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From the Chairman

We had a very successful Members’ Day and AGM in October, with an encouraging turn-out of members at what proved to be an excellent new venue. Our choice of speaker was perhaps controversial to some, but Dr Starkey’s lecture and the audience reaction to it more than justified our decision to invite him. He delivered a compelling lecture, engaging with members in a courteous and respectful way, and was received in a similar manner. Reaction to the day, and the lecture in particular, has been wholly positive. We were also delighted to hear from Australia’s Hazel Hajdu and Canada’s Richard Duncanson at the AGM, their enthusiastic accounts of Ricardian activity in both countries reminding us all that this is a truly international society.

To end the year we have a bumper issue of the Bulletin, brimming over with news and articles which will provide much good and, I hope, inspiring reading over the Christmas holidays, and to add to your enjoyment we introduce colour for the first time. This enables us properly to promote some of our sales items and give a more realistic taste of the Bosworth weekend than black and white would have allowed. There is also a cryptic Ricardian crossword to challenge you all.

In this Bulletin it is particularly pleasing to hear from Rosemary Hawley Jarman in this the fortieth anniversary year of the publication of We Speak No Treason, one of the truly great Ricardian novels. We celebrate two more anniversaries: The Ricardian’s fiftieth birthday is marked by an interview with Anne Sutton, who gives us an insight into her work as editor. The Richard III and Yorkist History Trust has reached its twenty-fifth year and we provide an account of its many achievements since 1986, and Professor Mark Ormrod of the University of York gives a very encouraging assessment from an academic historian’s point of view. We also have a witty and very tongue-in-cheek piece from Professor Colin Richmond about Warwick the Kingmaker and a game of fives. This will, I hope, greatly amuse readers, as long as they don’t take it too seriously.

During the summer we learnt of the discovery in Norfolk of the will of Thomas Longe, a soldier who almost certainly fought at Bosworth for King Richard. He is the first ordinary soldier in the king’s army whom we can identify by name, and we have a report of the discovery as well as details of the will. Next year’s Ricardian will carry an article by John Alban, the Chief Archivist at the Norfolk Record Office, giving the full story. That gems like this can still be found is a great inspiration to those working on the Ricardian Chronicle project, something that I urge members to support.

Over the past year we sadly lost a number of valued officers and members, and in this issue we record the deaths of two more: Margaret York, our longest-serving member and recipient of last year’s Robert Hamblin award, and Anne Buyers, one of the founders of the Canadian Branch. They both gave decades of service to the Society and will be greatly missed. We also have an obituary of Joyce Croft, whose death was recorded briefly in the September Bulletin.

We can look back on another successful Ricardian year, with more to follow in 2012, especially the triennial conference in April. Full details of the exciting programme and impressive range of speakers can be found in this issue. There are still places available, so please book quickly to secure yours. I will certainly be there and look forward to meeting many of you. In the meantime, Beth and I wish all members and their families a very happy Christmas and a safe and prosperous New Year.
Annual General Meeting 2011

Minutes of the 2011 Annual General Meeting of the Richard III Society

The 2011 Annual General Meeting of the Richard III Society was held at The School of Oriental and African Studies, Russell Square, London on Saturday 1 October 2011 at 2.30 pm. 170 members were present.

Chairman’s Opening Remarks
The Chairman, Phil Stone, welcomed members from the UK, Europe and further afield, including Compton Reeves from the US, Hazel Hajdu from Australia and Robert Duncanson from Canada.

He then gave an address, including remarks on the year’s events and proposals for the future. He referred to Dr Starkey’s presentation earlier in the day and commented on how well he felt it had been received, and there was general consent from the audience. He expressed disappointment that an attempt had been made, via the Students’ Union, to organise disruption to Dr Starkey’s appearance but was very pleased that it had been unsuccessful.

He mentioned in particular that The Ricardian was 50 years old this year. The Editor for 34 of these 50 years had been Anne Sutton, and he presented Anne with a basket of white roses to thank her for such a significant contribution. He thanked several people for their input during the year. An edited copy of his address can be found on p.7 of this Bulletin.

Apologies for Absence
Apologies for absence were received from Lesley Boatwright, Andrea Brown, Denys Carden, Jill Davies, Rachel & Gordon Field, Dr H Carron, Ros & Andrew Conaty, Mary Elliot, John Gallagher, Anmmarie Hayek, Joyce Hutton, Philip Jackson, Gillian Kendall, Doreen Leach, Shirley & Roy Linsell, Mr & Mrs J Lovely, Neil Metcalfe, Tula Miller, Callie Orszak Kendall, Charles Rees, Jean Richards, Ian Rogers, Gina Strachan, Eric Thompson, Livia Visser-Fuchs, Jane Weaver.

Minutes of the 2010 Annual General Meeting
These were published in the December 2010 Bulletin. They were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record of the proceedings.

Reports from Members of the Executive Committee and other Society officers:

Lynda Pidgeon reminded all present of the forthcoming Triennial Conference in Loughborough from 20 to 22 April 2012. She urged anyone who had not already booked to do so.

Marian Mitchell gave details of the visits organised during the year and expressed disappointment that some had been cancelled due to lack of support. She commented that the ‘own transport’ trip to Sutton Hoo had been successful, and the Visits Committee may consider more of this type of event. She added that a questionnaire was available on the Visits Table* and encouraged everyone to let the Visits Committee know of places that might be considered for a trip in the coming year. The three-day trip to Bruges in August for the Pageant of the Golden Tree was proving popular. Marian concluded by urging Members to support the visits.

*See p. 14 of this Bulletin, and the centrefold.
Richard Van Allen spoke on a project currently underway in Leicester led by a Society member. The object was to carry out a scientific-based search for the remains of Richard III. The search would centre on and around the site of the Greyfriars monastery – now a council car park near the cathedral. Early ground radar surveys had produced positive results and it was hoped that a television documentary would be made. Further details would be given when available.

Heather Falvey spoke on behalf of Lesley Boatwright to give an update on the York Wills Project. The work is progressing well although much remained to be done with 18 wills still requiring attention. Heather would be creating indexes to the wills and it was hoped to publish in time for the Triennial Conference in April 2012.

Carolyn Hammond, the Society’s Library Co-ordinator, advised that library borrowing figures were up this year although they had not reached the record figures from the 1980s. She added that the librarians were very willing to help to find the right book or paper if members gave details of what they were looking for. She concluded by reminding attendees that there were still books available at bargain prices on the Barton Library stall.

Treasurer’s Report/Adoption of Accounts for Financial Year ending 31 March 2011
The accounts had been printed in the Annual Report, and Paul Foss advised that he had nothing to add. There being no questions, adoption of the accounts was proposed by Jean Judd, seconded by Babs Creamer and approved unanimously.

Appointment of a Qualified Independent Examiner
Paul Foss recommended the continued appointment of Anne Summerell to examine the accounts and no objections were raised.

Reports from Branches/other Officers
A number of reports and messages were received from UK and overseas branches. David Wells read out greetings from Tracy Bryce and Nita Musgrave, respective Chairs of the Canadian and US Branches. David then passed on greetings from Callie Orszak Kendall and Gillian Kendall (daughters of Paul Murray Kendall) who were unable to be present but wished the Society well on this day. They had also sent £100 for the Society to use ‘as it sees fit’. Reports of the past year were received from Hull, North Cumbria and New South Wales branches, and David also read these out.

There followed brief presentations from overseas members – Hazel Hajdu from the Victoria Branch in Australia and Robert Duncanson on behalf of the Canadian Branch. Both talked about activities within their own areas and gave greetings to the UK AGM. Robert intrigued the gathering with talk of ‘Ricardian Bingo’, which aroused a degree of curiosity.

Where transmitted electronically, these messages are available on the website. They include a report of the Australasian Convention held in August 2011.

Resolutions and Motions
No resolutions or motions had been received.

Robert Hamblin Award
The Chairman explained that this award was instituted in memory of the former Society Chairman, Robert Hamblin, as a means of recognising work done by members of the Society that is of particular merit and ‘beyond the call of duty’. Consequently, it is not open to members of the Executive nor to Vice Presidents or the President.

He then gave details of the award for 2011 – which was to be presented to Annmarie Hayek, Secretary of the Norfolk Branch. In his comments on the award the Chairman said:
‘As well as being a tireless worker for both the Society and the Battlefields Trust, every year she organises a superb study day. I say they are superb not just because I have spoken at them on a number of occasions, but because it is true. They are splendid showcases for the academic standing of the Society.’

Family commitments meant that Annmarie was unable to be present at the AGM. The Chairman and his wife were to see her soon and would present the certificate at that time.

**Election of President**
The re-election of Peter Hammond as President of the Society was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Derek McCulloch and carried unanimously.

**Election of Vice-Presidents**
The Chairman, on behalf of the Executive Committee, proposed John Audsley, Kitty Bristow, Carolyn Hammond, Moira Habberjam and Rob Smith as Vice-Presidents. The nomination was seconded by Ruth Gayfer and carried unanimously.

Peter Hammond then thanked the meeting on behalf of the Vice Presidents and himself. He mentioned the work of the Executive Committee and the various Committees – such as the Bulletin, Research and Visits Committees and the Ways & Means Sub-Committee. He commented that, whilst there was a lot of work involved, it was pleasurable and generally enjoyed by all. He hoped that the outcomes were appreciated. He went on to say that the Society was not standing still and must continue to present a professional and appropriate image to ensure that it is taken seriously.

**Election of Executive Committee for 2010/2011**
Nominations to the Executive Committee had been received for Lesley Boatwright, Howard Choppin, Paul Foss, Marian Mitchell, Wendy Moorhen, Lynda Pidgeon, Phil Stone, Anne Sutton, Richard Van Allen, David Wells, Susan Wells and Geoffrey Wheeler.

The President pointed out that the nominations would result in an Executive Committee of 12 persons. The constitution permitted up to 14 members. This meant that it would not be necessary to hold individual elections and he asked the meeting to consider the nominations as a whole.

The nominations were formally moved by Andrea Lindow, seconded by Nicky Bland and carried unanimously.

Phil Stone then thanked the meeting on behalf of all nominees.

**Important Dates for 2012**
The annual Bosworth commemoration would take place on Sunday 19 August 2012 although the Society would have a presence at the Battlefield event throughout the weekend.

The carol service at Fotheringhay would take place on Saturday 15 December 2012.

**Date of AGM 2012**
The AGM and Members’ Day for 2012 will take place on Saturday 29 September in the Merchant Adventurers’ Hall, York. The speaker will be the historian George Goodwin, who has recently published a book entitled *Fatal Colours* about the battle of Towton. The book has an introduction by Dr David Starkey, which he acknowledged in his talk.

**Open Forum and Questions**
One formal question had been posted by Frank Bland, who asked what happened to review copies of books once the review had been completed. This was answered by Anne Sutton who commented that the reviewers retained the books. She added that it was a ‘perk’ that encouraged reviews and that many would not be undertaken otherwise.
Any Other Business
Elisabeth Sjöberg mentioned the possibility of the Barton Library publishing a ‘wish list’ of books that it did not possess. She felt that it might encourage members to donate such books, especially the more expensive ones.

Howard Choppin thanked the Chairman for his work and support – to both the Executive Committee and the Society as a whole – during the past year. He added that, as Vice Chairman, he had appreciated even more the level of input from the Chairman.

RCRF Raffle
Elizabeth Nokes supervised the drawing of the winning tickets and selection of prizes for the raffle. First prize was won by Anne Ayres.

Close of AGM
The Chairman closed the meeting at 4.00pm. He extended thanks to a number of people, mentioning in particular the Croydon Group for their work on reception, the stall holders for their efforts, Elizabeth Nokes for organising the raffle and the Joint Secretaries for arranging the day. He ended by thanking everyone for attending.

The thirty-third Major Craft Sale at the AGM and Members’ Day

The thirty-third Major Craft Sale, which is in aid of the Ricardian Churches Restoration Fund, made a total of £303.61

Grateful thanks are offered, as always, to all who contributed to the success of the sale, either by serving on the stalls or contributing items for sale or raffle. We know who the former were, but suspect we do not know the names of all the latter, as people came up to the stalls with items for sale throughout the day: so, if your name is not listed below, and you did contribute, very grateful thanks, nevertheless.

Known contributors and helpers, whom we thank: Kitty Bristow, Elizabeth Claridge, Barbara Ellams, Pamela Evans, Jean Hester, Frederick Hepburn, Renée Jennison, Maureen Nunn, Elisabeth Sjöberg, Margaret Stiles, Beth Stone, Richard Van Allen, Joyce Wells, Sue and Dave Wells, Geoffrey Wheeler.

