same authority that if the said Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and Anne shall subsequently be divorced, then lawfully married, that yet this present act to be to them as good and available as if no such divorce had been had, but as if the same Anne had continued wife to the said Duke. And over that it is ordained by the said authority that if the said Duke of Gloucester and Anne hereafter be divorced, and after that he do his effectual diligence and continual devoir by all convenient and lawful means, to be lawfully married to the said Anne the daughter, and during the life of the same Anne be not wedded nor married to any other woman: that yet the said Duke of Gloucester shall have and enjoy as much of the premises as shall appertain to the said Anne during the life of the said Duke of Gloucester.’

In other words, Richard asserts that he is resolved upon a true marriage with Anne. If an attempt to nullify a marriage between them were to succeed, he would do his utmost to secure a true, valid marriage to replace it, however long it took. And even if Anne were to die before that legal marriage should be accomplished, nevertheless he would be permitted by the king to continue his hold on her inheritance for as long as he lived.

That should have put an end to the hopes of any other future claimant for Anne’s hand or property. Clarence seems the most likely person to have harboured such an idea in his mind, but certainly not the only possible one. Already George had been attempting to denigrate his brother’s marriage by noising it abroad that Anne had been kidnapped and forced into it against her will. Nobody knows for sure what did exactly happen at the time, but this allegation might certainly be used to contest the marriage, since duress, if it could be proved, would be sufficient grounds to invalidate it. But there were other possibilities that might be worked on just as well, like the ever useful ‘pre-contract’ which was not always easy to repudiate.

Now we know that Richard had certainly protected his intended marriage from the prohibition of too-near kinship. This prohibition was guarded against by men in his position, because it was the one most likely to cause a serious impediment. With a dispensation accomplished though, and King Edward’s additional support assured by act of parliament, he and Anne could with confidence retreat to their life together in the north.
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Richard’s ‘Incestuous’ Marriage: Part 1

Since I wrote my original observations on the subject of Richard’s dispensation (see Spring Bulletin), much water has passed under the bridge. I have had leisure for further thoughts and study on the subject, and Michael Hicks’ biography of Anne Neville has been published, highlighting additional relationships not covered by the 1472 dispensation. To recapitulate, the dispensation discovered last year by Peter Clarke in the register of the Vatican Penitentiary dates from April 1472 and absolves Richard and Anne from the impediment of affinity (i.e. a marriage relationship as opposed to a blood relationship) in the third and fourth degrees, which accords with the relationship they had incurred by Anne’s marriage to Edward of Lancaster.

It seemed illogical that the couple should have obtained only this somewhat arcane dispensation when they knew full well they were first cousins once removed – i.e. related by consanguinity in the second and third degrees: even more so, given that after Clarke’s opposition of 1473–4 no further objections were raised to the marriage, not even in 1483 when Richard’s wife became his queen and his son heir to the throne. At the time of writing, the only explanation that had occurred to me was that between 1474 and 1483 a further dispensation might have been obtained.

It was never an entirely satisfactory solution to the mystery. And, as Michael Hicks has rightly pointed out, Richard and Anne were not only first, but also second, cousins once removed, Anne Beauchamp’s maternal grandmother Constance having been the sister of Richard Duke of York’s father, Richard, Earl of Cambridge, consanguinity thus incurred being in the third and fourth degrees). Clarence’s dispensation of 1468 survives in a copy made by Dugdale, and absolves him and Isabel of three marital impediments:

‘Dispensation of Pope Paul III [sic] for the contracting of matrimonio between the nobleman George, Duke of Clarence, and Isabel, daughter of the nobleman Richard Nevill, Earl of Warwick, although the same George and Isabel are related in the second and third, and third and fourth, degrees of consanguinity, and although the mother of the said George raised the said Isabel from the font. Dated at St Peter’s, Rome, the 14th March 1468, the 7th [year] of Edward IV.’

("Dispensatio Pauli PP iii de matrimonio contrahendo inter nobilem virum Georgium Ducem Clarencie & Isabellam filiam nobilis viri Ricardi Nevill Comitis Warwici, licet ipse Georgius & Isabella secundo & tertio & terto & quarto consanguinitatis gradibus coniuncti sunt, Ac etiam licet mater ipsius Georgij eandem Isabellam de sacro fonte leuauit. Datum Rome apud sanctum Petrum pridie Idas Martij Anno 1468. 7o Edwardi 4ti. ‘")

Hicks claims that the ‘spiritual’ relationship arising from Cecily Neville’s sponsorship of Isabel would also have extended to Richard and Anne. Most importantly, he also stresses that, in addition to these relationships of blood and baptism, the couple had a much closer relationship by marriage than the one involving Edward of Lancaster, for Richard’s brother was married to Anne’s sister. There were, therefore, in Hicks’ estimation, no fewer than four separate impediments to Richard and Anne’s marriage not addressed by the 1472 dispensation, and he correctly points out that the Crowland Chronicler believed some grounds for a divorce between Richard and...
Anne to be still extant during the last months of her life (‘... and it was said by many that the king was applying his mind in every way to contracting a marriage with Elizabeth after the death of the queen, or by means of a divorce for which he believed he had sufficient grounds’).

Michael Hicks’ interpretation is that Richard failed to request absolutions from these four closer ties because he believed they would be refused, the relationships being too many, and the brother-and-sister-in-law relationship in particular (which he calculates as affinity in the first degrees) too shockingly and incestuously close, to be easily capable of dispensation. Hicks draws a parallel between Richard’s ‘affinity’ to Anne in the first and first degrees, and his (blood) relationship to his niece Elizabeth in the first and second degrees, citing the Crowland Chronicler’s shocked attitude to the uncle-and-niece marriage as evidence of how incestuously beyond the possibility of dispensation his contemporaries considered such close unions

This explanation, however, also fails to satisfy. First, it relies either on Anne’s complicity, or on Richard having taken sole responsibility for obtaining the dispensation in order to deceive his bride, and neither Anne nor the celebrating priest having shown sufficient interest to read it. That the officiating priest might have been overawed by a prince of the Blood is perhaps credible; it is rather more difficult to believe that the noble bride whose future so depended on this marriage would have failed to glance at the document that made it possible, particularly since, having already lived through the saga of multiple dispensation applications for Isabel’s marriage to Clarence and her own to Edward of Lancaster, Anne would have been rather the dispensation expert of the pair. Certainly, like all girls of her class Anne could read, and read enough Latin to follow the liturgy. Indeed, either Anne or her mother was the co-owner of an English devotional work inscribed on the flyleaf with the names Anne Warrewyk and R Gloucestr. 5

The second problem, however, is that it is simply not the case that Richard would have had grounds for assuming these relationships to be beyond dispensation. Consanguinity in the third and fourth degrees was routinely dispensed for all classes, and even consanguinity in the second and third degrees was not so close as to be shocking, certainly not within the context of Europe’s inbred nobility. Whilst it is true that Warwick’s application for a dispensation for Clarence’s marriage to Isabel was initially refused, this was entirely on political grounds, Edward IV having made a personal representation to the Pope to halt the process.

More important to this interpretation, however, are the two ‘impediments in the first degree’. To deal first with the issue of Richard’s mother’s sponsorship of Isabel’s baptism: the rules on spiritual relationships have since been relaxed by the Council of Trent (1545-63) and Cecily’s sponsorship of Isabel would not today constitute an impediment even to Clarence’s marriage. Evidently it did so in the fifteenth century as Clarence received a dispensation from it; however, it would appear that this has never been a very extensive impediment and it is unlikely that Richard’s right to marry Anne would, as Hicks suggests, have been affected by the identity of Isabel’s godparents, although it is quite possible that there may have been some other (dispensable) spiritual impediment arising from the couple’s own baptisms.

We now come to the tour de force of Hicks’ analysis: i.e. that Clarence and Isabel’s marriage had rendered Richard and Anne brother and sister. Leaving aside the unsoundness of a comparison of marital relationships to their equivalent blood relationships (‘the motive for the impediment of affinity is... not as strong as that of consanguinity’), this ‘first-degree affinity’ was not actually affinity in canon law at all.

Whilst affinity was indeed regarded as an impediment over the same number of generations as consanguinity (i.e. four), the purpose of this impediment was not to prevent multiple marriage alliances between two families but to inhibit an individual from having carnal knowledge of two or more people who were related to each other. Furthermore, the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had limited the way in which such relationships were calculated.
Essentially, ‘the man becomes related to the woman’s blood-relatives and the woman to the man’s . . . the relatives of the man do not become relatives of the woman’s relatives, neither do those of the woman become relatives of the man’s relatives’. 6

Consequently, the fifteenth-century rules forbade a widow or widower to marry a sibling or cousin of their late spouse, but put no obstacle in the way of marriage between the respective siblings of a married couple, or between the offspring of a couple by previous marriages. Clarence’s marriage to Isabel had no bearing on Richard’s freedom to marry Anne because it had not rendered George’s relative (Richard) a first-degree relative of his spouse’s relative (Anne), nor vice versa. Nor, by the same token, had Isabel’s marriage to George affected Anne’s availability to marry George’s cousin Edward of Lancaster, and thus we find no record of such a dispensation having been sought. A generation earlier, indeed, Anne and Isabel’s mother Anne Beauchamp and her brother Henry, Duke of Warwick, had become the spouses of two of the Earl of Salisbury’s children, whilst their half-sister Elizabeth had married Salisbury’s brother Lord Bergavenny. Fifteenth-century marriages between stepsiblings include those of Eleanor Washbourne and Sir Thomas Wyndham. 7

Anne’s marriage to Edward of Lancaster, on the other hand, had rendered her personally connected by affinity to all his kindred over four generations, Richard included, hence the dispensation for this relationship obtained in 1472. A proper understanding of these rules – rather than ignorance of the remaining impediments – explains the failure of our doctor of canon law at Crowland to express moral outrage at Richard and Anne’s union.

So we are left with two missing dispensations for consanguinity in the second and third, and third and fourth, degrees respectively, and another possible missing dispensation for a spiritual relationship of some sort. For these, fear of papal rejection appears an unlikely explanation; but neither is it plausible that the couple could have inadvertently overlooked so many important missing items. A rational solution to the mystery is, however, near at hand for it lies within the wording of the 1472 dispensation itself. Likewise, we do not have to guess at the grounds on which Clarence sought to annul the marriage, for they appear to have been recorded. These are the subjects I shall be exploring in the second part of this article.
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4. See M A Hicks, Anne Neville, Queen to Richard III, Tempus, 2006, p.205.
I am indebted to Frederick Hepburn (author of *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets*, Boydell, 1986), for the following additional information and observations on my article on Louis XI’s lost effigy which appeared in the *Bulletin*, Spring 2006, pp. 43-44.

Visitors to the church of Notre Dame of Cléry today, will no doubt recall that there exists a life-size memorial statue of the king, kneeling in prayer to the Madonna, on a marble slab, supported on four columns, decorated at each corner with cherubs holding escutcheons of his arms. A local guide states that this is the ‘work of Michel Bourdin, who completed it in 1622, to replace the original bronze statue melted down by the Huguenots in 1562’. Fortunately this appears to have been recorded by the indefatigable Roger de Gaignieres, as a drawing is preserved amongst his collection in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Ms. Gough 11, fol.46). However it seems that Louis’ original wishes, as indicated in the Colin d’Amiens instructions and drawing were not carried out, as this shows a figure similar to the one now displayed, bareheaded and richly attired in an ermine-trimmed robe, decorated with fleur-de-lys, overlaid with a heavy gold chain (illustrated in ‘*The First Tomb of Henry VII of England*’, by Barbara Meyer, *Art Bulletin*, 56, 1976, pl. 6).

With regard to the suggestion put forward in *The Royal Funerals of the House of York at Windsor* (AF Sutton, L Visser-Fuchs, *et al.*, 2005) that Edward IV may also have requested a similar kneeling figure for his chantry at Windsor (pp. 100-102 and diagram), one of their sources, Hugo van der Velden, places the praying effigy of Louis in the context of votive portrait figures, and that it was placed before an image of the Virgin, had particular significance for the king. In view of this, if Edward’s tomb effigy had been similar, I would have expected some reference in his will to it being placed before such an image, which must militate against the idea of the tomb being inspired by Louis’ example. All this apart such a representation would have been a radical departure from English royal tradition such that its unusual pose would again have been referred to in the wording of the will.

In cultural terms Edward IV’s court looked towards the Burgundian Netherlands far more than towards France. Additionally, Edward was surely no great admirer of Louis XI, who had capitulated to him at Picquigny. Louis’ planned effigy was idiosyncratic and strangely ‘low key’ in that it showed him as a private individual, rather than as king of France. It was also obscurely located, in a village in the Loire valley, hardly the sort of thing to have inspired Edward, who clearly wanted a showpiece monument in a major royal centre.
‘Things they never said’

BRIAN WAINWRIGHT

The Editorial Team have invited novelist Brian Wainwright to be an occasional contributor to the Bulletin and we hope readers enjoy his first piece. NB: Brian’s hilarious novel, The Adventures of Alianore Audley, is reviewed on page 69.

‘I think there should be far more women at Court – and what would you like for Christmas, Isabel?’ Edward II.

‘In all honesty, our claim to the throne is pretty weak; I think we should just let the Duke of York be king.’ Margaret of Anjou.


‘I’m fed up with power politics; I’m going to retire to Middleham and breed whippets,’ Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick.

‘I think it’s high time I gave Harry Buckingham more responsibility,’ Edward IV.

‘No.’ Jane Shore.

‘Thank God we can always rely on the Stanley brothers in a crisis,’ Richard III.

‘I have the best mother-in-law in the world,’ Elizabeth of York.

‘I have the best mother-in-law in the world,’ Henry VII.

‘It’s only money. Who cares?’ Henry VII.

‘My history will be truthful and objective, making use of all relevant sources. And if King Henry doesn’t like it – tough!’ Polydore Vergil.

‘I don’t care whom my sisters marry, as long as they are happy,’ Elizabeth Wydeville.

‘CHARGE!!!!’ Thomas, Lord Stanley.

‘If I’m unfaithful to my wife, she has every right to be unfaithful to me,’ Henry VIII.

‘Books bore me silly, especially the religious ones. Let’s just have a bop and get drunk.’ Lady Jane Grey.

‘I think Calvin and Luther have some really cogent arguments,’ Mary I.

‘You’re a very naughty man, Sir Francis, and you must take all this gold straight back to Spain.’ Elizabeth I.

‘I can’t wait to meet my cousin, Mary of Scotland. I don’t mind at all if she’s better looking than I am.’ Elizabeth I.

‘To be honest, Robin, I think it’s a great idea that you should marry Lettice. Can I be bridesmaid?’ Elizabeth I again.
Correspondence

Will contributors please note the letters may be edited or reduced to conform to the standards of the Bulletin.

Dear Editor,

Michael S Bennett is quite right in his assertion that there is a dearth of similar productions to his own (Bulletin Spring 2006).

We had the pleasure of his company in celebration of our fifteenth anniversary as a Group and it proved a very enjoyable and informative evening. Five years on, and not wanting to repeat ourselves too quickly, we are trying to book something similar for our 20th.

I thought we had almost secured the production of My Kingdom For A Horse with Richard Derrington, a professional actor, who has written and performs his own one-man play. From the leaflet I had picked up, (ominously stating ‘Cancelled at Bosworth’!) it sounded a fascinating study of Richard’s illegitimate son, who is possibly the stonemason buried at Eastwell in Kent. It would have provided insight into Richard III’s story for Ricardians and non-Ricardians alike, as well as being a piece of moving and compelling theatre. Last November I obtained a £500 grant from our County Council’s Community Initiatives Fund for the event, on the premise that it would ‘widen access to theatrical work in a rural area’ – i.e. not in the inner city. Now, to our great disappointment, Mr Derrington has had to withdraw from the provisional booking. Understandably, as a self-employed actor, it can be very difficult to fulfil single bookings unless at very short notice, because of the possibility of losing other, more long-term work. Attempting to plan a production involves having to book venues, design and print tickets, arrange publicity etc and obviously the commissioning body (me!) needs as long as possible in order to do this. Sadly Mr Derrington felt he was not able to confirm his booking, despite my trying to be as flexible as possible for up to only twelve weeks before the event. We do understand; but finding an alternative is proving very problematic - as Michael Bennett says, there is no one else out there who seems to be doing it. Watching on DVD completely lacks the atmosphere of a live audience, the interaction and roar of the greasepaint: Geoffrey (Wheeler) had only experienced a sort of historical record of the event, necessarily a pale imitation. He had not, as one generally tries to do with live theatre, willingly suspended his disbelief – or subsumed his academic, critical faculties to the pleasure of the moment and just gone along with the flow.

So I say ‘Good on yer, Michael,’ – we welcome any attempt to bring Richard’s story to a wider audience, be it theatre or ‘infotainment’ as Isolde Martyn put it in the same Spring Bulletin. And – er – we may be in touch!

Anne Ayres, Secretary, Nottinghamshire & Derby Group

Dear Editor,

I am surprised that Michael S Bennett (Bulletin, Spring 2005, pp. 48-9) declares that he was unaware of similar one-man shows about Richard III existing, seeing that no fewer than three of them originated in his own county of Yorkshire. The late Arthur Starkie regularly presented This Son of York on a country-wide basis (inevitably including Middleham) in the late 1990s. Premièred at Scarborough in 2000, a version of events related by ‘Dickon Broom’ of Eastwell: My Kingdom for a horse? was devised by Richard Derrington (Yorkshire Post review 16 June 2000 and Bulletin, September 2001 pp. 36-7), whilst Scorpio in the House of Mars, by John Stuart Anderson, had John Argentine as the narrator. (Seen at the NPG London, October 2000, earlier version reviewed in the Bulletin, September 1985, p.14) and finally a similar ‘humorous’ approach was given by Jim Dunk in Dirty Dick, which The Stage thought ‘a
sheer delight – seldom can a history lesson have been such fun’ (5 November 1981, also Bulletin review, December 1981, pp. 13-14). Certainly there is something to be said for such a treatment of history, as 1066 And All That memorably showed many years ago, and the Horrible Histories books testify to its continuing popularity, but unless it includes deliberate anachronisms, on the lines of Blackadder, surely an entertainment that purports to be truthful to the historical Richard III should aim for some degree of accuracy, and not distort known facts with inventions like the ‘reversal of the princes’ illegitimacy’, as I quoted originally. Just the kind of thing Mr. Bennett objects to in Shakespeare, though paradoxically, of course, even today’s dramatists tend to make ‘fast and loose’ with historical facts, following the dictum ‘Good History makes Bad Drama’, as described recently by Ann Wroe (Bulletin, Autumn 2005, pp. 18-19) with regard to the television Princes in the Tower, based on her own Perkin biography.

However it is also true to say that amongst the scores of unread, and mostly unperformed, worthy pro-Richard plays languishing in the Society’s library, perhaps the only one to have achieved a notable production within recent years, was also a combination of humour and music (though with a rather more complex plot and intellectual content): David Pownall’s Richard III: Part Two, which enjoyed a modest success in the 1970s. (Review, Bulletin, March 1978, pp. 6-8) though unfortunately the subsequent radio production could not reproduce some of the visual aspects of the stage version (review, Bulletin, December 1978 pp.10-11. Tape in AV Library, with the author’s introductory talk on The uses and abuses of history). Inevitably some theatrical presentations have to simplify the complex realities of the ‘Wars of the Roses’ period, and in so doing reduce the characters to stereotypical ones of unrelied black and white, often just reversing roles, so that we get a ‘villainous’ Henry Tudor, for example. Also the necessity to maintain this ‘reactionary’ view often ignores more recent research that has rehabilitated the reputations of Queen Elizabeth and other Woodvilles, Henry VI and even Margaret of Anjou.

Although Mr Bennett concedes at one point that ‘Shakespeare was not a historian’ (a point raised also by Wendy Johnson in her letter, pp.46-7), to affirm as some writers have done that he would have ‘ended up in the Tower’ if he had written an alternative more favourable view, overlooks the purpose of the plays, which were intended to teach valuable lessons from recent history on the dangers of civil war and tyranny to a contemporary Elizabethan audience at a comparable dangerous and vulnerable period in their lives (most recently discussed in William Shakespeare, the Wars of the Roses and the historians, Keith Dockray, Tempus, 2002). Doubtless Mr Bennett and many other society members will find it difficult to accept that, as Anthony Hammond (editor of Richard III, the Arden Shakespeare, 1981) demonstrates, the ‘minority view [held] since the early 17th century, but popularised recently by Kendall and others – that “Tudor historians” collectively plotted to blacken Richard’s character (and by implication to whitewash the Tudor usurpation) is not well founded: almost all the things said about Richard in subsequent chronicles were common gossip in his own time or shortly thereafter … Shakespeare was writing in a tradition [but] he was not the originator of that tradition’ (pp. 76-7), and later: ‘Nothing is more belittling or misleading than to see [Shakespeare] as “parroting Tudor propaganda”’ (p.119). Indeed as Michael Hicks has observed in his Richard III biography, if anything, Richard was a ‘victim’ of his own propaganda!

**Geoffrey Wheeler**

Dear Editor,

I was pleased to notice that my ‘Audience with King Richard’ received some correspondence in the last Bulletin. Angela Morton will be pleased to learn that since my Grantham performance (around 1999, I believe) King Richard has acquired both a new costume and a new head of hair.

Returning to Geoffrey Wheeler’s less than complimentary review of my show in the Winter 2005 Bulletin, I recall that (among other things) he accuses me of ‘dubious his-
historical references’. My response to this is simply to say that my show is entirely historically accurate from Richard III’s point of view. Returning ‘from the dead’ to ‘state his case’, my Richard is inevitably going to put a favourable ‘spin’ on his life, his character, and the many crimes he is accused of. Furthermore, I feel that I am perhaps in a slightly different situation from many Ricardians. In front of an audience for what (with questions, frequently from the unconverted) can often amount to nearly two hours, can my Richard really refuse to offer some kind of explanation of what became of Edward Prince of Wales and Richard Duke of York? I thus offer an explanation of what happened to the two Princes. Its historical foundations are obviously open to discussion.

Am I not simply doing what is perhaps the obligation of all self-respecting Ricardians? Given that it is impossible (surely?) to purport to be a ‘supporter’ of a man viewed by much of history to be guilty of infanticide, should not all Ricardians be able to offer an explanation of what became of the ‘Princes in the Tower’? Over the years I have heard a variety of pro-Richard opinions ranging from the debatable ‘Richard didn’t do it - he didn’t need to...’ or ‘it was obviously Tudor’ to the downright ‘Richard was so loyal, good, gentle and kind, he would never do such a thing...’, all of which seem rather inadequate. Is not failing to offer a plausible explanation of the boys’ disappearance treating the Richard III Society as merely a ‘social club’, a ‘debating society’, or an intellectual forum?

I therefore invite all Ricardians to offer their views, which I am happy to collate. Some years ago I began collecting visitors’ views in the Richard III Museum (a couple of very anti-Richard opinions, it must be said, including a lengthy one from Alison Weir!), for a proposed book ‘Richard III – The People’s Verdict’. With further contributions this project could yet come to fruition. All contributions c/o msb@richardiiimuseum.co.uk.

Michael S. Bennett

NB
The debate in this issue is intended to give members the chance to say what they think happened to the Princes. Any messages sent for publication in the Bulletin could (with the author’s permission) be sent on to Michael Bennett to become part of his database.

PWH

Dear Editor

I refer to Wendy Johnson’s letter [Spring 2006] suggesting that we, as a society, should be doing all that we can to distance the real King Richard from the caricature of Shakespeare’s Richard III, and that this would be an opportune initiative with which to celebrate the Society’s fiftieth year anniversary. The proposal, it seemed to me, was given extra weight by the Editor’s response that past Society attempts to request programme disclaimers have met with a varying degree of success.