Elizabeth Nokes and Phil Stone, RCRF Trustees
Continuing to make our presence felt

The Chairman’s Address to the Society’s AGM 2011

I hope you all enjoyed the lecture by Dr Starkey. Inviting him was controversial but the fact that over 200 members signed up to hear him, some coming from Canada, Australia, the USA and across Europe, shows that he was a popular choice of speaker. He was invited in his capacity as a distinguished historian and I think his lecture demonstrated that it was right to invite him.

Any meeting of this nature involves a lot of work and effort by a number of people, so my thanks to everyone who has contributed, and particularly to our joint secretaries, Sue and Dave Wells. They are very much a dynamic duo, although which is Batman and which is Robin, I’m not sure – neither seems to wear their underpants outside their trousers! The secretariat is the lynch-pin of the Society and, while we have been well served in the past, we are extremely fortunate now to have Sue and Dave sharing the role. We also now have new Business Manager, Stephen York. He brings much valuable knowledge and experience and we are already feeling the benefit of it and with a name like York, he must be a good thing.

Of course, I’m grateful for the contribution made by all the officers and it’s always my pleasure during the AGM to thank everyone involved with the work of the Society. Let us not forget people like our stock-holders who store our publications and sales items and make the journey to the post office to despatch them to members. Without these contributions, freely given, of course, we simply wouldn’t be able to function.

Sadly, we have lost some valued members and officers during the year: Anne Smith, Tony Gayfer, Brian Moorhen, Peter Lee, Bill White and too many others who have passed on and are best known to their local branches and groups. We will miss them all very much and we send our best wishes to their families. Another loss was Margaret York who died just before the Bosworth weekend. Beth and I attended her funeral on 22 August, where I had the privilege of giving the eulogy. She, too, will be greatly missed.

Our finances are stable and sound, and that’s no mean achievement under the ever present gathering financial storm clouds. For that I thank our treasurer, Paul Foss. We have been fortunate this year in that Isolde Wigram and Anne Smith have left the Society legacies which amount to a little over £6,000. We want to use this money wisely and would welcome suggestions. Please let me know if you have any thoughts.

At every AGM, I stress the importance of our two key publications, The Ricardian and the Bulletin. They bind us together as an internationally renowned society. This year is no different and I thank Anne Sutton and the Bulletin Editorial Team under editor-in-chief Lesley Boatwright. It’s The Ricardian’s fiftieth birthday this year, and for thirty-four of the fifty years, The Ricardian has been edited by Anne and we all salute her for it.

Of significant importance in keeping the Society together is our website, which continues to be the main source of new members. I thank the two key people involved in keeping it up to date - my wife, Beth, and our webmaster, Jane Weaver. We also have a presence on Facebook, and I am greatly encouraged by the progress we are making there.

Over the past year, we have been active in many fields.

- We celebrated the centenary of the birth of Paul Murray Kendall with his two daughters, Callie and Gillian, in March and when they joined us for the Bosworth weekend for the unveiling of the memorial bench in memory of their father.
- We have expanded our range of promotional items. There are the splendid new
Society badge and pendant, a new drawing of Richard’s standard and the impressive bronze plaques of King Richard and Queen Anne Neville. My thanks to Geoffrey Wheeler for his excellent work on the design of the standard and the plaques.

- In York this April, the Research Committee held another very enjoyable Study Weekend
- The Research Committee launched the exciting Ricardian Chronicle Project, which amongst other things, encourages participants to look anew at local records and archives.
- A new updated edition of *Ricardian Britain* was launched. It was first produced many years ago and was for far too long out of print. It was decided to publish it online this time as that makes it much easier to keep up to date.

In any review of the Ricardian year we must not forget our regular activities – visits and commemorations, the branch meetings, the bursaries we grant, and the work of the Ricardian Churches Restoration Fund amongst others. All too often unsung, all these activities are essential to our success.

I think we can justly say that the Society has continued to make its presence felt in a constructive and positive way. Not that we can become complacent. Our work continues and if I sum up our immediate priorities, they would be:

- To keep our finances on a sound footing;
- To do all we can to retain members and to attract new ones;
- To expand and enhance our commitment to historical research; and
- To ensure that we effectively communicate all these to members and the wider world.

Over the next year and beyond, we already have some positive things to look forward to:

- We hope to be back at the Leeds Medieval Congress when we will be sponsoring a series of lectures and, of course, we will be present again on the battlefields at Tewkesbury and Bosworth.
- The visits team have an enticing programme for 2012 which includes, at the end of August, a visit to Bruges for the Pageant of the Golden Tree. It’s truly an experience not to be missed.
- Next April, we will be in Loughborough for our Triennial Conference which will focus on the new discoveries at Bosworth.
- During 2012, we will publish the results of the York Wills project, which has involved transcribing wills from the Prerogative Court of York.
- We hope, during 2012, to make progress with our plans to erect a plaque in Wingfield Church in Suffolk to commemorate John de la Pole, Richard III’s heir presumptive, and his brothers.
- As ever, throughout the year, we will continue to seek out and take advantage of media opportunities. Engaging with the media has many dangers, and we are fortunate to have Richard Van Allen keeping a watchful eye over our public and media relations.

I have thanked several named members of the Society and especially the Executive Committee in this address. Before I close let me thank the others who have not had a special mention. No-one is more aware than me that without them, the Society would be the poorer and I would most certainly not be in a position to give an up-beat resumé of the state of the Society.

2012 will be a busy year and we will make a welcome return to York where our Members’
Day will take over the Merchant Adventurers’ Hall. Our speaker will be George Goodwin, whose book, *Fatal Colours*, is about the Battle of Towton.

For nearly ninety years, we have worked hard to promote the rehabilitation of King Richard’s reputation and we will continue with all the vigour we can muster to show the world he really was Good King Richard.

Fans of the BBC’s ‘Horrible Histories’ series will know that there have been several references this year to the Wars of the Roses. One programme included a very catchy song about Richard III, sung by the king himself. It gave a very positive image of the king on a popular programme aimed at younger viewers. The song has many memorable lines, such as:

Tudor propaganda, it’s all absurd,
Time to tell the truth about Richard III

I don’t think any of us will disagree with that. Thank you.

The Robert Hamblin Award

The Award was instituted in memory of former Chairman, Robert Hamblin, as a means of recognising work done by members of the Society that is of particular merit and ‘beyond the call of duty’. In their own way, each recipient is, or has been, a tireless worker for the Society or for furthering its aims.

This year, it was awarded to Annmarie Hayek for her work in the Norfolk Branch and especially for organising the extremely successful annual study day.

As well as thanking the Executive Committee for the Award, Annmarie writes:

I first became interested in Richard III when I was 16 and it was, as is often the case, because of *The Daughter of Time*. A friend suggested I read it, and that was it, I was set on a path for life.

I had always been interested in history but can remember at school being told I knew too many strange things. That was because, when we studied Nelson, I knew about Lady Hamilton and no one else in the class did. It was a long time ago, we led sheltered lives then.

I re-joined the Society in the 1980s and soon after became Secretary of the Norfolk Branch and I’m still here. I organise a full programme of events each year which I hope people still want to attend and so far they do.

On a personal note, my working life was in libraries and the civil service. I travelled and worked abroad as an au pair for several years. I love reading, organising events and just being lazy sometimes. I also run the East Anglian Region of The Battlefields Trust, am heavily involved in Youth football, which I believe shapes and defines character, and I’ve just become a school governor.

On a more personal note, I’ve been married to Ziad, a Jordanian, for 37 years and we have one son. Ziad has become quite fond of Richard III over the years and, as many can testify, he has welcomed Ricardians and Battlefield Trust members with unfailing hospitality and generosity.

I hope to continue for longer before I run out of ideas, you can then put me out to grass.

Annmarie Hayek
The Annual Report 2010/2011: an omission and a correction

Due to an editorial error the visits entry for the 2010/11 Annual Report was omitted from the published report. We reproduce here the entry that should have appeared and apologise to the Visits Officer Marian Mitchell and the Visits Team. Also, in the Branches and Groups section of the report we incorrectly referred to the Yorkshire Branch as the ‘largest home branch’. That should have read ‘one of the largest’, as the London and Home Counties Branch is in fact the largest UK branch in terms of membership.

VISITS REPORT, 2010/2011

The Visits Committee organised two day-trips and a long weekend in France during the reporting year, together with the annual visits to Bosworth and Fotheringhay.

The first trip in May 2010 was to Kenilworth, not exactly Ricardian but well worth a visit and thoroughly enjoyed by all. July saw an intrepid band following in the footsteps of the Black Prince and Henry V with visits to Crécy and Agincourt from a base in Calais. On the annual commemoration day-visit to Bosworth in August there was an opportunity to see, from a distance, the newly discovered ‘real’ site of the battle. September’s visit was to Tewkesbury where, after a quick visit to Clarence in his Abbey vault, guides from the Battlefield Society made the Battle of Tewkesbury come to life. In December, carols at Fotheringhay rounded off the year beautifully. All the trips this year were successful, with full or very nearly full coaches. For Tewkesbury, there was even a waiting list.

The Visits Committee, led by Marian Mitchell, is a small team of dedicated volunteers who endeavour to arrange interesting outings at reasonable prices. Coach hire charges escalate each year, and this is the largest element of visit costs. These charges are based on a take up of 30, which is not always achieved, so please continue to support the trips and the work of the Visits team.

Summing up the AGM

The event coincided with the SOAS students’ Freshers’ Week, and there were hundreds of students visiting the stalls outside the building. Many members felt that this added atmosphere to the event, although at times access to the front of the building was akin to an assault course, and it was hard to find somewhere to eat sandwiches. The threat of student protest about Dr Starkey’s presence, as advised to us on the Thursday afternoon, meant a great deal of extra work for the Joint Secretaries to ensure that the event went ahead and everyone’s safety was assured. Fortunately, nothing transpired, and the lecture was very well received by almost all of the audience.

It was the hottest October day for many years, and the sales and exhibition room was very warm, but the lecture auditorium was air-conditioned and comfortable. The venue proved to be very popular, with excellent facilities and accessibility, and we had arranged for SOAS to provide what seemed to be an endless supply of tea, coffee, water and biscuits. 198 people had registered to attend, of whom 170 actually came. Society sales were brisk, and the final total from the sales of books, badges, plaques etc. was just under £950, excluding the Barton Library, and RCRF craft stall (for which see earlier). Annette Carson’s pre-signed copies of The Maligned King proved to be a best-seller on the day. Once again, the Battlefields Trust and White Boar Sales had tables, and both reported a lot of interest and brisk business.

All in all, a very successful day, and a number of members have since told us how much they enjoyed the event. Our thanks go to all who worked so hard to make it such a good day, especially our joint secretaries, Dave and Sue Wells.
Whatever may be thought about Dr Starkey’s opinions about Richard III, he is an unfailingly entertaining and informative speaker. His lecture at the AGM did not disappoint.

Dr Starkey began by saying that 1485 is always presented as a turning point but that is ‘completely nonsensical’. Henry VII was the most insecure of any English ruler not excluding Richard III. The fact that he managed to stay on the throne had made his survival seem inevitable, but this was far from the truth. Nor is there any evidence that the red rose was used before 1485. The present Welsh Herald Extraordinary has carried out research and investigated heraldic badges, and has found no evidence for its prior use. Edward IV did use the white rose, but his primary badge was the sun in splendour. The Lancastrians favoured the white swan or ‘SS’ but not a red rose. This was a deliberate invention of Henry VII and Richard Foxe,* who was a master propagandist. The house of Lancaster became extinct in 1471. All males of the house of Beaufort were killed before 1471 and Edward IV had only kept Henry VI alive while his son Edward still lived and he did not know where to find him. After all, Dr Starkey said, ‘It was incredibly stupid not to kill the heir’. There was therefore no Lancastrian following; it had to be invented to give Henry VII parity with Elizabeth of York. The Wars of the Roses was a piece of Tudor fiction, with history invented ‘backwards’. George Goodwin in his recent book on Towton has demonstrated how extraordinary and unexpected Henry VII’s achievement was in winning the throne.

Henry had been in exile for years. His first language was effectively French, the key members of his inner court were French, and his ambassador to France was French. Dr Starkey reminded us that every dynastic change was the result of a foreign invasion. The British coastline is potentially one big harbour, and it was not until Henry VIII’s reign, when the coastline was surveyed and fortified, that we became a defensible island. Henry VII’s success was extraordinary, but it was a French invasion; the troops, ships and money were all French. It was an accident of continental politics; success was dependent upon foreign support.

It was therefore necessary to invent the red rose in 1485. The Tudor rose was no use to Henry VII. The only person who could use it was Henry VIII, who embodied both roses. There was no Tudor following and Henry therefore had to invent one. His following was based on his fellow exiles, the Wydeviles and the Kent gentry; he had no natural following – in contrast to the house of York. The Yorkists had been a successful dynasty for more than twenty years and were particularly favoured by the aristocracy.