At the Scottish Branch this caused much discussion as many of our members have experienced similar incidents to that of Ms Johnson: ill-informed denouncements of Richard based on Shakespeare’s play. We were also concerned that such a gargantuan task (to make approaches to all the productions of Richard III the length and breadth of the country) might be beyond the scope of the central committee. Therefore, could we perhaps offer this as a branches and groups initiative? This way we could each patrol our own borders, so to speak, and thus cover all productions of Richard III across the entire country. We in the Scottish Branch would approach all productions north of the border to request an insertion, or addendum, to the programme notes. We may not always be successful but at the very least we will be seen to be doing what we can for Richard’s reputation. Perhaps the society could issue all branches and groups with a formal declaration so at least all those wishing to take part would have a unified voice?

Since writing the above I have just read an article in the Sunday Times culture section entitled, ‘The History Boys’ which details the Northern Broadsider production of Shakespeare’s plays at the West Yorkshire Playhouse (going on to Liverpool, Salford and Guildford), which have been made into a trilogy of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III.
Here, the writer confirms: ‘these form a trilo-
gy that tells not only the familiar story of the
most famous aristocratic feud in history, but
charts the rise of its most compelling villain. I
have sat through enough stage and screen ver-
sions of Richard to consider myself a dab
hand, but seeing him in this context was like
watching the Godfather movies in their
chronological reworking and understanding
afresh the rise of Michael Corleone.’

As a Society is it not our duty to ensure
that theatregoers leave their seats with the re-
alisation that the ‘familiar story’ is not in fact
the true story.

Please, may we seriously consider Ms
Johnson’s words? How many more are to get
their view of Richard this way without any
attempt from us to give them a true insight
into the real man?

Philippa Langley

Dear Editor,

I read with interest Wendy Johnson’s letter in
the Spring Bulletin about her views on the
Shakespeare play and how the Society should
respond. As the Editor remarked at the end of
the letter the Society has requested insertions
in the past with varying degrees of success.
Many programmes from the play have carried
articles about King Richard and the nature of
Shakespeare’s treatment of him. For example,
Dr Rosemarry Horrox wrote about ‘History,
chronicle and myth’ for the 1998/99 RSC pro-
gramme for the production starring Robert
Lindsay, and this has been reproduced on our
website.

However, the purpose of my letter is to
share with you the experiences Jane Trump,
John Saunders and myself had with the pro-
duction of the play in 2004 by the Kaos Com-
pany. This was featured in the autumn Bulletin
together with a list of the dates and venues
and we asked if members local to the theatres
would be prepared to liaise and arrange for a
supply of our brochure to be available to theat-
regoers. Only one member, I believe from
the midlands, volunteered. We then decided
to contact the remaining theatres ourselves
and make the necessary arrangements. No
theatre turned us down. To complement this
initiative we also produced a simple press re-
lease and began a programme of sending it to
the local newspapers in the towns where the
play was being performed. Unfortunately we
had no means of measuring our success and it
certainly didn’t help when a number of the
performances were cancelled. Nevertheless
we felt it was a worthwhile exercise although
it proved to be very time consuming. This ap-
proach could certainly be repeated in the fu-
ture, and although it could be co-ordinated
centrally, buy-in from members, either indi-
vidually or from branches and groups would
ensure success.

Wendy Moorhen

Dear Editor,

Philippa Langley asks, in the Spring 2006
Bulletin whether Lord Olivier was a Ricardi-
an. In 1979 Jeremy Potter wrote on this topic
in the Bulletin and came to the conclusion
that the actor was at least ‘an anti-
traditionalist’ when it came to portraying
King Richard. Mr Potter mentioned Olivier’s
support for the Society’s proposed statue of
the king in Leicester, as well as remarks in
America that even if Shakespeare’s play was
not good history it would be ‘a pity that all
legends should die merely because they’re
disproved’. Jeremy Potter also referred to
Charles Wood’s article Whatever happened to
Margaret of Anjou? which tried to show that
even in his film of Richard III Olivier re-
vealed a certain Ricardian sympathy – nota-
ably in the ridiculous exaggerated Welsh ac-
cent given to Henry Tudor and the close-up of
the Garter motto on the dead king. However
Mr Potter’s conclusion here was that most
film-goers would not be likely to see
Olivier’s Richard III as ‘a prodigious send-
up’ of the traditional view.

Whether he was a Ricardian or not, Olivier
was clearly affected by the Shakespearian
character (with which he was to live for about
a decade on stage and in film) as several ac-
tors attested – and not always in a good way.
He himself said that his original stage perfor-
ance in 1944 was the signal turning-point of
his career and he had not truly learnt to act
until he confronted the character of Richard.
Sir Ralph Richardson, who played Richmond
in 1944, but of course Buckingham in the
film, commented that the ruthless ambition shown in Richard held a fascination for Olivier which he never quite shrugged off and which colleagues felt took him over.

Anticipating Antony Sher by some years, Olivier had to resort to using a crutch when on tour with Richard III in Australia in 1948 after tearing a cartilage in his knee. (He claimed that this was due to the limp he affected as the demon king.) He took to using the crutch as a symbol of violence and power, becoming so carried away by it that one night he actually broke it in rage over the shoulders of the actor playing Brackenbury.

Angela Moreton

Dear Editor,

A rather belated response to the letter from Philippa Langley in the Spring issue of the Bulletin. I’ve only just got a chance really to read our copy.

The question that Philippa Langley asks in the Spring issue on why Lord Olivier called his younger son Richard seems to be fairly easily explained. There may have been no Richards in the family tree of both the boy’s father and mother, but as is apparent from his memoirs, Olivier obviously had a great affection for the role of Shakespeare’s Richard III. Why not? His performance brought him huge acclaim. In his book On Acting, Olivier speaks of the role’s qualities combining ‘the baddie, the hero, the comic – Richard of Gloucester has them all, which is what makes him, as it always has, such an attractive part to play.’ He goes on to talk of the wooing of Lady Anne, and of the audacity of this scene he says, ‘you can’t wait to get on the stage to play it.’ But his affection for the part of Richard is explained in Confessions of an Actor. The great director Tyrone Guthrie asked him why he did not like the role of Sergius in Shaw’s Arms and the Man, explaining that ‘if you can’t love him, you’ll never be any good in him.’ These few words changed the course of Olivier’s thinking and he applied it to every role thereafter. ‘When I came to it,’ he says in On Acting, ‘I loved Richard and he loved me, until we became one.’ So perhaps it is not surprising that Richard was an easy choice when it came to naming his son. On the other hand, it could just be that both Olivier and Joan Plowright liked the name. Me too.

Julia Redlich, Sydney, NSW

Dear Editor,

I read with interest Jean Nicholls’ report on ‘Mechelen – women of distinction’ and would like to reiterate what was said in the article. As we went after the exhibition had been on for some time, we felt that there must have been quite a few society members that had beaten us to it. If not, a wonderful opportunity was missed.

My friend June Pearson and myself are members of the East Midlands Branch and live in Leicester. We booked our Eurostar tickets and our hotel on the internet and found it simplicity itself to travel there. It was November when we went and believe it or not, having done an orientation walk on the first afternoon, we sat out in the Grote Markt enjoying lemon tea as it was so warm. We found the information centre and bought joint tickets for the following day for the exhibition itself and a guided walk for the afternoon.

The venue itself was very interesting – a huge cavernous place which had been a former brewery and ideal for staging exhibitions. The audio guides were brilliant because the labels on the exhibits were either in Flemish or French. We found it amazing just how many objects that had belonged to both Margarets were extant, and bought a book from the exhibition entitled Femmes d’exception which, although in French is beautifully illustrated, enabling us to see again all these superb items.

The afternoon walk proved to be very interesting because we were the only two English visitors, so had to join a Dutch group. The guide did a sterling job translating in both languages. The walk covered all the places associated with the two ladies and after two and a half hours walking on cobbles we were ready to sit down. We thought the plaque could have been sited somewhat lower down on the walk of the cultural centre, but were pleased to see that it still looked in very good condition.

The following morning we visited St
Rombouts and appreciated Van Dyck’s painting of ‘Christ on the Cross’. Unlike Jean, we
did not find the cathedral gloomy and were more than pleased to find a statue of our fa-
vourite saint – St Roc.

At the time of writing, in March, we plan
to travel to Belgium again, in April, to visit
Ghent. Having recently read Christine
Weightman’s *Margaret of York* we discov-
ered that she spent a lot of time in Ghent
while her husband Charles the Bold was
alive. We are hoping to once again walk in
her footsteps.

Annette Shaw

Dear Editor,

Hunchbacks, hair and historical novels: dou-
bble magnificence arrived in the post about all
the above in the spring issue.

Firstly, Edmund Crouchback. There used
to be almost as many stories made up about
him as, later on, about the Society’s chief rea-
son for existence. It was even stated that Ed-
mund was really the first-born son of Henry
III and Eleanor of Provence, but that owing to
his deformity he volunteered to surrender his
rights to the throne, like Esau, and give it to
his straight-backed younger sibling Edward.
All this is eyewash. The name Crouchback
springs not from anatomy but from the cross-
es worn by returning crusaders. The pronun-
ciation of the day would be something like
‘Crooshback’, meaning crossback. It is easy
to understand how long after Edmund himself
was dead, and Edward glorified as the great-
est of the Plantagenets (who had however
made a hash of the siege of Acre and only
achieved fame in this particular respect by
having recovered from a poisoned wound in-
flicted by an Assassin) the tall erect figure of
the king overcame the memory of his less
showy brother, founding father of the house
of Lancaster.

Edward I’s hair may give an answer to the
controversy about Edward IV’s. There is a
kind of fair hair which darkens after youth,
and from a description his was of this variety,
turning ‘white as a swan’s wing’ later on. In
illuminations Edward IV is certainly shown
as dark haired, with his queen and the young
prince decidedly fair in the one where all
three are present at the king’s acceptance of a
book by a kneeling Lord Rivers. There is an-
other version with Edward receiving a book
alone. In that instance, the fair hair inherited
by her daughters is from Elizabeth Woodville,
not the Plantagenets.

Plantagenet hair could however in certain
instances be true gold. The earliest I have
seen is painting of the marriage of the future
Louis VIII of France with Blanche of Castile,
herself a granddaughter of red-haired Henry
II and Eleanor of Aquitaine. Eleanor’s own
hair is stated to have been black, but Blanche
may have inherited golden hair from her fa-
ther Alfonso VIII. From whatever source it
came, golden hair persisted in the Capets and
was reinforced by the second marriage of old
Edward I with Marguerite, sister to Philip IV,
the Fair. Their younger son was the father of
the Fair Maid of Kent, who passed the golden
hair on to her son Richard II and her descend-
ant by her first Holand marriage, Queen Joan
Beaufort, whose hair is legendary and was
gilded in marble on her tomb in Perth. An-
other Capet marriage was of course that of
Philip the Fair’s daughter Isabella, the much-
tried She-Wolf, to Edward II, himself the pos-
sessor, somehow, of the golden beard he was
made to shave off to avoid recognition on his
way to murder at Berkeley. In other words,
his mother the beloved Eleanor had Capet
genes from her forebear the fair Alice of
France, who bore Henry II several recorded
daughters while officially betrothed to his son
the Lion Heart.

Edward III, from the manuscripts showing
his coronation in late boyhood, is dark, so
whether or not the She-Wolf was so despite
her father, we will never know. However the
genes persisted, and a portrait in the Shrews-
bury Talbot Book showing Richard of York,
father to Edward IV and the also-dark Rich-
ard III, gives him golden hair beneath a coro-
net. His face is not routinely drawn and is
probably from life, and is not that of a likea-
ble man; the nose and chin are arrogant, the
eyes calculating and the mouth full and sensu-
al. However he passed on golden hair to his
daughter Margaret of York, although this
seems to have darkened in her later portrait
belonging to the Society of Antiquaries. Is it
therefore possible that Edward IV, like his ancestor Edward I, had fair hair which darkened by the time he was king? One could perhaps call it Type I while Richard II’s was Type 2, or handed-down Capet. Elizabeth Woodville brought in Type 3, found in her daughter Elizabeth of York, the latter’s daughter Mary the queen-duchess, and the eldest daughter Margaret Tudor’s daughter Margaret Douglas, who passed it to her son Darnley.

Lastly, historical novels. The great drawback is that while authors want to use factual history without messing it about, publishers want romance. Even my first and squeaky-clean publisher old-time Chatto, wanted ‘some more romantic involvement with William Wallace’ and Bruce’s daughter Marjory. Wallace having been hanged, drawn and quartered in 1305 made this difficult, as did a Scottish historian’s picturesque statement that Marjory had been hung in a cage outside the Tower of London, aged twelve. Closer research revealed that Edward I had kept her politely in a convent near York. He certainly caged two other ladies, but I could not in conscience put Marjory where she was not, although it would have made a better story.

Finally, may I, over the vexed question of ‘Warbeck’, recommend readers to the first-rate Richard of England by Diana Kleyn, published by the Kensal Press in 1990? It gives succinct facts such as the secret code discovered in Spanish archives which proves that Ferdinand and Isabella were well aware of the identity of the young man whose letters they failed to answer. It ought to be better known. The ISBN of this excellent book is 0-946041-63-6.

Pamela Hill

Dear Editor,
As a new member of the Society, I read my first Bulletin (Winter, 2005) with great interest and enjoyment. The debate about historical novels certainly struck a chord. Shaun Tyas stated that he had met several academic historians whose careers had been motivated by reading children’s historical fiction when they were young. I remember joining the local library as a youngster and borrowing my first historical novel, which was by Jean Plaidy. That was the start of a lifelong love of history, especially all things medieval, and ultimately led to a degree in Medieval Studies. I therefore have to agree with Shaun Tyas that historical novels are definitely ‘useful as introductions to history’ and may well lead to more serious study and research at a later date.

Caroline Watson

Dear Editor,
Anyone kind enough to have read my article in the Spring 2006 Ricardian Bulletin concerning Sir George Buck’s claim that Margaret Beaufort and John Morton murdered the Princes may be interested in a potential consequence of this theory. If one accepts Beaufort’s guilt then a solution to the long running question of why Thomas More failed to complete his History of Richard III becomes possible.

By the time of Margaret Beaufort’s death in 1509 John Fisher, the future chancellor of Cambridge University, was both a close personal friend and confessor. At some point Margaret would have revealed to Fisher her part in the murder of the princes. This, I am sure, is a confidence that Fisher would have taken to his grave.

According to Paul Murray Kendall, Thomas More wrote his History of Richard III about 1513 (p. 421), by which time Fisher had assumed the chancellorship of Cambridge University. Fisher may then have informed More, without divulging any details, that in his opinion Richard was not responsible for the murders. More would have instantly recognised the authority of Fisher’s belief, and so nothing explicit would need to have passed between them for the History to be abandoned.

I think it pretty unlikely that Fisher and More were not acquainted by 1513. They had a long-standing mutual friend in Erasmus, who must have caused the pair to become friends by the time More embarked on the History. I would be interested to know if any-
one could provide conclusive proof that More and Fisher were in contact by this time, and any other views that readers may have about this theory.

David Johnson

Dear Editor,
I was delighted to find notification in the Spring issue that stocks of the Battle of Bosworth Shiraz are now available for Ricardian imbibers in the UK.

Members may recall that in the Autumn 2005 issue of the Bulletin, it was reported that this splendid Australian red (most of them are) was served at the Banquet during the Australasian Convention at Sydney University in July, and that the Sydney supplier was called Richard (what a happy coincidence).

Naturally it was much appreciated by the delegates, and I now view my last bottle here at home. High time to restock so that I can take a bottle to various occasions when needed. Never let it be said that a loyal Ricardian will miss an opportunity to enlighten others on the tragic battle at Bosworth.

Julia Redlich, Secretary, NSW Branch

MEDIEVAL MARINE INSURANCE?

Will no. 266 in the Logge Register, made on 12th March and proved on 3rd May 1485, is that of a man named John de Saire, who describes himself as ‘merchant’. He gives his father’s name as Girard de Saire, and asks to be buried beside the font in the church of St Mary at Southampton. His will lists what are obviously trading debts, debts for rental of cellars and for casks of wine and quantities of tin; for example, he says, ‘I will that my debts should be well and faithfully paid and satisfied, namely £100 to Thomas Cok of Salisbury, for which he has my bond, concerning which £100 John Kenaules holds ... 18 large pieces of tin ... also the said John Kenaules has from me 18 pieces of large white cloth, each piece containing 24 yards or thereabouts, which goods the said John Kenaules holds until I am able to deliver to him 45 casks of wine now being in two or three cellars in this town. ... And I acknowledge that I owe Nool Baker for his cellar 6s.8d. ... and I owe Laurence Larmeurez for his cellar 6s.8d. ... and I owe John Kenaules 13 hundredweight of tin, worth 24s a hundredweight ... and that all dues belonging to the customs of the king and the town be well and faithfully paid ...’

One very interesting clause says that a ship’s master, John Paschall, master of the hulque, owes him 54 crowns of English money ‘because I take upon myself all the chances and outcome of the sea in going and travelling by sea to la Rochelle, and also returning to this country’. This sounds very much like marine insurance. Do any readers know any parallels to this, or anything further about medieval marine insurance? How far back into medieval times does the history of any form of insurance go? All information gratefully received by Lesley Boatwright and the Logge team.

He leaves small sums to churches, 3s.4d. to Theodore Noble, a priest, and says that his host [hospita] is to have goods to the value of 4s. ‘for a prisoner from Normandy’, and Leonard Cheveau, one of his executors, a gown of russet lined with black. The rest he leaves to his executors to spend for the health of his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed, so he appears not to have had any family of his own. The will was drawn up in the house of Ralph Pykart in Southampton, so he is presumably the host who will inherit the 4s.

Logge testators may be found in other sources of the period, and Harleian Ms 433 gives us more information about John de Saire. His goods had once been seized in Southampton, and then he had received a licence to bring to Breton wine-ships to London or Southampton – and he came from Middelburgh in Zeeland. This will shines a small spotlight on to the trading ventures of one entrepreneur operating in Richard III’s England.

Lesley Boatwright
Announcement of New Society Librarian
I am delighted to announce that, further to my notice in the last Bulletin, Keith Horry from Preston will be taking over from me as Society Librarian and custodian of the non-fiction book library. Due to logistics, Keith will not be taking delivery of the library until September 2006, so, should you require any non-fiction books in the meantime, please continue to contact me. More information will be forthcoming in the September Bulletin.
In the meantime I would like to welcome Keith on to the Library team.

Jane Trump

Latest Additions to the Non-Fiction Books & Papers Library
Listed below are a selection of books and articles that have been added to the Non-fiction Books and Non-fiction Papers Libraries. All the books are hard back unless otherwise described.

Books
O’MALLEY Gregory The Knights Hospitaller of the English Langue: 1460-1565 (Oxford University Press 2005) An investigation into the British and Irish branch of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, its recruitment of members, its approach to its military and financial responsibilities and the influence of local politics with an extended discussion of the relationship between senior Hospitaller officers and the governing authorities of Britain and Ireland.

Papers
LYDON James Medieval Waterford: The City of Waterford in the Later Middle Ages A series covering different aspects of Waterford and hinterland in the later middle ages (c.1200 - 1500). This paper includes fascinating details relating to Richard, Duke of York, and the Earl of Warwick post 1459 and the abortive Battle of Ludford Bridge.

Latest Additions to the Audio Visual Library
BBC2 TV History Mysteries - see page 9 for review.
The Actors, 2003 – Film starring Michael Caine, Dylan Moran, Michael Gambon and Miranda Richardson, based on a story by Neil Jordan. Set in Dublin, Caine plays the ageing actor appearing in a pretentious and disastrous ‘Third Reich’ production of Richard III (probably a satirical nod at the Ian McKellen stage and film versions) who persuades Tom (Moran) to join him in a money making scam. Critical verdicts were disappointing, pronouncing it ‘more am-dram than West end hit’
Friends – Also in comedy vein, an episode from the USA TV series Joey, the spin-off from the long running Friends. This sees Matt Le Blanc understudying the role of Richard III, as well as several others in different plays, and when called on to ‘go on’, it has predictably chaotic results. (Kindly donated by Irene Soulsby, Tyne and Wear).
Olivier’s Richard III and Channel Four’s The Trial of Richard III - see page 10 for review.
Dr Who: ‘The Kingmaker’, (noted on the media pages of this issue) is available, and hopefully will be reviewed in the next edition of the Bulletin.
The Adventures of Alianore Audley by Brian Wainwright, published by BeWrite Books

Have you ever read an historical novel and wondered how you would handle the situations the central characters find themselves in? Have you ever wished for a more ‘modern’ medieval hero or heroine? Well, we’ve had the hero for some time now. Cadfael approaches all his cases with razor sharp intuition and knowledge just falling short of DNA. Now welcome the heroine – Alianore Audley!

You don’t mess with Alianore – she’s a cross between Vikki Pollard and Margaret Thatcher – but you can’t help loving her. She storms through the haphazard life of a medieval noblewoman with panache and ease. Pragmatic and feisty, those around her either totally appreciate her merits (in the case of Edward IV and Roger Beauchamp) or come to regret not appreciating them, as with the Earl of Warwick.

Alianore begins life in Shropshire. She is the daughter of Lord Audley, Chamberlain to Henry VI for South Wales. She has several siblings, some Yorkist and some Lancastrian in sympathy and many periodically changing sides, which proves confusing and useful to her at the same time. As with many leading characters in an historical novel, Alianore manages to find herself at all the interesting events – if you can call the birth of ‘The Obnoxious Tudor Slimebag’ (as Alianore refers to Henry VII) an interesting event. When Edward IV comes to the throne, having had his amorous advances spurned by Alianore (she has far more sense than to succumb to his royal cousin’s charms – although she does have her regrets), he senses her talent for espionage and sends her up north to spy on his brother, Richard – yes, the loyal Richard.

Thus Alianore becomes an important member of the medieval MI5 and gets involved in most of the major events during the later Wars of the Roses and Richard’s reign, culminating in Bosworth and the initial aftermath. It is her chronicle, written in her dotage (if Alianore can ever be said to have a dotage) that Brian Wainwright has discovered and retells in his book.

Brian Wainwright has written a superb romp – a wonderful mixture of modern and medieval along with some serious research. Brian certainly knows his history and his explanations for various events, including the disappearance of the Princes, are extremely plausible. The style is light, delightfully irreverent and fast in pace and he has a wonderful turn of phrase which made me laugh out loud on occasions. Ladies pose, men follow the all important Knightly Code - and look out for the reference to an orange and a passing Woodville.

Brian’s characterisations of the principal people are largely predictable but very colourful. However, Brian’s description of Richard is not what the average Ricardian would expect but for me it was perfect and I was so pleased that Anne Neville was not painted as a timid character but was given all the backbone a daughter of Warwick the Kingmaker should have.

This is a must for all Ricardians. If you enjoy your history, you will love this book. I urge you to buy it!

Jane Trump
In this Golden Jubilee year of the re-founding of the Richard III Society, the Sydney, New South Wales Branch is celebrating its Silver Jubilee. In January, we marked this achievement with a champagne toast at our summer picnic in the Botanical Gardens. We plan to celebrate both Jubilees in fine style at our Coronation Lunch in July.

In some ways it may seem strange that Richard III’s life is studied with such enthusiasm so far from his home but it has to be remembered that the non-indigenous citizens of settler societies have their longer heritage half way around the world. If a recent English television programme is to be believed, we have the rightful King of England resident in southern New South Wales, albeit in a town as far away from Sydney as Inverness is from London.

My personal interest in Richard actually began in London in 1970 when my English flatmate, knowing my enthusiasm for English history, recommended that I read *The Daughter of Time* by Josephine Tey and lots of things fell into place. As a librarian and dedicated bibliophile, I knew that any ruler who lifted all taxes on books because he wanted information to be easily available to his people had to be a good bloke. And books remained tax free in Australia until the current Prime Minister, John Howard introduced the 10% Goods and Services Tax at the end of last century. Shades of Henry Tudor. The spirit of Richard’s good will must still prevail because that very flatmate visited me in Australia in March 2006.