Henry’s lack of a following was a recipe

Yorkist Sentiment in the Reign of Henry VII

DAVID STARKEY

The inaugural Isolde Wigram Memorial Lecture was given at the Society’s 2011 AGM by Dr David Starkey to a large and very appreciative audience.

This summary of Dr Starkey’s lecture is by Lynda Pidgeon.
for profound and sustained insecurity. The attitude was that if someone as improbable as Henry could win the throne then anyone could. He was of bastard descent on both sides his family, and it could be said he had a better claim to the French throne than the English one. He was permanently faced with real usurpers until the last three years of his reign, and this shaped the childhood of Henry VIII. The Tudor myth was created by Richard Foxe and John Morton, who had been busy in Rome prior to Bosworth on Henry’s behalf. They came up with the literary myth of the two badges based on a red and white rose which were united by the marriage of Henry and Elizabeth of York. However, Henry had delayed his marriage to Elizabeth because he did not want his claim to be dependent upon his wife.

There had been a serious attempt to unite York and Lancaster earlier. A plan to restore Elizabeth Wydevile as queen dowager led to the Buckingham revolt, or, more accurately, a ‘ladies’ revolt’, as Elizabeth and Margaret Beaufort had worked together. Margaret Beaufort was an awkward figure. As king’s mother, she needed a special label and was referred to as ‘my lady, the king’s mother’. This was nothing new, but imitated what had been done for Cecily Neville.

At the beginning of Henry’s reign there were three women vying for a regal position, Elizabeth of York, Elizabeth Wydevile and Margaret Beaufort. Elizabeth of York as the queen was a pleasant undemanding woman. However, her mother and mother-in-law were two extraordinary women who were also rivals. Margaret Beaufort was a mean, grasping, assertive, and unforgiving woman.

In 1486 Elizabeth Wydevile was created queen dowager and had her property restored, but not long after she was stripped of everything and sent off to a nunnery. It was the remnants of a Wydevile group which led to the next rebellion. The heraldic accounts of the first years of Henry’s reign have been overlooked; they demonstrate just how difficult Henry found it to raise an army for Stoke. To try to rouse support, he publicised the papal endorsement of his marriage to Elizabeth. It proclaimed the title of Henry and his queen who was the authentic Yorkist, not Lincoln, nor Simnel who was a fraud. This seems to have worked. Henry was dependent for his survival upon Yorkist support.

The early years of his reign were a peculiar period. While trying to present a united front, he was also deliberately trying to go back and personalise his reign as Lancastrian. Henry nearly bankrupted himself trying to establish his regime. Then Warbeck appeared, and this was another Yorkist conspiracy, which was backed by France. There is a pattern to all revolts: domestic and foreign support appeared in all conspiracies. This came near to destroying Henry VII. To counter Warbeck, Henry invaded France to force Charles VIII to give up his support for the pretender. Indeed, the whole of English foreign policy was redirected to dealing with the problem of pretenders. After Henry invaded France he made peace, and he was able to embed the idea of peace in the minds of all his councillors and nobles by allowing them to accept French bribes, thus making possible the peace treaty.
With the loss of French support, Warbeck fled to Mechelen where he was supported by Margaret of Burgundy, whose primary purpose in life was to restore the house of York. Warbeck went on to Scotland and obtained Scottish support. Henry’s response was to launch the largest military operation since Henry V’s day. Once again he was fighting a pretender with foreign support. The Cornish revolt, which was unconnected to Warbeck, caused additional problems. All Henry’s troops were in the Midlands and heading for the north, while the south was defenceless. He immediately sent his wife and Prince Henry to the safety of the Tower. His eldest son, Prince Arthur, was safe in Ludlow. It took weeks to obtain sufficient forces to deal with the Cornish, who were defeated at the battle of Blackheath. There was genuine fear that Henry would lose, but Warbeck was too slow to take advantage of the Cornish revolt and arrived after they were defeated.

Henry now created his second son duke of York, which was a deliberate policy as the usual title for a second son was duke of Clarence. However, York was the title Warbeck had used. Henry’s creation as duke of York was an elaborate, glamorous event, more so than his brother’s creation as prince of Wales. This was to counter Warbeck’s own creation which had benefited from the splendour of Burgundy. Henry made peace with Scotland to ensure they did not back another pretender.

The marriage of Arthur to Katherine of Aragon provided an alliance that would unite Lancaster and Tudor. Katherine was a descendant of John of Gaunt, and she too had a Lancastrian claim to the throne which was more legitimate than Henry VII’s, but Spain had no dynastic interest in England except as an ally against France.

The third pretender was Edmund, earl of Suffolk. His rebellion is interesting because he was the senior joust at the early Tudor court. His connections were all Yorkist and centred on Elizabeth of York. All his friends were first cousins, Thomas, marquis of Dorset, and William Courtenay, who were also jousters. At the marriage of Arthur and Katherine of Aragon in 1501, Henry set up a grand international joust at Calais, of which the stars were the Yorkist jousters. A few months later Suffolk rebelled and went to the Netherlands, where he declared himself to be the true Yorkist heir.

Since Suffolk was Henry’s star joust; this was very humiliating for him. The Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian, now had a hold over Henry, since this was no pretender but a genuine Yorkist. Henry now devoted all his efforts to getting his hands on Suffolk. The scale of this was huge. The Netherlands was a major trading partner so any action could be dangerous for the English economy, but Maximilian could be bribed because he was broke.

Henry received £15,000 in tribute from previous treaties with France, yet he paid Philip of Burgundy and Maximilian £150,000 in cash. This demonstrates the huge level of fear he had of the Yorkist pretenders. However, it was chance that solved his problem. When the archduke was shipwrecked off the English coast, Henry kept him as a hostage until he agreed to hand over Suffolk and sign a treaty of alliance with Henry.

Only in 1509 was the dynastic uncertainty finally resolved with the accession of Henry VIII. Everyone accepted Henry except Suffolk. The dynastic question ended with Henry VIII, who united York and Lancaster in his person.

Dr Starkey ended with some observations about Henry VII’s style of government. Henry had done all he could to preserve his hold on the crown. The Milanese ambassador made some interesting comments on this period, as did the Spanish ambassador, who claimed that Henry had adopted French methods of government and intended to get rid of parliament. He raised taxes without consent through the use of recognisances and bonds. There was a genuine debate in 1509 over whether we would have a parliament or not.

* Note: Bishop Foxe was bishop of Winchester from 1501 to 1528. His portrait hangs in the National Portrait Gallery, London.
Membership Matters

Thank you to those members who have renewed their membership, particularly those who have also sent in their cheques or updated their standing orders for the new subscription rates. If it has slipped your mind and you have paid at the old rate, you will have a personal reminder to this effect and the opportunity to make a further payment.

Unfortunately, the banks have paid a number of standing orders twice, at the old and the new subscription rates. By the time you receive this Bulletin I hope the necessary refunds will have been made, as this is something which I give priority to after all the transactions have been completed, but if this has not happened please let me know, and ideally supply your sort code, account number and name of the account so that a direct transfer can be made to your bank account. Apparently one of the reasons for this is that the banks have processed the name of the Society as Richard 111 (one, one, one) and not with the customary Roman numbers (Richard III), and therefore their IT systems have not picked up that the earlier standing order should have been cancelled, i.e. this is human and not computer error.

If you have not renewed, a reminder will be mailed out in January, but please note that this Bulletin is the last that will be sent to you until payment is made. If you do not intend to renew, it would be very helpful to let me know, and you can use the insert form in the September issue.

Despite the continuance of the financial crisis, I am delighted to report that donations are still being received from several members, so thank you to all concerned.

Wendy Moorhen

Visits Committee Survey 2011

Your Visits Committee wants to provide long weekend visits and day visits that Society members want.

Visits Committee members – Marian Mitchell (Chair), Kitty Bristow, Ros Conaty, Elizabeth Nokes, Phil Stone and Rosemary Waxman – all put in a lot of work to make visits a success, and are very disappointed when visits have to be cancelled. During 2011 a long weekend to Sussex and a day visit to Abingdon and Oxford had to be cancelled due to insufficient support.

To run a coach visit we need at least 30 coach bookings to make the trip viable. However, if we run long weekends and visits using public transport (and perhaps taxis) we do not need a minimum number of applicants to enable the visit to go ahead. The day visit to Woodbridge and Sutton Hoo on 30 July 2011 and the proposed long weekend to Bruges 25-27 August 2012 to attend the Golden Tree Pageant have both been arranged using public transport only. Nineteen people booked for and attended the former and bookings have just closed for the latter.

In the centre-fold of this Bulletin is a two page survey regarding day and long-weekend visits. We would very much like you to complete this survey. To encourage you to do so there will be a prize of a £20 book token. The names of all entrants will be put into a draw, which will take place at a Visits Committee meeting in March 2012. (Members of the Executive and Visits Committees are excluded from the prize draw, but we would certainly like them to complete and send in the survey.) The results of the survey and the name of the prizewinner will be announced in the June 2012 Bulletin. We have no objection if the survey is completed jointly, provided that you do not mind sharing the prize if you win.

Closing date for receipt 31 January 2012. Please post your completed surveys to Ros Conaty, White Rose House, 15 Sutton Road, Walpole Cross Keys, King’s Lynn, Norfolk PE34 4HD. (Tel 01553 827367)

Alternatively, requests for survey forms as an email attachment can be sent to Rosemary Waxman at rwaxman@btinternet.com; completed forms can be returned to her by email (Tel 0208 521 4261).
BOSWORTH AND WARFARE

- new finds, new ideas -

Don't miss the exciting Richard III Society Triennial Conference, to be held at Burleigh Court, Loughborough, from 20-22 April 2012

There is still time to book a place on next year’s triennial conference, but it’s filling up fast. This is one not to miss, with five first-class speakers exploring recent finds and research on battles and fifteenth-century warfare. It’s an opportunity to hear about all these developments and engage in discussions about them with the speakers and fellow members.

The Theme:
It’s all about new discoveries and new thinking: from the discovery of the new site of Bosworth and the war graves of Towton to new thinking about battle records, armour and weapons.

The Speakers:
Dr Glenn Foard, Project Officer for the Battlefields Trust, who led the Bosworth archaeological team that found the battle’s new location: Glenn will speak about the search for the real site of the battle of Bosworth, the finds that have been made and what is planned for the future.
Dr Tim Sutherland, Honorary Research Fellow in Battlefield Archaeology at the University of Bradford: Tim will tell us about the latest finds from the grave pits of Towton and what they can teach us about fifteenth century warfare and the people who fought in battle.
Professor Anne Curry, Professor of Medieval History at the University of Southampton and author of a number of books on Agincourt: Anne will explore the way battles were written about in contemporary records and chronicles and outline the problems we face in interpreting them.
Dr Toby Capwell, Curator of Arms & Armour at the Wallace Collection: Toby will speak about English armour of the Yorkist period, and in particular the armour that Richard III may have used. He gave a superb lecture on these subjects at the Society AGM in 2009, and will be bringing us fully up to date with his latest research at the conference.
Mark Stretton, a world record holding Bowman and Master arrow smith: Mark will tell us about war bows and their power and effectiveness in battle.

There will also be an optional Saturday afternoon guided visit to Bosworth and the battle-field centre.

The Venue:
The Burleigh Court Conference Centre at the University of Loughborough. This is a four star hotel with full conference facilities and disability access.

The Costs:
Single room: £275 per room; Sharing in Twin/Double: £440 per room/£220 per person.
Non-residential: £95 per person, with option for Friday dinner (£26) and Saturday dinner (£26).

Please complete the application form in the centre of this Bulletin and be sure to answer all the questions. For those who originally filled in the form in the March issue, please note the new question about tea or coffee at Bosworth, and let Jacqui Emerson know your choice.

Don’t delay!

Get your application in as soon as possible to book a place.
In March this year, Chicago new member Judy G. Thomson, lamenting the fact that Richard III had no significant memorial tomb or effigy, proposed to the Society’s Executive Committee that one should be commissioned. She envisaged an elaborate carved marble tomb chest, inlaid with a full-size memorial brass, and supplied sketches of her initial ideas. Doubtless she would now admit that the scheme was rather over-ambitious in scale, and, given the precarious state of the country’s economy and the global recession, it would be an impossible task even to attempt to raise the money needed for it. Furthermore, the most obvious site, Leicester Cathedral, already had its commemorative ledger-stone, installed by the Society in 1982, so another is unlikely to have been approved, even if the lengthy process of obtaining a faculty was successful.

However, one of her suggestions for fund-raising, the production of small-scale replicas of the brass image, seemed attractive, and a more viable proposition, and so it was decided to explore the possibilities further.