In 1985, the Branch mounted a magnificent display in the foyer of the State Library of New South Wales to mark the 500th Anniversary of the Battle of Bosworth Field and it was after seeing this exhibition that I joined the Society. At that time, the Branch met at the headquarters of
the Country Women’s Association in Pott’s Point and Peter Ryan was President and Jenny Leigh was Secretary. The talk was given by Professor Ian Jack on ‘How to forge a Medieval Manuscript’, a fascinating look at parchment, inks and the many reasons why people would want to forge a manuscript.

Originally, members met in each other’s homes, but as the membership numbers grew, the Branch met at The Captain’s Table Restaurant in the City until a further increase in numbers made that venue too small. Over the years, the Branch has been a little like the Mendicant Friars and moved from venue to venue: CWA, YWCA, Don Bank Museum, Lavender Bay Catholic Church Hall, Kings Cross Library Meeting Room amongst others – but always with great talks and sharing of Ricardian research.

As well as guest speakers, members at the beginning of each year pull a Scrabble tile from a pouch and research a fifteen minute talk on a topic beginning with that letter. Talks from the Scrabble tiles have included Anne Neville, Francis Lovell, Sin and Wrongdoing in Richard’s Time, St George, Gloucester circa 1483 and the Great Fairs of the Middle Ages. Other enjoyable topics covered by guest speakers over the years have been Medieval Calligraphy, Medieval Costume, Historical Novels set in the Age of Richard III, and Sex Work and Workers in the Middle Ages.

From time to time we have received media publicity about the Society, usually an item about off beat activities you can indulge in. But I have found that reporters often become quite interested in all the achievements of Richard’s short reign once you get them past the uncle who murdered his nephews bit. The same interest is shown when we talk to various groups such as schools studying Shakespeare’s Richard III. It is always fascinating to see an audience of whatever age perk up and listen to the words recorded by the townspeople of York on hearing of Richard’s death: ‘This day was our good King Richard most grievously slain and murdered to the great heaviness of this city.’ It certainly paints a very different picture of him.

Another feature of life in our part of the globe are the biennial Australasian Ricardian Conferences. At the Sydney Conference last year among many other things we enjoyed a drop or two of the Battle of Bosworth Shiraz from McLaren Vale which was featured in the Spring Issue of the Ricardian Bulletin. Previously we have been to conferences in Brisbane, Adelaide, Melbourne and Canberra and next year the Aussies are all off to New Zealand. The conferences are a time of interesting talks, good fellowship and provide the opportunity for some medieval feasting.

So, with a healthy crop of full members of the Richard III Society, plus a strong group of Friends of the Branch, Richard’s support in New South Wales - as well as in the other Australian States and New Zealand - shows no sign of flagging. The abundance of badges bearing the White Boar insignia and white roses of York in various forms that are worn at all our meetings proves that no matter where in the world Ricardians find themselves, loyalty binds them.
Report on Society Events

Westminster – Commemoration at Anne Neville’s Tomb
On the afternoon of Wednesday 15 March – the vigil of Queen Anne’s Neville’s anniversary – a small group of Ricardians met at the collegiate church of St Peter, Westminster (popularly known as ‘Westminster Abbey’). We were introduced to Canon Jane Hedges, who led us to the site of Queen Anne’s memorial for a short service. This included, as usual, the reading of an extract from the letter of sympathy sent to Richard III on the occasion of Anne Neville’s death by the Doge and Senate of Venice. Floral tributes were laid by Marian Thomson and Joyce Hutton.

John Ashdown-Hill

Requiem Mass for King Richard and Queen Anne Neville
This year’s mass in commemoration of King Richard and Queen Anne was held at St Kenelm’s church in Minster Lovell in the Cotswolds, which in the fifteenth century was on the edge of the wool industry. Francis Lovell, Richard’s friend and Lord Chamberlain, who was immortalised in the rhyme ‘the cat, the rat, and Lovell our dog’ owned the now ruined manor.

A coach party of Ricardians left London, joining others for the mass. The service was celebrated according to the Anglican rite by Father Adrian Gabb-Jones, vicar of St Kenelm and a member of the Society. The requiem was uplifting and the readings provided suitable food for thought.

After the service time was allowed to explore the church and the manor ruins. The church is one of only seven dedicated to the Saxon saint Kenelm, whose murdered body was venerated in a shrine at Winchcombe Abbey. The saint’s festival day of 17 July was celebrated in ‘rhubarb jerkum’ or rhubarb wine in Minster Lovell’s inn. The church was built in 1450 by William Lovell, Francis’s grandfather. The area was originally priory land owned by the Benedictine Abbey of Ivry in France. The church contains such delights as carved corbel heads depicting a king (Henry VI), lord (Lovell) and bishop, and fifteenth-century font and seating in the nave. There are also fragments of glass depicting various saints – chosen I assume by the founder. William Lovell is thought to be buried in the elaborate decorated tomb in the Lady Chapel, embellished with Lovell heraldry and the figures of saints and weepers.

The remains of the manor house are quite atmospheric. The manor sits on the banks of the river Windrush, and in the fifteenth century, at the time of Richard’s visit in July 1483, the formal entrance was from the garden and the river. The manor buildings form a quadrangle, with the great hall and principal apartments in the North. The south-west tower by the river has the remains of an oriel window. During Richard’s visit a warrant was issued to chancellor John Russell to try unnamed persons ‘such as of late had taken upon them the fact of an enterprise’ – perhaps to free the princes? Here, too, Francis Lovell may have returned following the battle of Stoke in 1487. In the early eighteenth century a vault was uncovered in the manor house, containing the skeleton of a man sitting at a table. It was thought to be Francis Lovell who had disappeared after Stoke.

We then proceeded to the village of Bladon for tea. Winston Churchill was buried in the churchyard of St Martin in January 1965. His grave is surrounded by other family graves and there are also benches donated by the Danish resistance movement in recognition of Churchill’s leadership in the Second World War. The church was rebuilt in 1804, but the gravestones near the porch are decorated with seventeenth- and eighteenth-century cherubs.

Tea at the Bladon antiques centre tearoom allowed us to meet some of the newer members of the Society. Outside the tearoom we were greeted by a black cat – I didn’t see any dogs, Lovell’s or otherwise – all day.
It was a good day, despite the biting cold wind, and illness which had prevented some members from making the trip. Thanks must be expressed to John Ashdown-Hill who had arranged the event (but was unfortunately unable to be present), Sue Broughton and Dave Perry, organisers on the day, Father Gabb-Jones and finally David the coach driver for coping with the narrow lane near Minster Lovell church.

Fiona Price

British Museum Visit 8 April 2006
John Ashdown-Hill hosted the two visits, morning and afternoon, of fifteen members apiece. In reality we travelled no distance at all – just from the medieval artefacts room in the British Museum, to the medieval tiles room next door, and the clocks room, but in geographical terms we covered England, and Flanders, and in chronological terms, the thirteenth to the early sixteenth centuries. John divided the material into themes, beginning with religious life, showing us a set of morses (cope clasps), a chrismatory, a pax, a pyx and pyx veil, then some ‘papal rings’ – not as owned by popes, but as given by popes, and thus composed of a gilt overlay on base metal, and glass jewels. Medieval candlesticks gave an indication of how the base of the Bosworth cross might have looked, and a Walsingham pilgrim badge showed the ‘holy house’. The fifteenth century had already developed crowd control creating a one-way system for pilgrims to progress round the holy house, with added attractions on the way in the form of Nottingham alabaster plaques of the Life of the Virgin – Richard and Edward when they visited Walsingham would have seen these. The next theme was the royal family, with panels from the ceiling of the painted chamber at Westminster, doubtless passed under by Richard, but not seen by him, as they were then covered over. Wall paintings from St Stephen’s Chapel he would have seen, when taking part in the wedding of Anne Mowbray. Next we saw the ‘Chester sword’, clearly, from its heraldry pertaining to a prince of Wales – Edward ‘V’, or Edward of Middleham, or perhaps both. Jewelry demonstrated marguerites, used by both Margaret of Anjou and Margaret of York. The Dunstable Swan was absent on exhibition elsewhere, but the All Souls jewel was present, startlingly modern, and the royal cup, brought from France by John of Lancaster, would have been in the ownership of Edward IV and Richard, although not with its present band of red and white roses. The enamel is as fresh as if created yesterday, but the cup has seen vicissitudes, losing the pearl border on its lid, and its tripartite base. John then showed us a reliquary cross which he thought had an unrecognised Yorkist connection. It dates from the mid fifteenth century and was found at Clare Castle, and who should have been in residence at Clare at that time, as demonstrated by material in the Colchester archives, indicating that Edward IV visited her there in 1463, but Cicely Neville? Another reliquary of the fifteenth century showed white enamelled roses, and a devotional ring was similar to that mentioned in the will of Edmund Shaa. The parade shield was of the right style to date from the Bruges pageants to mark the marriage of Margaret of York to Charles the Bold in 1468. Items of everyday life included clocks, fixed to a wall or stood on a shelf, so that the weights could hang freely, and a tiled floor from Bristol. Objects which might have had a connection to Lady Eleanor Talbot included the Talbot casket owned by her father, a panel of arms from Burton Dassett church in Warwickshire, and the Savernake horn – Eleanor had property adjacent to the royal forest of Savernake – how did she obtain it if not from the king? Our grateful thanks go to John for explaining the significance of these items.

Elizabeth Nokes

The Logge Wills
Study Weekend – College of York St John: 21-23 April 2006
I, Kenneth Hillier, being (allegedly) of sound mind and good memory, do hereby report on recent deliberations held at the College of York St John by members of our Society.
One began to feel a certain empathy with poor Richard II, as one studied the programme for the weekend.

*Of comfort no man speak:*

*Let’s talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs;*

*Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes*

*Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.*

*Let’s choose executors, and talk of wills.*

However, far from falling into a slough of despond, the 35 gathered together were regularly uplifted by the standard of presentation and content of the course.

On Friday evening, Wendy Moorhen, our indefatigable Research Officer and superb organiser of the study weekend, introduced the programme. Is it really 15 years ago that I trekked north to the first congress? Since then, thanks to Wendy and the Hammonds, we have enjoyed memorable times. From the 1991 ‘Research for Beginners’, through subjects such as ‘Medieval Religion’ (1995), ‘Voices from the Past’ (1997), ‘Heraldry’ (1998), ‘Life in a Medieval Townhouse’ (2000), ‘The Arts’ (2001), ‘Vills, Villeins and Villainy’ (2003), to ‘Medieval Women’ in 2004, these study weekends have more than held their own with the Triennial Conferences.

Wendy rightly reminded us that the Logge Wills Project (named after John Logge the woodmonger whose will was the first entered into the Register) was a tremendous achievement for the Society – not only to have embarked upon but also to have seen it through to its present stage.

Ann Rycraft from the Centre of Medieval Studies in York gave an interesting introduction to the whole subject of wills, arguing that they are one of the most important and most used of medieval archives. She listed those legally unable to make a will, including imbeciles, bondmen and outlaws, and reminded us that, up until the Married Woman’s Property Act of 1882, common law took all a wife’s real or personal property away and gave it to her husband. The usual testator was male, over 21 years of age and who felt death approaching. He was unlikely to write the will himself, although occasionally one finds the phrase ‘I, with my own hand ….’ The majority were translated into Latin, which begs the question whether either the testator or witnesses actually understood what had been written down. Ann then explained the role of the executor(s) and the often long drawn out process of getting the will proved. The whole probate process could often, as nowadays, become expensive.

Lesley Boatwright, well known to all Ricardian Bulletin readers for her fascinating ‘Logge Notes and Queries’ gave us an update on the whole project. There was a mild outbreak of mental gymnastics and sparring amongst the audience over the pronunciation of the word ‘Logge’. As he was someone whose trade included delivering timber to London, many assumed an obvious ‘log’. However, some plumped for ‘lodge’ and yet others for ‘loggee’. It was agreed to differ.

Lesley explained that there were still four main targets ahead: to finalise the text – which is what she has been engaged upon for the last two years; to produce the main index and a glossary of unusual words; to write an Introduction; and to get it published. The Latin had to be checked and translations had to be assessed for accuracy and consistency (e.g. Beata Maria to be *Blessed not Saint Mary; relict not widow*). Thanks to the vital and continuing skills and support of Moira and Gerald Habberjam and Peter Hammond, the mills might be grinding slowly but they were exceedingly fine. Research to find out as much about the testator as possible, led to Harleian Ms. 433, Wedgwood’s History of Parliament, the Howard Household Books, the London Livery Companies’ publications as well as records of Oxford and Cambridge alumni. A few examples of testators followed, from Lord Hastings, whose *writs of diem clausit extremum* (see Logge Notes and Queries) were dated on 30 July ‘*in the first year of King Edward the bastard*’ to the B-list celebrities, such as Thomas Betson and Walter William, one of the October 1483 rebels from Southampton.

All the while, the typescript of the whole project lay at the back of the room, a testament to the sheer enormity of the undertaking. Lesley explained that the margins were sprinkled with red
All flesh is dust and we do not know the hour of our death’ and behaved with circumspection and world remembered the warning of the Logge testator, Robert Ascoigh, archdeacon of Exeter, that it became an independent Trust. Your scribe failed to attend, so ashamedly directs enquirers to that reconstructed medieval town house in York, which the Society has so nobly supported since (and someone in a burberry) were disported with wayward abandon on their way to Barley Hall.

Each to his own; so a veil is drawn over the hedonistic pleasures of some and the erudite pilgrim-tired of life’. Saturday afternoon was given over to the pleasures of Richard’s favourite city.

Vernon, daughter of Sir Richard Vernon of Haddon Hall. Roos has been called the Lancastrian of William, 6th Lord Roos, and a follower of Humphrey of Gloucester. He married Margaret Anne concluded that wills were really one starting point for the study of books in the late fifteenth century.

Religious texts were passed from one generation to another, almost as keepsakes. Women tended to be given something religious, but they were also often interesting bequeathers of books. Twenty-three portable breviaries were mentioned in Logge wills; many testators left bibles, including a ‘great and sumptuous Bible’. At that point I glanced at the two ‘sumptuous and greate ringe to be given something religious, but they were also often interesting bequeathers of books. Twenty-three portable breviaries were mentioned in Logge wills; many testators left bibles, including a ‘great and sumptuous Bible’. At that point I glanced at the two ‘sumptuous and greate ringe byndere bokes’ containing the typescripts of the Logge Wills – who would be left them one day? Anne concluded that wills were really one starting point for the study of books in the late fifteenth century.

Lesley then gave a talk on Richard Roos whose will was dated 8 March 1481/2 and whose Probate occurred on 1 April 1482. He wanted his ‘bodie to be buried in the feiraist wise that it canne be with the costes and expenses’ dealt with first of all. He was the fifth and youngest son of William, 6th Lord Roos, and a follower of Humphrey of Gloucester. He married Margaret Vernon, daughter of Sir Richard Vernon of Haddon Hall. Roos has been called the Lancastrian Poet, but he seems to have been a very laid-back Lancastrian and equally somnolent poet.

It is not remiss to misquote Samuel Johnson and opine, ‘when a man is tired of York, he is tired of life’. Saturday afternoon was given over to the pleasures of Richard’s favourite city. Each to his own; so a veil is drawn over the hedonistic pleasures of some and the erudite pilgrimages of others. Suffice it to say that soon after 6 o’clock, a motley collection of wimples and caulds, horned coiffures and roundlets, baldricks, gay chaplets, clothes full of gingles and belles (and someone in a burberry) were disported with wayward abandon on their way to Barley Hall – that reconstructed medieval town house in York, which the Society has so nobly supported since it became an independent Trust. Your scribe failed to attend, so ashamedly directs enquirers to others on the Research Committee.* I only hope those seekers after the earthy delights of this world remembered the warning of the Logge testator, Robert Ascoigh, archdeacon of Exeter, that ‘all flesh is dust and we do not know the hour of our death’ and behaved with circumspection and
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decorum.

Sunday saw Mary O’Regan deliver a talk on ‘Clerical, Medical and Lawyers: wills of those who cared for the soul, the body and the pocket’, with endearing touches of humour. She had counted c.44 of the 380 (or 378 or 381, depending on which Speaker you were listening to) as being ‘professional’ men. There was little to distinguish them from the other wills, the decisive difference usually being wealth rather than profession. Their wills were crowded with expressions of deep personal piety – for instance, a strong belief in Purgatory, the efficacy of good works and the value of chantries. Regular masses, both for their own and their friends’ and relatives’ souls, were specified and paid for. All levels of clergy were represented, from Richard Beauchamp, Bishop of Salisbury, and William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, to the humbler clerks, vicars and chaplains. Of the lawyers, Sir Thomas Lytillon, Justice of the Common Pleas, left several named books, including a ‘boke of myne wherinne is conteigned Constitutions Provinciall, De Gestis Romanorum and other treties’. He also willed that ‘my grete English boke to be sold by myn executours and the money thereof to be disposed for my soule’. One prays, for his soul’s sake, it made a packet.

Peter Hammond gave a fascinating talk on ‘Silver and Sallets’, pointing out that the Logge wills gave us an incredible insight into medieval life, with the enormous range of objects mentioned in them. He dealt with arms and armour – 14 out of 378 wills made reference to this; silverware and gold – an overwhelming impression of wealth and conspicuous consumption was created by the lists of silver, brass and gold livery collars, gold chains and coins; and the ubiquitous spoons (56 wills mentioned them), including a ‘folding’ spoon which, one hoped, obeyed its owner’s instructions at table.

And then it was off for a final lunch and goodbyes until next April, when the 35 strongly recommend the rest of the Society to join them for another compelling journey into past times.

In the Name of God. Amen.

Postscript: I was particularly taken with one will which specified that the testator’s wife could look forward to her just deserts “if she pleas me during my liffe as a goode woman ought to pleas her husband ... if [she] pleas me not during my liffe than I woll [she] be excluded of all such gyfte” [will 268]. In the meantime, I have made an appointment to see my solicitor next week.

Kenneth Hillier

*As one of the ‘motley collection’ who attended the banquet I am delighted to report that a good time was had by all. Perhaps the laughter became a little raucous, and the ripostes across the tables rather loud but the food was excellent and the company delightful, We were entertained by Trouvère who aptly included a story about St George.

A group photograph of the delegates is on page 86.

The 2007 study weekend will have as its theme ‘Warfare’.

Wendy Moorhen
Future Society Events

Bookable Events

Bosworth 2006 - Sunday, 20 August, 2006
This year our one-day visit to Bosworth comprises the traditional service in Sutton Cheney Church, and visit to the Battlefield Centre, including tea. Much work is being undertaken at the Battlefield Centre and it will be interesting to see developments since our last visit, two years ago.

We hope that as many members as possible will attend during the day, as this is one of the occasions during the year when members from all over the world can meet.

Programme
09.15 Coach departs, Embankment Underground Station (Embankment exit) 09.15 sharp.
12.30 Memorial Service in Sutton Cheney Church, with Society wreath laying.
13.30 Lunch - bring packed lunch: picnic area available, or pub. Village Hall plough man’s lunch will again be available for those booking in advance.
14.15 Coach leaves Sutton Cheney for Battlefield Centre.
16.30 Tea at battlefield
17.45 Coach leaves Bosworth for London, arriving c.20.15

Members attending independently on the day may book for such elements of the day as they wish:
Cost for London Day Outing Coach (coach + battlefield entry + tea) = £30 concessions £27
Cost for tea only = £6.00 per head

Romney Marsh Churches, Tenterden and Smallhythe
Saturday 9 September 2006
Our first stop will be Brookland, where we will meet our guide, a member of the Romney Marsh Historic Churches Trust, and visit the church of St Augustine. This thirteenth-century church, dedicated to the first Archbishop of Canterbury, has a detached octagonal bell tower covered with wooden shingles, which has been likened to three candle snuffers stacked together. Although the chancel was ‘restored’ by the Victorians, the rest of the church is charmingly uneven with unequally spaced and perilously leaning aisle arcades. It also contains one of the country’s best remaining lead fonts.

Then we will go on to St Thomas Becket Fairfield: this small, isolated church is in the middle of sheep-inhabited flat lands and reached by raised causeways. Rebuilding took place in 1913 but the timbered interior, dating back to the fourteenth century, remained untouched. The church contains box pews and a three-decker pulpit.

We will stop in Tenterden for lunch and a look around this interesting town and perhaps have time to visit the medieval church.

Our afternoon will be spent at Smallhythe Place, which is an early-sixteenth-century half-timbered house owned by the National Trust, the home of the Victorian actress, Ellen Terry, from 1899 to 1928. The house contains Ellen Terry’s fascinating theatre collection and in the grounds you can see her rose garden and orchard and the Barn Theatre. Refreshments can be obtained from the nearby Tenterden Vineyard Park.

The cost of the trip is £21.50 per person. The entrance charge for Smallhythe Place is £4.50, not included – payable at the time of the visit. If you are an NT member, please remember to bring your membership card.

The coach will leave as usual from Embankment station at 9.00 a.m. sharp. See centre pages
for booking forms.

Further information about this or any other trips organised by the Visits Committee can be obtained from Marian Mitchell, 20 Constance Close, Witham, Essex CM8 1XL. (Tel: 01376 501984 or email: emsquared.witham@virgin.net.)

‘The House of Lancaster’ - 11 November 2006
The Norfolk Branch presents a study day at The Assembly House, Theatre Street, Norwich.
Cost: £20 per ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Coffee on arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.55</td>
<td>Welcome to the study day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>The battles of Agincourt 1415 and Verneuil 1424, twin pillars of the Lancastrian Dynasty, by Dr Michael K Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Henry VI and the Wars of the Roses, by Dr John Watts, Oxford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>The favour of your good grace: the assimilation of Lancastrians, by Dr Rosemary Horrox, Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>The Lancastrian credentials of Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, in 1483, by Professor Tony Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Summing up by Dr Michael K Jones and close and vote of thanks at 17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you would like to attend the study day please complete the booking form in the centre pages.

Annmarie Hayek

The ‘Angel and Royal Inn’, Grantham

The ‘Angel and Royal’ at Grantham claims to be Britain’s oldest inn (circa 1203). Among its royal visitors was Richard III. The inn has also served in the past, and hopefully will serve again in the future, as a venue for the Lincolnshire Branch of the Richard III Society.

On Friday 19 May, Friday 21 July and Saturday 16 September the ‘Angel and Royal’ plans to commemorate its Ricardian associations with a re-enactment based around Richard III’s condemnation of his cousin, the duke of Buckingham. Although the title of the event ‘Buckingham Beheaded at the Angel and Royal’ is misleading (Buckingham was, of course, executed in Salisbury), the event, in costume, complete with a banquet, and participation in the re-enactment, offers the opportunity of a taste of the fifteenth century. Society members who might like to try this experience can find details on www.angelandroyal.co.uk/specialoffers.asp
Branches and Groups

Amendments to Branch and Group Contact Details:
Please note the correct email address for the East Midlands Branch is: sallytoftarahill@pgn.net, and that of the Continental Group is: dr.liethen@t-online.de

Please note that Jenny Hutt is no longer the secretary of the Thames Valley Branch. Sally Empson has taken over the role: contact details are: 42, Pewsey Vale, Forest Park, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 9YA, e-mail sally.bracknell@virgin.net

Please note that both the Scarborough and Wakefield Groups of the Yorkshire Branch are no longer extant. They have proved unable to continue owing to dwindling numbers. Our thanks go to Marie Belfitt and Val Stringer respectively for running them for many years.

Cumbria Group
Due to serious health problems of some of the members, there have not been as many meetings as usual in the past two years. However, we soldier on. We have nine members, we research our subjects for meetings ourselves, and take as much care as if we were presenting our papers to many. There is usually a question and discussion session after the talks, which occasions much interest.