Since the 1970s there have been a number of brass-rubbing centres set up throughout Britain, which make use of cast-resin replicas of the more famous and interesting examples, as well as recreating lost and ‘new’ images where none exist, such as those of Robert the Bruce and Shakespeare. Unfortunately, the intervening years have seen a decline in these establishments, and the only one to remain in Central London is that located in the crypt of St Martin in the Fields church. Enquiries showed that the majority of their stock, both full-size replicas for brass-rubbing on site, as well as miniature examples, was supplied by the Canterbury Studios, Haslemere, Surrey, and I duly contacted the director, Brian Jeffcoat, who was enthusiastic and keen to take up the challenge of producing something for Richard III.

Brian trained as a technical illustrator before developing his interest in monumental brasses and exploring the potential for reproducing designs in resin-based materials. From 1975 to 1984 he ran the Canterbury Brass-rubbing Centre, and during this time experimented with a range of brass-rubbing plates based on alternative designs, ranging from medieval woodcuts to illuminated manuscripts. The studio’s current collection features intricate designs from The Book of Kells, The Lindisfarne Gospels and The Book of Durrow, and he also undertakes special commissions for museums, historical societies and educational establishments. The design process begins by producing a large-scale detailed black-and-white image of the subject, with no half-tones. A metal plate using this is then etched to the required size, then filed by hand, ready to be mounted and used as the basis for a silicon-rubber mould. The moulds are used to produce the finished plaques, cast all in one piece, using polyester resin mixed with sintered metal (brass powder) for the figure, and crushed marble incorporated into the base.

In seeking inspiration for the Richard model, it soon became apparent that the customary figure of a praying, armoured knight would be rather difficult to achieve, with respect to transferring the image from any of the existing portraits to a full-face view, something attempted by a number of sculptors and wax modellers, with varying success, and, bearing in mind the small scale of the finished article (approximately 7 inches long), it would not be easy to reproduce the facial expression in any great detail. Fortunately, however, there already existed a suitable prototype in the form of a figure.
Primary source material and development of the design for the Richard III plaque: the numbers in square brackets in the text refer to these illustrations
designed by former member Ian Kestle [1] for his 1985 Battle of Bosworth poster, showing the king in Gothic armour, holding a battle-axe, with the boar at his feet. The canopy and inscription (which includes some questionable dates) would have to be omitted and, in order to ensure accuracy, it was decided to seek the approval of Tobias Capwell, Curator of Arms and Armour at the Wallace Collection, whose stimulating talk on the subject at a recent AGM was reported in that year’s Bulletin. Unfortunately, his verdict was distinctly negative: ‘the design ... drawn a number of years ago is quite inaccurate. [The king] is portrayed in German armour, which he almost certainly would not have worn. The domestic English style is by far the more likely, quite different from the German in appearance.’ Supporting this, a preferred illustration was cited [2], a reconstruction artwork by Graham Turner. The armour depicted is based on that worn by Ralph Fitzherbert on his alabaster tomb effigy at Norbury church, Derbyshire [3], celebrated for being the only one remaining from whose Yorkist livery collar Richard’s boar badge still survives. An additional heraldic element was also introduced, a version of the rose-en-soleil badge [4] in a simpler form [5], designed to counterpoint the shield of arms incorporated into the design of the brass to Queen Anne Neville, planned as a companion plaque. Several versions of Richard’s boar were also considered [6] [7] before deciding on the final image [8], considered the most aesthetically pleasing, which is based on that shown in the stained glass at Cardiff Castle [9] depicting figures of King Richard and Queen Anne. At a late stage in the design it was wondered if the substitution of a warhammer for the battle-axe (which, after all, is only known as Richard’s traditional weapon from sixteenth-century sources) might be considered, as difficulty exists in the casting process where sharp-pointed features occur, such as the crown and the axe-head here. However, as the hammer is not a two-handed weapon, this had to be rejected, as it would have involved considerable re-drawing of the figure’s stance, and possibly threatened the agreed deadline for completion.

Notes
1 A title unashamedly borrowed from an event which has passed into Society folklore. At the unveiling of memorials at Fotheringhay commemorating Richard’s birthplace and the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, the Guardian’s correspondent, Geoffrey Moorhouse, concluded his account as if the event had been reported in their Births column: ‘to Richard and Mary, twin plaques’. See G.V. Awdry’s History of the Richard III Society: the first fifty years (1976), chapter 13, and (in the Society’s press-cuttings archive) The Guardian, 11 May 1964.
2 Copies of the poster are still available from the Society’s Sales Office. Printed in gold on blue, the opposing figure of Henry Tudor is shown in Milanese armour, with an account of the battle, unfortunately now out of date owing to subsequent research, and other illustrations in the centre.
4 Personal communication to the Canterbury Studios, copy to the author, 6 July 2011.
5 See Christopher Gravett, The English Medieval Knight 1400-1500, Osprey Warrior series no. 35, plate F. The artist also depicts Richard wearing identical armour in his painting Challenge in the Mist, of the battle of Barnet.
7 Featured on the cover of The Ricardian no. 1, October 1961, as illustrated in the September 2011 Bulletin (p.14). The boar is a notoriously difficult beast to depict accurately heraldically. The series of windows showing the Lords of Glamorgan was designed by Paul Woodroffe c.1923 (I am indebted to C.E.J. Smith for this information) and the boar was featured on a number of Society artefacts, from the tie and silk commemorative head-square in 1983 to the most recent 2011 Royal Standard design.
8 As is shown by Graham Turner’s painting of Richard facing death, Bosworth 1485, Christopher Gravett, Osprey Military Series no. 66, pp.24-25.
Two Anniversaries:

1. The Ricardian at Fifty

An interview with the editor, Dr Anne Sutton

HEATHER FALVEY

This year marks the fiftieth anniversary of the first issue of the *The Ricardian*, published in October 1961. This journal is one of several important channels through which the Society furthers its aim ‘to promote in every possible way research into the life and times of Richard III’. Indeed it provides both members of the Society and academics with the ideal forum for contributions that will ‘secure a reassessment of material relating to the period’.

In 1975 the then editor resigned unexpectedly, and, following a brief ‘caretaker’ managership by Peter and Carolyn Hammond, Anne was invited to take over the role of editor. At the time she was already involved with the Society’s research agenda and was working with Peter on the *Coronation of Richard III*. Although her appointment was not for a fixed period, in 1977 she certainly did not imagine that she would still be in post 34 years later. In 2003 a special edition of *The Ricardian* was published to celebrate, in 2002, her 25 years of editorship. The wide-ranging contributions by colleagues, friends and fellow academics to *Tant d’emprises – so many undertakings*, edited by Livia Visser-Fuchs, illustrate Anne’s numerous research interests. Livia’s Introduction (p.v) provides a summary of the ‘Herculean labour’ involved in editing *The Ricardian*. The bibliography of Anne’s published work between 1975 and 2002 (pp.xv-xx) indicates the extent to which she had researched and written on various aspects of fifteenth-century history – and, of course, this now needs updating with items published subsequently.

The *Bulletin* Committee knew that members would be interested to learn more about the journal and its editor, and so I met up with Anne in the tearoom of Cambridge University Library for a chat about this, that and *The Ricardian*. What follows is a summary of that conversation.

As an archivist at the former Corporation of London Record Office (1972-81) and then as the archivist of the Mercers’ Company (1981-2002), Anne is well qualified to edit a fifteenth-century journal. Her knowledge of medieval documents and relevant secondary literature is encyclopaedic. As an archivist she developed a secure grounding in medieval documents and, of course, when working in archives, not only could she serve her employers and researchers in those institutions, but also she had the advantage of very easy access to material germane to her own research. Although retirement and removal from London to Bury St Edmunds mean that she is no longer on the spot, so to speak, her research continues, as her published output testifies. Indeed, she can be seen in the Manuscripts Room of the Cambridge University Library on a weekly basis, making good use of her free bus pass to travel from Bury to Cambridge.
For many years The Ricardian was issued quarterly; the issue of Tant d’emprises in 2003 prompted the change to an annual publication. In some ways this has eased the editor’s work because she has only one looming deadline per year, rather than four, but of course the number of items within the journal is about the same. Initially The Ricardian was a small (folded foolscap), stapled booklet; over the years it has increased in size, not only in the number of pages (or, more accurately, the number of words therein) but also in its physical size (now 15.5 x 23.5 cm). The yearly cycle for producing each edition means that ideally the final version of a contribution needs to be received by the end of December so that all of the necessary editing and layout can be done in time for publication in June.

The practical task of producing the journal has changed out of all recognition since 1977. When Anne visited Charles Clarke, the then printer, they had only just got rid of hot metal copy. In the days of the quarterly Ricardian, authors sent in material in hard copy, which (once edited in hard copy) the printer typed up and put into galley layout. Proof-reading was done by Rosemary Waxman, who also did the precise page layout with the aid of a printer’s rule. Nowadays all authors produce material digitally and Anne does all the editing and tidying up. A paid technician does the page layout on computer, which then goes back to the authors (and editor) for a final read through. It now falls on the editor to do an index to each volume – at the moment she has assistance from Livia. Finally, the printer receives the entire journal electronically.

Anne does not commission authors to write articles for The Ricardian, not least because this would imply automatic acceptance and publication. On occasion, however, aware that someone is working on a particular subject of relevance to the Society’s aims, she suggests that they might like to submit an article on that subject to be considered for inclusion. She welcomes contributions from members and would like to encourage members to conduct original research. Articles submitted to academic journals undergo peer review, that is, submissions are sent to acknowledged experts for their comments and suggestions for improvement of depth or clarity of thought. Anne’s expert knowledge of the period means that she well placed to review submissions to The Ricardian. Although seeing so much red ink on an initial submission can be daunting, not to say somewhat off-putting, her comments actually encourage authors to look at other sources and thus improve the scope and content of their work. To be sure, it takes time and effort to write up one’s research, but offering guidance on how to improve both the research and the writing is also time-consuming. As I and the other members who have contributed to The Ricardian can testify, our articles were much the better for Anne’s advice.

Members will have noticed that every year Anne contributes an article. Partly this is because she is always in need of submissions and providing one herself guarantees at least one article per year. When asked which of her own Ricardian articles has provided her with the most satisfaction, like some “Desert Island Discs” castaways, she cheated. It was not one article, but several: the series of 14 articles on Richard’s books that she co-wrote with Livia. They became the basis of Richard III’s Books, published in 1997.

She has been disappointed that the Logge project did not result in any articles for The Ricardian. She knows that several of the contributors to that project have since researched some of ‘their’ testators. Although The Logge Register of PCC Wills has now been published, it is not too late to send in a biography of one of the testators for consideration for publication in The Ricardian. Indeed, compiling a biography is a good introduction to historical research and there are plenty of published sources that might provide information on a particular individual, such as the numerous volumes of The Victoria History of the Counties of England (known for short as the VCH) and the various calendars (summaries) of medieval documents held in The National Archives, such as the Calendar of Patent Rolls.

Members can also contribute to The Ricardian in another very significant way. At the end of each issue is a section entitled ‘Notices of Books and Articles’, which is a list of ‘recent books and articles, mainly published in the last twelve months, although earlier publications may be
included”. Currently the contents of this list are mostly collected by Anne but here members could help, since relevant books and articles published locally to them may not have come to Anne’s attention. If you are a member of a local or county historical society that produces books or a journal, it would be very helpful if you checked each item as you received it and then sent to Anne publication details and a short summary of any book or article on late fifteenth-century England. The layout of your information should follow that in the relevant section of the latest Ricardian.

Academic respect for The Ricardian has increased greatly during the years of Anne’s editorship. References are made frequently to it in books and in articles in other journals. Several fifteenth-century historians have commented on the usefulness of the aforementioned ‘Notices’ as this saves time trawling through assorted publications for information on recently published items. Similarly, the large Book Reviews section provides such historians, as well as Society members, with details of recent monographs and collected essays. From personal experience, I know that writing a review consumes much time and effort: not only does the reviewer have to read the book, but also summarise succinctly its arguments, its triumphs and its failings (if any). The reviewer’s ‘reward’ is to keep the book, but it is Anne’s hard work that secures the book from the publisher in the first place.

Finally, when asked what she does in her spare time, that is, when not working on The Ricardian, Anne said, ‘Research’, which was, I suppose, the answer that I was expecting. There are, however, odd minutes, and even hours, that she spends gardening and going to the theatre.

2. The Richard III and Yorkist History Trust at Twenty-five

Professor W. Mark Ormrod (University of York) writes:
I am very honoured to be one of the Trustees of the Richard III and Yorkist History Trust, and consider myself fortunate indeed to be part of the Trust’s silver jubilee celebration in 2011. Over twenty-five years, the Trust has supported numerous students and researchers in their pursuit of the politics, society and culture of fifteenth-century England. The Trust has always been keen to fund the finest scholarly activity, and the beneficiaries of the scholarships have gone on to make major contributions to our understanding of the Yorkist age. Equally important is the Trust’s publication series of critical editions and monographs, issued in conjunction with our publisher collaborators (most recently, the medieval specialists Paul Watkins/Shaun Tyas). By providing access to precious primary sources and to the latest in cutting-edge interpretive scholarship, these books have helped re-define the research agenda of fifteenth-century studies. We can take strong pride in these achievements, and look forward to sponsoring the very best research findings in the current and future generations.