In November 2004 the subject of the evening’s talk was ‘Henry VI: Part three’, given by Jim Spence. His final talk on this subject described the gradual disintegration of Henry’s reign, and the descent of the country into civil war – the Wars of the Roses. He spoke of the main protagonists, who changed sides several times, or even fled, leaving their men leaderless. Henry’s final recorded words were to Edward, then earl of March, saying he knew his life was safe in Edward’s hands. A sad man, the wrong man, in the wrong place, at the wrong time.

In December 2004 the group met at the Royal Oak in Appleby for an excellent meal, after which we retired to the home of our Chairman and her husband, where everyone enjoyed Christmas goodies and hot mulled wine. The was followed by Christmas readings, the letter from an Australian RIII Society member, and a tuneful carol. The Christmas season had begun.

In May 2005, we held our AGM. It was arranged for one of the members to put white roses into the Neville window for 22 August and also for a notice to be inserted in the In Memoriam column in the local weekly newspaper, The Cumberland and Westmorland Herald. A letter was read to the group from John Ashdown-Hill containing information about DNA from a descendant of Richard’s family which had been found in Canada. This may make it possible to identify remains found in Belgium, which could be those of Margaret of York. A programme was prepared for the forthcoming year, although the actual dates of each monthly meeting are only arranged at the previous meeting.

In July 2005 we visited Brampton church to see the Burne-Jones windows. As it was a brilliant sunny day the colours of the east window were at their very best and it was much admired, as were all the superb windows, colours and design. We then visited the church, and the extensive priory ruins at Lanercost. The tape commentary supplied to visitors explained the buildings and greatly enhanced the visit. We had a plain but excellent meal in a cool room (it was a hot day) with a lovely view, at the Centurion Inn at Walton, then went on to Bewcastle to see the ancient spectacular cross shaft, and the little church which was in a very good condition of repair. It felt used and loved and there were ladies busy arranging flowers for the next day. After that, we visited the explanatory exhibition housed in the barn in the churchyard. The nearby castle was the last stop, much improved and consolidated since our last visit many years ago.
Heritage has fenced the area, and put in a gate so that one does not now have to go through the farmyard to the house and ask permission. Much fallen rubble has also been cleared so that one can walk the whole castle area: a huge building built within the Roman fort.

In September 2005 we discussed ways of celebrating the Society’s fiftieth anniversary and our Chairman suggested that we should produce a leaflet describing a Richard III town trail for visitors. The project was agreed, and production started. The meeting’s talk was given by Jim Spence on *Edward of Middleham – the unknown prince*. It demonstrated how many mysteries surround this young Prince of Wales. His parentage is not entirely certain, nor his dates of birth and death, nor even his burial place. The extraordinary gaps in the brief life of the ailing prince cannot be attributed entirely to the loss or destruction of the records. So the suspicion remains that there was deliberate suppression of information, for reasons we can only guess at.

In October 2005 we further progressed the town trail leaflet, with the encouraging news that the Tourist Information Office supported the project, and would sell them for us. The talk, given by Norma Benathon, was on the subject of the Stanley-Harrington feud – which lasted for twenty-six years. It seemed that Richard had mostly come down on the side of the Harringtons in the many and various legal wranglings, and one wonders if this was a significant factor in Stanley’s behaviour at Bosworth.

In November 2005 we had a talk on Richard Ratcliffe by Linda Smith. This is the second part of a series on the men who held power under Richard III as featured in the popular doggerel of the day: ‘the cat, the rat, and Lovell our dog, rule all England under the hog’. Richard Ratcliffe was the younger son of Thomas Ratcliffe (of Cumberland) and Margaret, daughter of Sir Thomas Parr of Kendal. Ratcliffe was in the service of the Duke of Gloucester by 1475, eight years before Richard claimed the throne, and ten years before Bosworth. He progressed quickly to being one of Gloucester’s trusted associates, especially in the events leading up to Richard’s assumption of the throne in June 1483. Ratcliffe fought for Richard at Bosworth and was killed there.

In December 2005 the group again met at the Royal Oak in Appleby for its annual Christmas meal, and afterwards withdrew to the home of the Chairman and her husband for seasonal goodies and readings: a splendid beginning to Christmas.

In March 2006 we made the final decisions on the Richard III Town Trail leaflet and put it into production.

Marjorie Smith

**Gloucestershire Branch**

During the last quarter the Branch has enjoyed two excellent talks by members – ‘Medieval Beliefs’ by Gwen Waters and ‘A New Look at the Renaissance’ by Suzanne Doolan. In March a local historian, Julian Lea-Jones, gave a lecture on ‘The Templars in the West Country and their Legacy’. This proved a very comprehensive survey of many aspects of the Templars – organization, religious practice and belief, aspirations and architecture. Julian has dedicated many years of research into investigations into the movement and readily admits he has virtually only scratched the surface of a subject now shrouded in mystery. Anyway, the talk represented a very interesting diversion from our normal period of focus.

Bristol Group held a ‘Video Evening’ in February – always a popular topic for complete relaxation on a cold winter’s night. Short papers in March returned to ‘Favourite Saints’, always a popular subject with plenty of scope.

Will members please note programme changes included with our Forthcoming Events below:

**Saturday 3 June**  ‘Did Edward IV’s Family Policy Make the Reign of Richard III Inevitable?’ Talk by Stephen David [Branch].

**Saturday 17 June**  ‘The Churches of North Herefordshire and South Shropshire.’ Field visit led by Mickie O’Neill [Bristol Group].
Saturday 1 July  ‘Medieval Ludlow and Stokesay Castle.’ Conducted walk with Mickie O’Neill [Branch].

Sunday 16 July  ‘The Newport Medieval Ship’. Field visit [Branch].

Friday 21 July  Bristol Group AGM.

Saturday 2 September: Branch AGM.

Please note the December meeting has now been changed:
Saturday 2 December: Christmas Gathering – Festive Food and Drink with the Coynes at The Old Stables, Beckford, near Tewkesbury. Please note this meeting will begin at 12.00.

**Annual Branch Lecture - October**

We are especially proud this year to welcome the Society Chairman, Dr Phil Stone, to give our Annual Branch Lecture. A very warm welcome is extended to all Society members and their friends to join us for this very special event:

**‘Of Golden Trees and White Roses’: Bruges and the Re-enactment of the Wedding Pageant of Margaret of York**

Illustrated talk by Dr Phil Stone, the Society Chairman on Saturday 14 October 2006, 14.00 to 17.00 (including afternoon tea and time for conversation) at Emanuel Church Hall, Leckhampton, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire. Cost: £6.00 per person to include afternoon tea.

Tickets and information available from Keith Stenner, 96, Allerton Crescent, Whitchurch, Bristol, BS14 9PX. Tel. 01275 541512.

**London and Home Counties Branch**

Notice of forthcoming meeting, which all Society members are most welcome to attend:

Saturday, 22 July, 2006, at 15.00, in the Lecture Hall of the Art Workers Guild, 6, Queen Square, WC1N 3AT (nearest underground Holborn or Russell Square), **David Baldwin** will lecture on:

‘How much can we really know about a medieval battle – how it was fought and what persuaded some to risk everything while others stood aside?’

David Baldwin will discuss these issues in relation to his new book *Stoke Field – the last battle of the Wars of the Roses* (Pen and Sword 2006).

Tea and biscuits will be served after the meeting, and there is a ‘money in the hat’ collection after the lecture. For further information, email: elizabeth_nokes@hotmail.com.

**Mid Anglia Group Report**

When he visited the Mid Anglia Group on Saturday 25 February, for its inaugural meeting of 2006, the Society’s chairman, Dr Phil Stone, combined two of his passions: medieval England and ancient Egypt. *First catch your Asp* was a lively and well illustrated survey of the deaths of kings (and queens), and the causes that lay behind them. The Group was delighted to welcome the Chairman, and his wife, Beth, to Colchester on a chilly but bright afternoon.

The Richard III Society, both locally and nationally has made a significant financial contribution to the restoration of a window at the west end of the north aisle, of Stratford St Mary Church, Suffolk. This church was under the patronage of Richard III’s sister, Elizabeth, Duchess of Suffolk, and the window, which contains all the church’s surviving medieval glass, includes royal and de la Pole arms, and a number of fifteenth-century white roses. The glass was removed for restoration on 19 April, and should be back in place by the autumn.

The Mid Anglia Group’s programme for the rest of the year is as follows:

**Sunday 25 June**  Visit: Hadleigh (Suffolk). Meet at Hadleigh Church, 14.00

**Sunday 3 September**  Visit: Fifteenth-century Harwich walk. Meet at 14.00 at the Old Lighthouse (junction of Main Rd, West St and Wellington Rd)
Saturday 18 November

14.00 Castle Methodist Church, Colchester: Group AGM, followed by ‘Richard, Duke of York’, a talk by Rebekah Beale.

All the above events are open to anyone, whether members of the group or not. Fellow Ricardians are especially invited to join the Harwich walk in September, when hidden and little-known facts about Harwich will be revealed! Harwich is accessible from London (Liverpool Street) in just over an hour. During our visit we shall be looking for traces of the medieval walls of Harwich, the duke of Norfolk’s palace, the king’s castle, and the quays where Sir John (Lord) Howard built ships for Edward IV. If time permits we may also explore the former shrine of the Holy Rood of Dovercourt – a miracle-working crucifix patronised by John Howard.

For further information about any Mid Anglia events, contact John Ashdown-Hill (details inside back cover).

Worcestershire Branch

As we enter our 20th anniversary year we have been very privileged to be entertained and informed by three excellent speakers in the first quarter of 2006. Our year began with an afternoon at the beautiful St Leonard’s Church Beoley where our chairman Ralph Richardson gave a talk entitled ‘My Other Interest’: most of us knew that to be philately. We were intrigued to find out how this would be linked to Richard III. We were soon enlightened, firstly with a set of stamps issued by Barbuda depicting Kings and Queens of England, including Richard III, Edward IV and Edward V, followed by a schematic set including some of the famous landmarks of London, Westminster Abbey and the Tower of London. Next we saw stamps showing some royal heraldry, including heraldic beasts like the Falcon of Plantagenet and the Bull of Clarence from a set issued in 1984, 500 years since the founding of the College of Arms by Richard III. We then saw one of Ralph’s collection of commemorative covers for the 500th Anniversary of the Battle of Bosworth showing both Richard III and Henry VII. A full set for Henry VIII and his six wives and a first day cover commemorating the anniversary of the Armada led us into the Tudor period.

Ralph’s interest extends into the history of the postal service before the introduction of the postage stamp, in particular the free post system used by serving politicians, and he went on to talk about the history that can be revealed through these letters and other documents. The first letter was written to his own great grandmother by a banker living at 4 Pall Mall, and this was followed by letters from Lord Astley, who is famed for freeing children from working down mines, Viscount Goodrich, and the Earl of Ripon who never attended Parliament. He also had letters from Wellington who was ordered to be Prime Minister by George IV, Earl Grey, Lord Melbourne and Robert Peel who were appointed PM by William IV. Each letter carried a story and Ralph reminded us about the importance of such documents and the history they preserve.

Our meeting in February was held in Malvern where Ann Wroe gave an illustrated lecture on her research into Perkin Warbeck: a most interesting illustrated talk presented with great expertise and, judging by the numerous questions that followed, Ann has left us with further research to pursue. Those who had not yet read her new book were eager to buy one for themselves and we also purchased one for our ever-growing library.

At the March meeting we welcomed back Paul Renfrey who is a fountain of knowledge about castles. He has spoken previously on Wigmore Castle in Herefordshire. His subject this time was Carreg Cennen Castle in Dyfed. It is said to date back to the late thirteenth century, however Paul believes there was a castle on this three-hundred-foot limestone crag much earlier, perhaps in the ninth century. The castle has no foundations and is built of local limestone directly onto the crag with a ten-foot-wide ditch at the base, and there is also evidence of a sandstone floor running beneath the walls which suggests an earlier castle was built of sandstone. In the great hall are the remains of a central pillar and twelve wall seats that Paul believes indicates a Welsh council chamber. He also pointed out the many alterations made to the ruin during the Victorian era, arrow slits where they should not be, an altar where a garderobe should be, straight stone steps that would have been slate or wooden spiral stairs, all given away by the lime stains from Victorian
mortar. Paul interspersed his talk with the history of the seven people, mostly from the Rhys family, who fought for, owned and lost the castle between 1140 and 1369. We are planning a visit to this castle next year.