Peter Hammond writes:*
As part of the quincentenary celebrations of Richard III’s reign, the 1983 AGM resolved ‘that the Society shall set up a research and publishing Trust with charitable status’. This was to take over most of the Society’s academic publishing and research activities. Such a trust would have advantages for members and others wanting to support our research, as they would pay no tax on the money they donated or left to such a charity, and the charity would not pay tax on its investments. It would also make it easier for us to involve academic experts in our research activities.

The Richard III and Yorkist History Trust was formally constituted in October 1985, and was able to start business in February 1986 when it was recognised by the Charity Commissioners and registered as charity number 327005. It is thus 25 years old this year. Regular progress reports have been made every year since at the AGM and nowadays in the Annual Report, but it seemed a good idea to summarise here what the Trust has done in the first 25 years.

The Trustees

The Trust is legally separate from the Society, but the majority of the nine trustees who control it will always be chosen from people nominated by the Society's committee. The five Society trustees are currently Peter Hammond (Society President and chairman of the trustees), Dr Anne Sutton (editor of The Ricardian and chairman of the managing trustees), Lynda Pidgeon (Society Research Officer), Dr Livia Visser-Fuchs, (managing trustee), and Dr James Petre (Treasurer of the Trust). The other four trustees are chosen primarily for their academic achievements in the field of fifteenth century studies. They are Caroline M. Barron, Professorial Fellow, Royal Holloway, University of London; Julia Boffey, Professor of Medieval Studies, Queen Mary, University of London; Mark Ormrod, Professor in the Department of History, University of York; and Professor Anthony Pollard, University Fellow of the University of Teesside. The Trust also has two honorary officers, both active members of the Society, that is Susan and David Wells, who are joint Secretaries to the Trust as well as to the Society.

Because it is financing research and publishing work previously paid for by the Society directly, much of the Trust's initial income naturally came from the Society. By January 1991 the Society had given the Trust £45,000; but after this no regular large grants were made, although in the last few years the Society has made further grants. The Society gives the Trust £500 a year, plus another £500 on the publication of a book. In recognition of the Society's role, members are allowed to buy Trust publications at substantially reduced prices – as a glance at the advertisements which appear on the back cover of the Bulletin will show.

Publications

So far there have been eleven such publications. They include such important works as The Crowland Chronicle Continuations, 1469-1486, one of the principal sources for Richard's reign; an edition of The Hours of Richard III, the book of hours which Richard chose to use as king, and which includes his own additions to it; a new edition of the York House Books 1461-1490, containing some of the most important documents from any English city archive, providing an unparalleled view of Richard, who was York's greatest patron, both as duke of Gloucester and as king of England; and an edition of The Beauchamp Pageant, a 'biography in pictures' of Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, made by his daughter Anne for her grandson, Edward, prince of Wales, son of Richard III. This is a mine of information on costume, armour and weapons. A complete list of Trust books is given on the Society website. Do go to it to check on them.

Grants have also been made to encourage other publishers to issue books of Ricardian interest: recent examples are the paperback reprint of Richard III’s Hours mentioned above, and The North of England in the Age of Richard III (the proceedings of the Society’s 1993 Conference).

Bursaries

The Trust exists to 'further education, learning, and research related to the history of late medieval England (and in particular the life and reign of Richard III) and to disseminate the results’. Apart from publishing books, its other main activity is therefore the provision of financial support to researchers, mostly in universities. Most grants have been relatively small, usually under £400, and are often used for travel while the holder is carrying out research for a higher degree. In the 1990s the Trust briefly gave a Research Fellowship worth about £6,000 a year to doctoral candidates researching in British history, or topics relevant to British history,
from the late fourteenth to the early sixteenth century. This was administered for the Trust by the Institute for Historical Research. The IHR is part of the School of Advanced Study in the University of London. The Trust no longer offers these fellowships since funds do not allow it.

The Trust still has a connection with the IHR, however. Last year the Trust agreed to join with the Society in the awards that the Society gives through the IHR and also through York University. Also last year York University asked the Society if it could increase the value of the Bursary it has offered for many years. The Bursary was then worth £500 and the Society asked the Trust if it would agree to offer joint bursaries of £1,000, £500 from each. The Trust agreed to this since it would help further its educational and research objectives. This year the first jointly funded bursaries were offered. The conditions are similar to the Fellowship previously offered by the Trust. One thousand pounds is a useful sum of money and this year there have been more applications than in the past, perhaps because of the increase in value.

These grants are seen as making a significant contribution not only to encouraging and developing the study of Yorkist history, but also to raising the profiles and academic standing both of the Trust and of the Society.

**Richard III and Yorkist History Trust IHR Bursary 2011**

Every year the Society offers a bursary through the Institute for Historical Research. This is the first year in which the increased bursary of £1,000 offered jointly with the Richard III and Yorkist History Trust has been awarded (see above).

The economic situation (and probably the increased award) led to our receiving a record number of applications this year. They were all good applications, covering a wide range of medieval history, and making a decision was not easy. It caused considerable discussion among the Research Committee and the Executive Committee.

We finally agreed that the award this year should be made to Annameike Kaper, who is undertaking her PhD at St Andrews on the subject of ‘The Iconography of St John the Baptist in Medieval England, c.1300 to 1550’. Her MA was awarded by the University of Leiden, where she studied the art and visual culture of the late middle ages and early modern period.

In her thesis, she hopes ‘to examine the relationship between the imagery of St John the Baptist and the text found in medieval manuscripts that relate to St John in order to assess their relevance to the ways in which he was represented. In addition, examining the texts and liturgies performed on the feast days of St John the Baptist may offer us a greater insight into his role as a Christian figure of devotion’.

Two images of St John the Baptist from the British Museum. On the left is an engraving from Germany dated 1469-74, showing the saint holding a book and symbolic lamb; on the right is an early-sixteenth-century ivory pax from the Netherlands or France showing the baptism of Christ.
The will of a foot-soldier in Richard’s army at Bosworth

There is still information about the Battle of Bosworth to be found in record offices. As the Society’s Bosworth team gathered at the Battlefield Centre ready to put up our sales tent and prepare for the two days of re-enactment spectacle, news came – via that most modern of communication media, the Internet, and released exactly 526 years after the event – that we now know the name of one of the ordinary soldiers who fought in the battle. This is not information of major historical importance, but it is still a new fact. He was Thomas Longe, of Ashwellthorpe in Norfolk, and he had made his will on Tuesday 16 August 1485 when he was on his way to join Richard III’s army at Nottingham. In his own words:

In dei Nomine Amen. the twesday after the fest of Ye assumpcion of our lady the xvj day of August in Ye yere of our lord MCCCCxxxv Thomas longe of Aysshwelthorpe hole of his body and of a good mend willyng’ to dey as a child of Ye chirch the seid day and tyme goyng forth unto Ye kynges hoste at notyngham to bataile made his testament nuncupatyve in this wise

[The letter written in this transcript as Y is that old favourite, the ‘thorn’, which in fact is a spelling of ‘th’ and once confused the heritage industry into creating a plethora of Ye Olde Tea Shoppes. It is more usual to transcribe it using the sign Þ, or as th, but in this hand it does resemble a Y and transcribing as Y perhaps makes it easier to match the transcript to the picture.]

Ashwellthorpe was a manor in Norfolk about 12 miles south-west of Norwich, at that time in the possession of Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, in right of his wife Elizabeth Tilney, who was the widow of Sir Humphrey Bourchier, who had been killed at Barnet fighting on the Yorkist side. Thomas Longe would therefore have been in the Howard contingent at Bosworth.

A nuncupative will is one that is spoken in front of witnesses rather than written down and signed at the time. Very often they were spoken by people on their death-beds, when there was no time to fetch a clerk or the dying person was incapable of signing or making their mark on a written document. Or it might be that no writing materials were at hand in an emergency, or no-one who could actually write. Here perhaps we may envisage a gathering of men, at their evening bivouac somewhere on the way to Nottingham, realising that there would be real fighting before they got home again and that they needed to put their affairs in order. Would it have been more than a conversation over the evening meal? Did their leaders say, Now, lads, take it in turns and state what you want done? Did this happen regularly on the way to a battle, when death suddenly became more than a distant possibility? The named witnesses to Thomas Longe’s will were William Partryk and Richard Partryk (that is, Partridge), ‘and others being present at the time’, presumably his fellow-soldiers, so it could be that we now really know three names of rank-and-file from Richard’s army, not just one.

Thomas Longe’s instructions were very simple. His wife Joan (Johan or Jone in the will) and William Herward were to have all his goods and chattels in Norfolk after his death, and all his household goods of all sorts and whatever household they were in. Joan and William were to...
have full power to dispose of everything, provided that they paid his debts, and to do whatever would be pleasing to God for the health of his soul, and they were named as his executors. This is an absolutely standard sort of will for a man with not a great deal to leave, though hasty wills by the better-off may also be on these lines, so it isn’t safe to infer that Thomas Longe was poor, any more than the fact that he doesn’t mention any children proves that he didn’t have any. And who was William Herward? Was he perhaps Joan’s father or brother, or someone in Ashwellthorpe who could be trusted to look after the widowed Joan? It seems reasonable to infer that he was not another man mustering with Thomas for the king’s army, but was safely back home and out of danger.

The will was proved on 14 January 1486, and the probate clause tells us that the grant was made to Joan, ‘with power reserved for the other executor’ [i.e. if and when he came to claim it], which again is a very standard type of clause and probably means that Joan felt capable of acting alone, though Herward was there in the background to help if necessary.

The will is not the original document produced at the consistory court (there never had been an original written will) but is an enrolled copy in the register of Norwich Consistory Court Wills which is listed as ‘Caston’ (i.e. the first will recorded in the register is that of someone named Caston, just as the first will in the Logge register is that of John Logge). The photo on the Norfolk website shows a later margination which is very difficult to read, but appears to say *dimiss’ propter exiguitatem* ‘dismissed because of (something)’. I discussed this margination with Christopher Whittick, archivist at East Sussex Record Office, who has often helped the Society in palaeographical matters and knows a lot about wills, and he thinks the word might be *exiguitatem*, ‘smallness’, and the whole thing mean ‘dismissed on account of smallness’. Unfortunately, the Latin word *dimiss* doesn’t have an ending to show us who or what was dismissed – was it the will itself? i.e. was the estate too small to worry about? That is, having granted Joan probate when she asked, the court then found that Thomas left so little that she need not account for it?

Was Thomas Longe killed at Bosworth? Probably not. Probate was granted five months after the will was made, which is rather a long time, though not unheard-of. Perhaps he died later of wounds, or even picked up the sweating sickness around at the time. That is something we shall never know. The will shows us that there is still evidence to be found, if we look hard enough. This particular evidence was found by a family historian, someone researching the Longe family of Norfolk. Who knows what is still lurking in the archives?

Lesley Boatwright

John Alban, Archivist at Norfolk Record Office, will be writing about this will in *The Ricardian* next year.

**Talk by Chris Skidmore at Gloucester: ‘Richard of Gloucester, the Battles of Tewkesbury and Bosworth and the Fall of the House of York’**

As part of the Gloucester History and Heritage Week 2011 a number of talks were held in the Blackfriars, Gloucester. This is a splendidly atmospheric location for talks. Of particular interest was the talk by Chris Skidmore.* It was based on the research he is undertaking for his new book on Bosworth which is due out in 2013. A Tudor historian, Chris was looking at Bosworth in the context of the Wars of the Roses and the rise of the Tudors. The talk was a comparison of the two battles. He wove information together from the two battles, to give an interesting perspective on Bosworth and Richard’s actions on that day. In many ways it required an understanding of the battles to prevent confusion, but the audience appeared to be very informed, especially about Tewkesbury, which may perhaps be expected from an audience in Gloucester.
The battle of Tewkesbury led to the death of Edward, Prince of Wales, which left Henry Tudor as the next claimant. 1485 was a surprising defeat for Richard, and the question Chris posed was: how much was Bosworth affected by the memory of Tewkesbury?

Tewkesbury was the culmination of a remarkable series of events. Warwick had died at Barnet, and, when Margaret of Anjou landed at Weymouth and heard the news, she was determined to continue, rather than return to France. She moved through the West Country and headed towards Wales. The Lancastrians were confident, as they had a large army raised in the west and one in the north. The Arrival gives a very detailed account of events.

Edward delayed leaving to meet this new army by attending the feast of St George, but as soon as the feast was over he was determined to meet the Lancastrian army as soon as possible and stop them turning towards London. In the same way, Richard III positioned himself in the Midlands to stop Henry’s army heading towards London. Believing God was on his side, he waited at Nottingham to gather a large force. Who actually turned up is difficult to find out. There were a lot of common men in the army but how many, and for which nobles they turned out for, is unclear.

A recent find which gives us a glimpse of the common soldier is the will of Thomas Longe [see the preceding two pages]. Henry VII’s act of attainder gives an idea of the battle array and Molinet also describes the battle. According to the ‘Ballad of Bosworth Field’ serpentines (cannon) were used in the battle.

On the journey to Tewkesbury, Edward moved quickly in pursuit, to put pressure on the Lancastrian army and deny them the crossing to Wales, ordering the gates of Gloucester to be closed to them. The tired Lancastrian army arrived at Tewkesbury at four in the afternoon, after marching overnight, and were forced to make a stand. Edward too had forced his army on, shadowing the Lancastrian army, and his men had marched thirty-six miles on a very hot day.

The memory of this had an immense effect on Richard and caused him to make great preparations for the confrontation at Bosworth. There was a lot of pomp and display, and he brought his treasure with him. Richard’s army was twice the size of Henry’s and he set up a long line across the front of the battle.

The massacre of the fleeing Lancastrians at Tewkesbury had made a great impression on Richard, and this explains why he decided to make a stand and not flee. Richard had little choice but to make his last charge. The battle was lost by desertions: Stanley stood still and Northumberland with many northerners fled. A Spanish chronicler, de Valera, spoke to Salazar who was at Bosworth and recorded him as advising Richard to flee because of treason, but that Richard had replied ‘he would die a king’. Richard’s determination to fight inspired his army, and it nearly worked. He overcame Tudor’s standard bearer, John Cheyney. The Tudor side almost despaired of victory, but the outcome was decided by William Stanley who charged in for Tudor.

At Tewkesbury Edward IV was determined to go after the Lancastrians who had taken refuge in the abbey. Some of them were executed two days later, Somerset among them. The Prince of Wales was killed in the battle and buried in the abbey. With the death of Henry VI in the Tower the Lancastrian line had run out. John Morton joined Edward IV while Margaret of Anjou fled to France. The male Beaufort line was extinguished, leaving only Margaret Beaufort, a female claimant. Jasper Tudor fled to Europe taking Henry with him; Henry thus became the only ‘genuine’ claimant to the throne left after Tewkesbury.

According to Chris, English history is a great thing. Documents need to be looked at, and more effort made to find documents – as the example of Longe’s will demonstrates, there are still documents to be found. This is what historical study is about.

* Chris Skidmore is MP for Kingswood (Glos.). He took a double first in history at Oxford University in 2002, and has written a book on Edward VI and another on Amy Robsart, Death and the Virgin. Bulletin readers will remember that Amy Robsart died after falling downstairs,
and her death made Robert Dudley a widower, at once freeing him, and making it impossible because of the potential scandal, to marry Queen Elizabeth I. The coroner’s inquest on Amy Robsart’s death has been in the public records all along (TNA KB 9/1073 pt 1, m.80) but not known by historians until Chris published it.

Lynda Pidgeon

Book Review
Loyalty Binds Me

Loyalty Binds Me is the second in a proposed trilogy of novels, the first of which This Time, I have already reviewed (Bulletin, June 2010). In the first book, Richard is transported into the twenty-first century by way of the secret QDE (Quantum Displacement Engine) and, specifically, to Portland, Oregon. Here he marries Sarah, inventor of the QDE, brings his son Edward back from the past and becomes a loving husband, father and stepfather.

In the second part, Richard and his family arrive in London, where he is promptly arrested by the Metropolitan Police for murdering his nephews in the autumn of 1483. The only evidence to support this ‘cold case’ investigation is his false birth certificate and passport and 400 years of Shakespearean propaganda, although the police are hoping to get DNA evidence. The Americans also want Richard, but their aim is to secure the secret of the QDE so that they can go back in time and prevent 9/11. And so plot and counterplot unfold with MI5, police, FBI, the press all involved. Eventually, Richard escapes custody and finds himself at a Bosworth Battlefield Re-enactment Day, masquerading as an archer for Henry. The Met drop their charges, Sarah agrees to help the Americans with the QDE and Richard is free once more.

This second novel doesn’t have the same time travel impact of the first and is slowed down by too much emphasis on Richard’s family life. However, it is an easy read and, if you’ve ever speculated about Richard’s more human side, this wildly eccentric book could be just the thing for you.

Elaine Henderson

Pontifical High Mass of Requiem for King Richard III, Queen Anne, Edward, Prince of Wales, and for all the fallen of Bosworth Field

Richards and their supporters from as far away as Barnet, Milton Keynes, Nantwich, Oldham, and Beverley, as well as locations in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, made pilgrimage to the isolated but stunningly beautiful Royal Chantry Chapel of St Edmund at Spital-in-the-Street, north of Lincoln, on Bosworth Day, to assist at the Pontifical High Mass of Requiem which was being sung there for the repose of the souls of King Richard, Anne, his queen, their only son Edward of Middleham, Prince of Wales, and for all those, friend or foe, who fell on that day 526 years before on Bosworth Field.

The idea for the requiem was that of Mgr Howard Weston-Smart, the Titular Bishop of Tintern and a member of the Lincolnshire Branch of the Society, who was eager that the impetus for the requiem established by John Ashdown-Hill should not be lost when these were discontinued. In this he was enthusiastically supported by Jean Townsend, the secretary of the Lincolnshire Branch, and by its members as well as by the Trustees of the Royal Chantry Chapel at Spital, where Mgr Weston-Smart is the Senior Chantry Priest, saying a requiem mass on a regular basis for the later medieval kings and queens of England and for several members of their families and courts, in accordance with the wishes of Thomas de Aston, Canon of Lincoln, who re-established the chapel in its present form in 1397.
Much planning had gone into the event, and on the day there was standing room only for the High Mass and Absolutions of the Dead. The mass itself was in English, though the music, which was exquisitely performed by the 1509 Society under the leadership of Rob Durk, was sung polyphonally in Latin and to contemporary music, which of course added an extra element to be appreciated by the congregation. The chapel itself looked stunning, with a catafalque set in the midst of the choir, covered with a French Second Empire Imperial funeral pall, surmounted with a golden crown set upon a crimson cushion, whilst at each corner stood a seven-foot-high candle bearing a shield with the arms of the king upon it. At the foot of the catafalque stood a tribute of thirty-three white roses, one for each year of the king’s age, which had been presented by the national Society, along with similar tributes of twenty-nine white roses, one for each year of Queen Anne’s age, set before the image of Our Lady, the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of nine roses for the Prince of Wales, before the statue of St Edmund.

The High Mass followed the ancient form for such occasions and, along with its music, would have been easily recognised by Richard and the members of his court, whilst the sermon, which seemed much appreciated by all those present, was preached by Mgr Weston-Smart, who also performed the rite of the Absolutions of the Dead at the conclusion of the mass, during which the catafalque, representing symbolically those for whom the requiem had been offered, was sprinkled with holy water and censed, as the dead were commended to Almighty God by the prayers of all those present.

After the mass – and a short time for the stretching of the limbs – we returned to the chapel where the afternoon continued with a totally fascinating lecture given by Dr Kate Holland, one of the Spital Trustees, on the subject of ‘An Ymage all in Brasse’, a re-evaluation of the Tyrwhitt memorial at Harpswell in Lincolnshire. After this, in good Ricardian style, all present joined in a veritable feast of the finest of food and drink, which had been organised by the Trustees and most generously funded by the Lincolnshire Branch.

When all was over, the matter of what to do with the stunning floral tributes had to be dealt with, and one of those present suggested, in emulation of Richard’s own charity to the poor and needy of his day, that, in return for £1 given, a rose could be taken away, and several of those present took advantage of this, and as a result a cheque for £25 will be sent to the Aid to the Church in Need charity.

The idea of such a requiem on Bosworth Day was much appreciated and commended by everyone, and will (deo volente) be repeated now on an annual basis. In the meanwhile, the life of the Royal Chantry Chapel itself goes on, with requiems arranged for 29 September and 26 November. Further information about the chapel and the requiems held there can be obtained by ringing 01636 805358.

Howard Weston-Smart
Geoff Wheeler has collected an impressive number of reviews of some recent books.

The History of England: vol.1, Foundation, by Peter Ackroyd (Macmillan, £25). The book is copiously reviewed in long feature articles, including in the Daily Express (30 Sept.) by Christopher Silvester, who says Ackroyd’s comments on medieval kings are ‘pithy and apt’, and gives as an example, ‘[Richard III] was the first usurper who had not taken the precaution of winning a military victory’. Noel Malcolm (Sunday Telegraph, 14 Aug.) believes Ackroyd’s ‘Big Idea’ is ‘the deep continuities in English life’, giving the following as ‘a classic piece of Ackroydism’: ‘The men of Kent were the first to rise against Richard III. In the miners’ strike of 1984 the miners of Kent were the most militant and vociferous.’ Malcolm comments, ‘this was because their mines were among the least economically viable in the country’, and picks up various inaccuracies especially in the derivation of names. Andy McSmith (The Independent, 22 Aug.) says, ‘Bosworth is treated as a little event that might have had a different outcome. Henry Tudor ... is portrayed as an insecure 28-year-old who tumbled by accident into a position of power.’

Geoff points out that on p.416 Ackroyd says, ‘In York [Richard] decided that he should be crowned for a second time, as if the ceremony in London had obtained the homage of only half his subjects’. This recalls the stricture on the Croyland chronicler in The Daughter of Time: ‘if he can be wrong about a big, known fact like a coronation, then he’s not to be trusted as a reporter’.

A Short History of England, by Simon Jenkins (Profile Books, £25). Guy Dimond (Time Out, Sept.) describes it as ‘triumphalist Anglocentric’. Jeremy Paxman (Saturday Guardian, 10 Sept.) says Jenkins is ‘always worth reading and pleasingly contrarian’, but that the writing seems to have been constrained to make room for the pictures. ‘It will do for anyone who wants to know their danegeld from their Dalriada, but one hopes for more’, and it is too heavy to read in bed. And Jenkins has decided ‘that the golden thread of English history is the fight against autocracy’. Jenkins himself has written two articles to promote his book, in the Guardian G2 supplement (2 Sept.) and the Telegraph Weekend (24 Sept.). In the first, he says, ‘Two threads run through this narrative. The first is England’s relations with its neighbours. ... the other is that of the distribution of power within England ... running through this story is the primacy of money.’ The second starts, ‘Damn the national curriculum. First teach history.’

Geoff quotes a passage on Richard’s coronation: ‘before a sullen congregation and a sullen citizenry’ – really? The whole of the Wars of the Roses take up 6½ pages.

Winter King, by Thomas Penn (Allen Lane, £20). A different sort of book, dealing mainly with the last part of the reign of Henry VII. Helen Castor (Sunday Telegraph, 18 Sept., also sent in by Lucille Dove) says it reveals Henry “as an extraordinary man hiding in plain sight”, one who ‘inherited a steel-trap mind and a smattering of royal blood’ from his mother, and ‘had always believed he was justified in his paranoia’. Tracy Borman (Sunday Times Culture, 25 Sept.) doesn’t like Henry: ‘one of the most unappealing protagonists in British history’, but likes the book: ‘a brilliant and haunting evocation of the Tudor world’. Philippa Gregory’s review (Observer, the New Review, 16 Oct.) is headed ‘Spies, paranoia and taxes’. She too thinks ‘the book succeeds brilliantly’. There is ‘an unusually engaging portrait’ of Elizabeth of York, and Margaret Beaufort ‘is frequently glimpsed’. ‘Whenever Henry suffered his regular illness, Lady Margaret turned up with physicians, remedies, her own bed and a barrel of her favourite wine.’
Recent events in the world have generated thoughts of Richard III in the minds of some commentators.

The destruction of the powerful
From John Saunders
Allan Massie in the Daily Telegraph blog http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/culture/
The fate of Colonel Gaddafi has provoked people to muse on our reactions to the death of a tyrant. ‘[this] may be a matter for rejoicing, but it may also be the stuff of tragedy or at least pathos. When Macduff enters carrying Macbeth’s head, Malcolm and the others on the stage may express delight, but this is not surely what the audience feels. They think the end is right, as Gaddafi’s end was right, but they still throb with the horror and pity of it. ...

‘Shakespeare offers another example ... in Richard III. Richard is an out-and-out villain, a murderer of little children. To forestall complaints from ... the Richard III Society who think him a much maligned figure, a victim of scurrilous Tudor propaganda – and that much is certainly true – let me say it is Shakespeare’s Richard ... that I am talking about. Shakespeare’s Richard is a scoundrel, a liar, seducer, murderer and tyrant, granted only two redeeming qualities – wit and courage. But when he is killed at Bosworth, and his body in the great Olivier film is slung naked over the back of a horse, we may think that justice has been done, but we feel pity too.