We held our AGM in April at St Nicholas Church Hall, at Warndon in Worcester, preceded by a guided visit to the church. There will be some changes to our committee principally due to the retirement of our chairman Ralph Richardson who has guided us so expertly for many years. His contribution to the development of our Branch will be greatly missed and we thank him for his service. Judith Sealey has volunteered to be our next Chairman, subject to election. We are sorry that Jane Tinklin, our press officer, and Mary Friend are also stepping down and we thank them for all their efforts.

On 13 May we visited Goodrich Castle near Ross on Wye, Herefordshire. It is a substantial red sandstone ruin that was owned principally by the Talbot family who became earls of Shrewsbury from 1442. An early-twelfth-century wooden fortress was built by the English Thegn Godric from whom it derives its name, Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Pembroke, lived there in 1138, and William Marshall, said to be the ‘best knight in Christendom’ owned it by 1216. He had five sons who all died tragically by the curse of a wronged Welsh prince according to legend! It was greatly enhanced by William de Valence who built much of what we see today. During the Civil War it was held by both royalists and parliamentarians, finally falling to Cromwell by siege in 1646.

Forthcoming events:

**June 10** is the date of our Branch 20th Anniversary Banquet at Inkberrow Village Hall. We are hoping to see all of our current and past members there for this special celebration. The evening will have a Medieval theme and we are hoping many guests will wear costume but this is not essential: it is much more important that we all have an enjoyable evening. Tickets may still be available. Please contact June Tilt on 01684-578742

**The Weekend of July 8th – 9th** will see us attending the Tewkesbury Festival again. We will have our promotional stand in the main marquee and will be pleased to meet any members who can attend this excellent event. There are re-enactments of the Battle of Tewkesbury each day and many excellent stalls and entertainments to interest visitors. On Saturday evening there is a re-enactment of the ‘storming of the Abbey after the battle’ in the Abbey grounds culminating in a trial and gruesome executions.

**On August 12** we have an evening meeting, led by Ralph Richardson, visiting Norton near Evesham and Wickhamford. We will meet at 18.15 in the car park at Norton Church and probably end the outing in a local hostelry. Ralph always finds wonderful little village churches with medieval connections for these evening visits.

**On September 9** we were planning a visit to Newland and Madersfield but this will now have to be replaced for reasons beyond our control. At present this is a mystery tour! Further information from Pat Parminter 01562 67264

**On October 14** our outing will be to Gloucester Cathedral led once again by Ralph Richardson. This is a beautiful and interesting cathedral well worth a visit.

**The November 11** meeting will be a talk by one of our newest members, Richard Thompson, entitled ‘Richard III and his Inheritance’. This will take place at Belbroughton Village Hall near Kidderminster at 14.00.

**On December 9** we shall complete our year with a ‘bring and share’ seasonal celebration at Upton Snodsbury Village Hall, again starting at 14.00. All of the above events will be reported in our excellent Branch publication *Dicon Independent*, edited by Pam Benstead. We are always pleased to welcome friends and prospective members at any of our meetings. Please contact our Secretary, Val Sibley, for further information on 01564-777329.

Pat Parminter

Yorkshire Branch
On Saturday 8 April the Branch held its annual lecture in Leeds. Our speaker, Ed Dennison, leads the team currently involved in a thorough multi-disciplinary investigation of the site of the ruined castle at Harewood, so we learned about the flora (and fauna – bats) on site as well as about the actual building. The property was constructed in the fourteenth century for the Aldborough family and was their only possession in England, but despite some fancy stonework details it was perhaps a rush, or at least a careless job in places: we saw slides of stones put in the wrong way round, windows moved and awkwardly-inserted doorways. It was never a defensive castle, and had ceased to be inhabited by the end of the seventeenth century, although alterations continued to be made to the fabric until as late as the mid nineteenth century due to the ‘picturesque’ ruins being incorporated into the Northern Pleasure Grounds of the present Harewood House. The castle’s main advantage seems to have been the marvellous views across country in all directions: Skipton Castle, for example, can just be seen in the far north-west distance.

Work on the site is ongoing, jointly funded by the Harewood estate and English Heritage, and it is hoped that some public access, with guides, may be allowed before too long. Very few of the audience at this fascinating and well-illustrated lecture had ever been inside the (overgrown) grounds of the castle – which are also being charted and cleared as necessary – and some people never knew there was a castle there at all, so on all counts this was a very rewarding afternoon.

Those attending the lecture had dodged showers suspiciously like sleet, as well as gusty winds, which should have prepared us for the windy uplands of Towton battlefield the next day. Several members and friends spent a few hours getting their feet either muddy or frozen in the grounds of Towton Hall, in whose barn, for the first time, Yorkshire Branch had a sales and publicity point, invited by the Towton Battlefield society who usually organise events on this anniversary. We did very good business, but it was definitely even colder inside that barn than out! Hot refreshments came in the form of a hog roast (how could they?) and as we were stationed opposite we could not avoid all the details of the complete head, apple in mouth. Maybe we should bring Lancashire hotpot next time in retaliation.

The Branch will hold its usual Bosworth commemoration at St Alkelda’s church, Middleham, at 14.00 on Sunday 20 August and all are welcome to attend this short informal act of remembrance and placing of a wreath. Our AGM will be at the usual venue - Wheatlands Hotel, Scaracroft Road, York - at 13.30 on Saturday 2 September, and we hope to visit Raby and Barnard Castle on Saturday 16 September. The Committee is currently considering other venues for our Boar Dinner this autumn, since Headley’s Restaurant at Utley, where we have met for some years, is now a Chinese restaurant. Details of the Branch outing and our Dinner should appear in August’s Branch Newsletter and the Autumn Ricardian Bulletin.

Angela Moreton
# New Members

## UK 1 Jan – 31 Mar 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connie Alexander</td>
<td>St Austell</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chandler</td>
<td>Welwyn</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Denian</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Dye</td>
<td>Innsworth</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Flear</td>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Grange</td>
<td>Creaton</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hall</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilma Jordan</td>
<td>Yateley</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kennedy</td>
<td>Wilmslow</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth McCombe</td>
<td>Emsworth</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Meale</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Meredith</td>
<td>West Wickham</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Osborne</td>
<td>Haywards Heath</td>
<td>W. Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irena Ray-Crosby</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>West Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Sebbage</td>
<td>Long Melford</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Staniford</td>
<td>Ferndown</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Tandy</td>
<td>Wraysbury</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Watson</td>
<td>Great Dunmow</td>
<td>Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Willacy</td>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morag Wilshere</td>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Winder</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Overseas 1 Jan 2006 – 31 Mar 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cummins</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Gee</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Herrmann</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Jago</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Round</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Ward</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>State/Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Benefield</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soren Bergeson</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Caccipuoti</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori M Colling</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Fiore</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Hiebert</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Hill</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, Lonnie &amp; Aaron</td>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Kohl</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Lagone</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Maupin</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann Milani</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariella Nasuti</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starla Kay Roels</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Rovin</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Wright</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the answer is yes then you may not have read *Good King Richard?* by former Society chairman, the late Jeremy Potter.

*Good King Richard?* is an account of Richard III’s life and times, character, appearance and reign, but above all, of the Great Debate which has raged since his death between traditionalists and revisionists. Written to mark the 500th anniversary of his accession to the throne, this is a history of his reputation from 1483 to 1983.

This book is a must for all those who want to know the real Richard III and to understand how 500 years on the Richard III Society are still campaigning to retrieve his true reputation.

Available from the Society’s Sales Liaison Officer. Price £8.50 plus £2.50 p&p.
Walter Welburn 16.05.1920 – 27.03.2006

My first memory of Walter is of him some twenty years ago, standing tall and straight at the top table at the first Medieval Feast held by the South Australian Branch of the Society. He was dressed in medieval attire which his stature allowed him to carry off with great aplomb. He could have stepped straight out of someone’s Book of Hours. It was Walter who, with two others, brought our branch into being early in 1983. He served as Founding Chairman and council member for many years, and continued his membership until his death. Last year we recognised his commitment by making him a life member of the branch, something which brought him obvious delight.

I never asked Walter why he joined the Society, but his sense of fair play would have had something to do with it. It was hardly in Walter’s character to let a fellow Yorkshireman’s good reputation continue to be damaged by bad press, so our branch came into being.

Walter’s involvement was far from being limited to earnest study and argument. He was always ready to add the authentic accent to any skit or play-reading, often with hilarious results. In our singing group Cantata Genista Walter added a reliable bass for our Bosworth memorial services, dinners and other social events – even a wedding.

In recent years, his failing eyesight prevented him from taking as active a part as before, but whenever possible, Walter was there, contributing whenever he could, encouraging, funny and unfailingly kind, always a gentleman, but never quite hiding that fire within which had spread not only to us, but to all who knew him.

Our meetings will never be the same without him. Farewell, dear friend.

Lenis Wells, Adelaide, South Australia

Joy Whitbread

Sadly Joy Whitbread, treasurer of the South Essex Group, lost her fight with cancer on Saturday 5 May. Joy and her family have been active in the South Essex Group for many years, and regularly supported the annual Requiem Mass at St Etheldreda’s. My favourite memory of her is when she played the witch in the play I wrote for the South Essex Group. Joy had great fun with this role, and clearly enjoyed gazing into her crystal ball and going into trances! Our sympathy goes to Joy’s family.

John Ashdown-Hill

Recently Deceased Members

Felicity Burns, Loughton, Essex. Joined 1990
Lesley Davies, Sherborne, Dorset. Joined 1985
Wilma Keppie, Skipton, North Yorkshire. Joined 2004
Anne Killins, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Joined 1989
John MacGregor, Hereford. Joined 2005
David Sutton, Caerphilly, Mid Glamorgan. Joined 2003
Jacquelyn Tubbs, Colchester, Essex. Joined 2004
We run a calendar of all forthcoming events: if you are aware of any events of Ricardian interest, whether organised by the Society - Committee, Visits Committee, Research Committee, Branches/Groups - or by others, please let the Editor have full details, in sufficient time for entry. The calendar will also be run on the website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Originator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>Worcestershire Branch 10th anniversary banquet, Inkberrow East Midlands Branch Study Day, Leicester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10 July</td>
<td>Long weekend visit based on Chester</td>
<td>Visits Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 August</td>
<td>Bosworth - traditional site, Sutton Cheney etc.</td>
<td>Visits Committee see page 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 September</td>
<td>Day Visit, Romney Marsh and Smallhythe</td>
<td>Visits Committee see page 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 September - 1 October</td>
<td>AGM and Members’ Weekend. York</td>
<td>See Winter 2005 issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October</td>
<td>‘Chivalry, the Order of the Garter and St George’s Chapel’, Vicars’ Hall, Windsor</td>
<td>See Winter 2005 issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 November</td>
<td>Norfolk Branch Study Day: The House of Lancaster</td>
<td>See page 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 December</td>
<td>Scottish Branch Christmas Lecture at Edinburgh Castle. ‘The 1482 Invasion’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December</td>
<td>Fotheringhay Nine Lessons and Carols, and Lunch</td>
<td>Fotheringhay Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March</td>
<td>Requiem Mass for King Richard and Queen Anne, at St. Etheldreda’s church, Ely Place and wreath-laying at the queen’s tomb in Westminster Abbey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15 April</td>
<td>Australasian Convention, to be held in greater Wellington area, New Zealand e-mail: <a href="mailto:secretary@richard3nz.org">secretary@richard3nz.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 15 April</td>
<td>Study Weekend in York</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 20 May</td>
<td>Visit to Provence</td>
<td>Visits Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>