‘There is always pathos in the destruction of the powerful, no matter how well deserved. This is something literature teaches us. ... Sic transit gloria mundi and all that.’

A new voice for the North
From Elisabeth Sjöberg and Geoffrey Wheeler
The Times, 15 August 2011, ‘Failure to trigger growth in the North threatens recovery hope’.
A ‘Behind the Story’ panel by Anushka Asthana, ‘Looking for a new voice’ is inserted into this article and illustrated by the portrait of Richard III. It says, ‘The North suffered under William the Conqueror. In response to a rebellion, he ordered the destruction of villages and crops during a terrifying “harrying of the north”. The damage lasted for centuries. Richard III ... set out to change the area’s fortunes, setting up the Council of the North in 1484. Its tasks were to improve governance and bring prosperity. The Smith Institute wants a modern version. It thinks the North needs a champion ...’
A letter from Lord Lexden in reply to this appeared in The Times, 17 August 2011.
‘The King’s Council of the North – its full title – was not established to “give more power to the North” but to take it from unruly feudal barons and vest it in the monarch, who ruled the region thereafter through a Lord President of the North, by whom summary justice was dispensed under the royal prerogative.’ Lord Lexden points out that the earl of Strafford was a very effective Lord President of the North under Charles I, but was very high-handed – and ended up on the scaffold.

Princesses succeeding
A third matter in the news recently has also had commentators considering past monarchs. This is the mooted change to the constitution so that the monarch’s first-born child would succeed, irrespective of that child’s gender.

From Geoffrey Wheeler
Daily Telegraph, 14 October 2011, ‘Succeeding where past princesses have failed’, by Glenda Cooper, plays the game of What If? with the help of Sarah Gristwood and Alison Weir.
Suppose that Margaret Beaufort, whose claim to the throne was greater than her son Henry’s, had succeeded in 1485. ‘She’d have made an incredible sovereign’ (says Weir), ‘she was a political operator behind the scenes, wily and devious, overshadowing Henry’s own wife. She later signed herself Margaret R. – which could stand for Margaret Richmond [the surname of her fourth husband] but certainly sounds suspiciously regal.’ And Henry VII would not have been succeeded by his son Henry, but by his daughter Margaret.
The legitimacy of the Beauforts: a correction

In the September Bulletin, Marie Barnfield wrote on the canonical minefield that is the question of the legitimacy of the Beaufort family. Unfortunately we inadvertently printed her original version rather than a second, amended version, in which the penultimate paragraph should have read:

‘The evidence for the double adultery is that of allegation: i.e. Froissart’s claim that John Beaufort was conceived in double adultery, and Richard III’s proclamation, according to which Henry Tudor’s “moder was daughter unto John duc of Somerset, son unto John Erle of Somerset, son unto dame Kateryne Swynford, and of her in double advoutrow goten”. But Richard, or his scriptwriters, may merely have been drawing on Froissart, and in any case there had been less than two months between Gaunt’s marriage to Constance (21 September 1371) and Sir Hugh Swynford’s death (11 November 1371) during which such a doubly adulterated child could have been conceived. The only solid indication we have regarding the timing of John Beaufort’s conception comes in the form of a pair of entries in the Calendar of Patent Rolls for 1392, viz. a grant of 100 marks dated 7 June, making no reference to John’s age, cancelled because of a fresh grant made on 10 September ‘in his 21st year’. These entries, assuming that they correctly reflect the patents concerned, show John to have been born during 1372, probably between early June and early September. That would certainly explain the apparently widespread belief that he was conceived before Sir Hugh Swynford’s death, but it is perhaps more likely that Katherine’s liaison with Gaunt was precipitated by her husband’s demise, particularly as the couple seem not to have claimed a dispensation from the effects of adultery on Katherine’s part.’

Marie has also provided a list of references:


Local traditions - are they correct?
From Marjorie Smith, Penrith
Cumberland & Westmorland Herald, 1 Oct 2011, ‘Historic pub to get £140,000 facelift’.
The pub in question is the Gloucester Arms in Penrith. ‘The building dates from 1477. King Richard III, when Duke of Gloucester, reputedly lodged here while he has carrying out alterations on Penrith Castle. ... The room known to locals as the King’s Room remains largely in its original condition with oak panelled walls and the Duke’s coat of arms embossed on the ceiling.’

Marjorie points out that this last statement is incorrect: ‘the arms are not Richard’s but those of the Whelpdale family, three elongated whelps. That family died out some centuries ago.’

From Susan Russell, Wisbech
Daily Mail, 22 October 2011.
‘I am not sure that Upton Cressett – where young Edward V, one of the two tragic “princes in the tower” stayed on his way from Ludlow to his murder in the Tower of London in 1483 – can quite match the Elizabethan splendour of Burghley – the Lincolnshire home of William Cecil, Lord High Treasurer to Elizabeth I.’
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The change to the rules had already been commented on by David Starkey ('Let’s try Strictly Come Ruling, Your Majesty', Sunday Times, 24 April 2011). Starkey thinks the idea ‘desperately silly’. ‘This does, of course, deal with the problem of gender discrimination. But what of the rights of the younger children, male or female? Why should the eldest take precedence or take all? What’s fair – as Ed Miliband might ask – about that? Why should the crown ... be hereditary? Why not make it elective? ... Or open, like dukedoms in Gilbert and Sullivan’s Iolanthe, to competitive examination?’

The Anglican church was sharply criticized for its “desperately silly” change to the rules to ensure that the Queen would remain the country’s head of state even if she were the only child of the late King George VI, who had no male heirs.

Starkey thinks the idea ‘desperately silly’. ‘This does, of course, deal with the problem of gender discrimination. But what of the rights of the younger children, male or female? Why should the eldest take precedence or take all? What’s fair – as Ed Miliband might ask – about that? Why should the crown ... be hereditary? Why not make it elective? ... Or open, like dukedoms in Gilbert and Sullivan’s Iolanthe, to competitive examination?’
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‘The evidence for the double adultery is that of allegation: i.e. Froissart’s claim that John Beaufort was conceived in double adultery, and Richard III’s proclamation, according to which Henry Tudor’s ‘moder was daughter unto John duc of Somerset, son unto John Erle of Somerset, son unto dame Kateryne Swynford, and of her in double advoutrow goten’. But Richard, or his scriptwriters, may merely have been drawing on Froissart, and in any case there had been less than two months between Gaunt’s marriage to Constance (21 September 1371) and Sir Hugh Swynford’s death (11 November 1371) during which such a doubly adulterated child could have been conceived. The only solid indication we have regarding the timing of John Beaufort’s conception comes in the form of a pair of entries in the Calendar of Patent Rolls for 1392, viz. a grant of 100 marks dated 7 June, making no reference to John’s age, cancelled because of a fresh grant made on 10 September ‘in his 21st year’. These entries, assuming that they correctly reflect the patents concerned, show John to have been born during 1372, probably between early June and early September. That would certainly explain the apparently widespread belief that he was conceived before Sir Hugh Swynford’s death, but it is perhaps more likely that Katherine’s liaison with Gaunt was precipitated by her husband’s demise, particularly as the couple seem not to have claimed a dispensation from the effects of adultery on Katherine’s part.’

Marie has also provided a list of references:

The Man Himself
Writing a Biography of
Richard III

DAVID BALDWIN

When I was asked to write a biography of King Richard my first thought was ‘why another’? There must be a dozen or more available already. But when I re-read them I found that only one or two really set out to tell his life story – the others were little more than histories of the Wars of the Roses or were concerned mainly with arguing that he was either ‘good’ or ‘bad’. So I decided that there was room for a book in which he was always the main character, one that would study the events of his career without preconceptions and would not rush to judgement at the end.

This was easier said than done of course. Little or nothing is known of many of Richard’s formative years and even when, later, the information becomes more plentiful we are seldom dealing with records that were written for the benefit of historians. The gaps can be filled by speculation, and references in documents can be ‘interpreted'; but all this risks producing an artificial character who behaves as the author thinks he would – or should – in particular circumstances. Only rarely are we told what Richard said on specific occasions, still less what he may really have thought.

Generally, it is all but impossible to write an in-depth biography of a medieval man or woman except where, in a few cases, evidence has survived either by chance or because of particular circumstances. We know the Pastons better than any other family of the period thanks to their abundant letters, and Thomas Becket’s murder in Canterbury Cathedral filled volumes; but if the Pastons had destroyed their correspondence they would be remembered only as an obscure gentry family, and Becket’s career would have meant little if he had not died in such appalling circumstances. A monarch who reigned for only two years and two months would not normally attract much interest, but Richard would surely feature in any list of England’s most famous kings and queens.

Richard did not leave a great literary legacy nor was the manner of his death particularly shocking, so why are we still fascinated by him more than five hundred years later? There are the ‘did he – didn’t he’ questions of course, particularly in relation to the disappearance of the Princes, but another reason is that his multi-faceted character defies analysis. We know – or think we know – that Henry I and Edward I were strong, able rulers, while Henry III and Edward II were incompetent, but it is less easy to pigeonhole Richard. Some of the things he did were admirable, but others, like his abrupt execution of Lord Hastings, are difficult to excuse.

No biographer can hope to exonerate Richard of all the allegations made against him – there are too many unknowns involved – but perhaps it is possible to explain what made him ‘tick’. All effective medieval kings were noted for their sometimes harsh determination, and if Richard wanted to emulate their success he would have been obliged to copy them. If he had been amiable and irresolute, like Stephen or Henry VI for example, he would not have commanded the respect of his greatest subjects and his reign would have been as difficult as theirs. Then there were the circumstances of his upbringing, a childhood that saw him captured at Ludlow when he was just seven, deprived of his father and elder brother a year
later, and then concealed in London before being sent into exile in the Low Countries for his own safety. I am not a psychologist, but these events must surely have left their mark on his personality. He had seen how quickly the wheel of fortune could turn against him, and may have resolved that when he grew older he would deal with potential enemies before they had an opportunity to harm him.

Richard must have hoped that his brother Edward’s victory in 1461 marked the end of his ‘travels’ (as Charles II would later call them), but he was again driven from England after Warwick the Kingmaker turned his coat nine years later. Within months he helped Edward recover his kingdom at the battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury, and as Constable was required to try the defeated Lancastrians who had taken refuge in Tewkesbury abbey. The verdicts and sentences were a formality—but Richard must have reflected that if either battle had gone against him he would now be the ‘traitor’ awaiting execution. He was by this time eighteen—well past the age where ‘mistakes’ might be forgiven on account of his youth and inexperience—and again, the lesson was surely that it was necessary to strike hard and strike first.

Richard has been much criticised for the methods he used to augment his landed estate in the 1470s, not least for the manner in which he wrested part of the Warwick inheritance from his brother Clarence and laid claim to the properties of the old Countess of Oxford. He was prepared to use his own eloquence, the law, and the threat of force to get what he wanted, but was he any worse than many of his contemporaries? Ownership of land determined both wealth and status in the Middle Ages, and acquiring more of it was central to every noble and knightly family’s strategy. Few allowed an opportunity to add to their acres to go begging, and if Richard appears more avaricious it is arguably because he was a king’s brother and his dealings were larger than others. There is no reason to doubt that he believed he had a right to the estates he coveted, and felt obliged to prosecute his claims.

These and other events make it clear that Richard was prepared to act decisively when he saw an opportunity or felt threatened, and it is likely that his deep sense of insecurity was partly, if not entirely, responsible for his actions in 1483. He must have thought that his deposition of Edward V, the boy he was supposed to be protecting, and the arbitrary executions of friends and colleagues like Lord Hastings and Earl Rivers would quickly be forgotten, but this time he had gone too far. The Yorkist establishment was not so impressed by his good government that it could overlook the manner of his becoming king, and the actions he thought would guarantee his safety ultimately destroyed it. It is impossible to tell if anyone was actually conspiring against him in the weeks after Edward IV’s death, but fears for his position, his estates, and his personal safety must all have loomed large in his mind.

The wide backing given to Buckingham’s rebellion undoubtedly surprised Richard, and he seems to have become increasingly paranoiac as the pressures on him mounted. His criticisms of his late brother’s government included the assertion that ‘this land was ruled by self-will and pleasure ... so that no man was sure of his life, land, or livelihood, or of his wife, daughter, or servant, with every virtuous maiden and woman standing in dread of being ravished and defiled’, and the letter castigating the Buckingham rebels he despatched from Leicester on 23 October 1483 expressed his disappointment that ‘all oppressors of his subjects, horrible adulterers and bawds’ had not been reconciled ‘to the way of truth and virtue’. The marquis of Dorset, Elizabeth Woodville’s eldest son by her first marriage, could have been upbraided for his disloyalty, but his principal offence, according to Richard, was that ‘not fearing God, nor the peril of his soul, [he] hath many and sundry maids, widows and wives damnably and without shame devoured, deflowered, and defiled’. If we were asked to write an essay on the presidencies of Jack Kennedy or Bill Clinton we might mention their extra-marital relationships, but they would not be the yardstick by which we judged their success or failure as politicians. Richard’s final charge at Bosworth—while courageous and having the potential to snatch
victory from the jaws of defeat – was not the action of a man who was thinking rationally about how the future might be best served.

Richard’s is a very complex character – which is why interpretations of it have varied so widely – and no single assessment will ever satisfy everyone. He can be justifiably criticised for some of his actions, but most, if not all, of them are explicable in terms of the era in which he lived and, more importantly, his own mindset. Perhaps he was a Machiavellian who just pre-dated Machiavelli, but we can only wonder how much of this he had imbibed from his old mentor Warwick who had himself deposed a king, executed several of his favourites, and grabbed everything that was going. Richard may have been ruthless, but he was far from being unique.

David Baldwin’s biography of Richard III will be published by Amberley in February 2012.

A Medicine for Nicolas Lenthorp

TIG LANG

On folio 14r of British Library Manuscript Harley 1628, the medical manuscript I have been looking at in a series of short pieces in the Bulletin, there is a short Latin recipe headed simply ‘for Nicolas Lenthorp’. I think the patient is possibly to be identified with Nicholas Leventhorpe, who was a Yeoman of the Chamber of Edward IV. The recipe is as follows:

‘Take oxi laxativi (laxative vinegar), diaprunis laxativi (laxative diaprunis, see below), of each 6 dragms, conserve of roses 2 oz., preserved ginger ½ oz., loaf sugar 1 oz., and let the mixture be made.’

The first two ingredients are compound medicines, probably available ready-made from apothecaries. The most common mixture containing vinegar was oximel, two parts of vinegar to one of honey, but other things could be added to this base; in this case we can assume from the tag laxativi that the added ingredients had a laxative effect. Diaprunis, a compound medicine based on plums, also has here the tag laxativi added to it. See below on conserve of roses (a mixture of rose petals and sugar), and preserved ginger. The loaf sugar was probably added to make the mixture more palatable.

The mixture is clearly intended to have a laxative effect, and it would be easy to assume, as I did at first, that Nicolas Lenthorp’s problem was simply constipation. However, purgatives were prescribed for many ailments in the Middle Ages, with the intention of ridding the body of the superfluous humours thought to be contributing to the disease. Using the Middle English version of Gilbertus Anglicus’ Compendium of Medicine as a reference proved interesting with regard to this recipe. Diaprunis is mainly recommended in Gilbertus’ treatise for ailments of the urinary tract, and, interestingly, it is prescribed along with some of the other ingredients which appear in Nicolas Lenthorp’s prescription. For kidney stone, for example, it is recommended that diaprunis is given in the morning and ginger with oximel in the evening. For diabetes, defined by Gilbertus Anglicus as excessive passing of urine, the patient should be given oximel, followed by diaprunis and sugar of roses mixed together ‘to the quantity of a chestnut’. When diaprunis is prescribed for other ailments, for example for abscess on the liver, it is not mixed with rose sugar, ginger or vinegar. It would not be too far-fetched to suggest from this evidence that Nicolas Lenthorp was suffering from some problem of the urinary tract for which this medicine was prescribed.

1 Calendar of Patent Rolls 1467-1477, p. 207.
3 Getz, Healing p. 262.
There has been only one ‘biography’ of the duke, an article by J.A.F. Thomson in Speculum in 1979, and there is a short entry in the ODNB. Thomson describes John as ‘one of the most obscure of the great magnates’ who ‘was seldom mentioned as playing an important part in public life’, but was ‘active in pursuit of family interests and that his public life had more to do with the local community than Lancaster and York’.

So what can be said about John? It is likely his attitude to life was conditioned by his parents and his family history. His paternal ancestors were determined men, who had seen the family rise from being merchants in Hull to close associates and advisors of kings. His great-grandfather Michael, the first earl of Suffolk, had been attainted and exiled, and history repeated itself with his father.

His mother Alice was another one of those extraordinary women of the period, strong, determined and forceful. Perhaps it is little wonder that John settled for the quiet life, sitting awkwardly on the fence, and trying to avoid confrontation.

Born in September 1442, John was only 8 years old when his father was killed. In those eight years it is unlikely he saw much of his father, the demands of state taking William away to court, and of course there was still the war in France. Even so, William found time to arrange for his son’s marriage. In 1446 William had acquired the wardship of Anne Beauchamp, probably with the intention of marrying her to John, but when Anne died in January 1449 at Ewelme, a new bride had to be found. He chose another of his wards, Margaret Beaufort.

Even as he arranged the marriage events were closing in on William. In early 1450 parliament attempted to attain him. His son’s marriage led to one of the more damaging charges against him. He was accused of intending, ‘to make John … kyng of this youre seid reame, and to depose you [i.e. Henry VI] … the same duke of Suffolk … presumyng and pretendyng her [Margaret] to be next enheritable to the Crowne of youre Reame, for lakke of issue of your Soverayne lord’.

There was concern over Henry’s lack of an heir, but it also suggests Margaret had a claim. How far this was believed or how much it was exaggerated in an attempt to remove William is debatable. It raises the question over how far this went towards putting ideas into the mind of Henry and others over the succession.

William put up a strong defence and hopes of having him executed faded; instead he was condemned to five years in exile, starting on 1 May. He went to his manor of East Thorp in Suffolk to make preparations. The failure to execute him had caused widespread discontent and when he set sail two days later his ship was intercepted, and he was murdered on 2 May.

In a letter written by William to his son, ‘on the day of my departing from this land’, he gives John some advice. It reads as though William did not expect to see his son again; perhaps he remembered that his grandfather Michael had died in exile, Given John’s age and the circumstances in which he received the letter, perhaps John took the advice too much to heart.

He was ‘to always obey your mother’, and ‘to ignore any one who advised him to do the
contrary of her advice’. His father continued, ‘I charge you in any wise to flee the company and counsel of proud men, of covetous men and of flattering men, the more especially and mightily to withstand them and not to draw nor to meddle with them, with all your might and power, and to draw to you and to your company good and virtuous men … Moreover never follow your own wit in no wise, but in all your works … ask advice and counsel [of the good and virtuous men] … and doing thus … you shall do right well ’.

The advice to, ‘never follow his own witte’ is interesting. Did William see something in his young son that suggested he was not very not bright or competent? Or was it a warning about the sort of factionalism that William had observed at court?

Further advice, to be true to the king, may explain why John never seems to have come off the fence. Did he take it literally to mean whoever occupied the throne at the time, rather than choosing a side? We can only speculate how a child might interpret this letter and how much it may have influenced his view of the world. But there does appear to be something in the advice beyond the conventional ‘obey your mother’, which suggests that William was not totally confident in his son’s ability to make the right decisions. Certainly John seems to have obeyed his mother throughout her long life.

The next few years proved difficult for Alice and her son. At parliament in November attacks continued against the de la Poles. Alice was named in a petition requesting the removal of unsuitable persons from the king’s presence for life and prohibiting them from coming within 12 miles of the king unless summoned. In June 1451 John’s inheritance was committed to the keeping of Thomas Scales and Miles Stapulton. It was Easter 1453 before Alice was finally granted the wardship and marriage of her son.

It may have been this attack on Alice and her son’s inheritance, coupled with the failure of Henry fully to protect her and her son, that caused Alice to hedge her bets. By February 1458 she had concluded an agreement with York for his daughter Elizabeth to marry John. York agreed to pay a dowry of £1,533 13s. 4d. to be paid in instalments over the next four years.

The marriage did not prove popular with the Lancastrians. According to Benet’s chronicle, it was because of John’s marriage that the Coventry parliament in November 1459 degraded his title to earl.7 John and Elizabeth were presumably married by this date. They were certainly living together as husband and wife by October 1460, when they are mentioned in a letter to John Paston, ‘the lady of Suffolk hath sent up hyre sone and hise wyf to my lord of York …’

Alice and John were now firmly on the side of the Yorkists.

In February 1461 John was at the second battle of St Albans with the Yorkists. Later John carried the sceptre at Edward’s coronation. After 1461 we begin to get a little more information on him; the primary source is the Paston Letters, which are invariably hostile. This was mostly due to the long running dispute over Fastolf’s inheritance. In October 1461 the duke of Norfolk made a complaint against the Pastons which John supported. The following January along with his brother-in-law Clarence, John was sent into Suffolk to deal with riotous people, which led Margaret Paston to write to her husband that the people ‘love not in no wyse the duke of Suffolk nor his mother’. In June 1464 Margaret wrote to her husband that she had heard that the duke had come home and either he was dead or else ‘right sick and not lyke to escape’. (This may have been wishful thinking.) Throughout 1465 Margaret’s letters are full of complaints against the duke and his mother over their attacks on the Fastolf lands, writing again on 17 October that the ‘old lady and the duke is set fervently against us.’

In 1466 John and Elizabeth settled at Ewelme. An inventory shows a large quantity of goods brought from the de la Pole home in Wingfield. John’s father had started work on a new residence in 1444 which Leland described in 1542 as ‘fair and built of brick and timber, the inner part set within a moat’. The inventory mentions a number of
chambers, a chapel, great parlour and nursery. Elizabeth and John had five surviving sons and four daughters. John was the eldest, probably born at some time in 1462. Items for the nursery included a cradle and two ‘beryng mantells’, one for every day of scarlet furred with miniver and one for best of red crimson cloth of gold tissue furred with ermine and powdered. The powdered mantle may have included the emblems and personal badges of the family. Leland described the manor house as richly decorated throughout with such devices and emblems. The heraldry in the church was echoed throughout the decoration of the manor house as well.

It may have seemed as though life was settling down. The matter of the Fastolf lands seemed to have been settled in 1467. Alice had come to an agreement with the executors in which they sold her the manors of Hellesdon and Cotton. The executors came to this arrangement because they wished to execute the true will of Fastolf, against all those ‘that untruely for their singular coveteousness maintained the forged will by John Paston’. It was thought that Alice was determined to acquire the manors because William had been born at Cotton, and that he had been forced to sell these manors to Fastolf to secure money to pay his ransom in 1434. It appears there was a sentimental side to Alice.

During the rebellion in 1469 John joined Edward against the Lincolnshire rising, but remained in England when Edward fled to Burgundy, and seems to have come to terms with Henry VI. However in January 1471 John delayed responding to demands to attend Henry VI at Westminster. According to a letter sent to Thomas Stonor, the duke was unable to come to London because his servants were all in Suffolk with his wife for Christmas. The children were there and Elizabeth had been longing to see them. Once his servants returned he would be able to come to London suitably attended as befitted his rank. The suspicion is that Elizabeth was in Suffolk so that she could get news of her brother. Upon Edward's return John took the oath to the Prince of Wales and on 11 July John and Elizabeth were granted the custody of the lands of Francis Lovell. In January 1472 John and his mother were granted the custody of Margaret of Anjou.

In 1475 personal disaster struck when Alice died. In the same year John answered the call to attend the king in France. In May 1476 Edward renewed a grant of £40 p.a. to John and Elizabeth, which had originally been granted to his father by Henry VI to help support his title of duke. On 15 August John was given licence to enter into all his lands which his mother had held and which should descend to him. In November John was enforcing his mother’s will with her executors. It seems likely that he was short of money, as his share of the Suffolk estate had only been valued at £278 p.a. Alice’s third share now came to him, but most of the family money was made up of her dower rights from her two previous marriages. John Paston commented in January 1478 that the duke needed money ‘and that in all haste’. At about this time he also sold a magnificent jewel to Edward IV for £160.

In October Elizabeth was in London attended by Elizabeth Stonor. She visited her mother on the Thursday and again on the Saturday, when Elizabeth and Cecily went to Greenwich to see the king and queen. It seems Elizabeth Stonor was anxious to discuss with the duchess the matter of some money, but the duchess was too busy preparing to ride to Canterbury. What the money related to is not mentioned but it adds to the impression that the Suffolks were in financial difficulties.

In March 1478 Suffolk was appointed Lieutenant of Ireland for twenty years, and in 1479 he was created a knight of the garter, neither of which would help with his money troubles. In June 1480 Elizabeth and John were granted a licence to grant in mortmain* lands in Leighton Buzzard, Dorset, Buckingham and Sussex, and the church of Tintagel, to St George’s Chapel. Given their lack of money there was possibly more to this than a simple act of generosity; possibly it was in exchange for settling debts.

They now appear less frequently in the records. John continued to serve regularly on commissions in Norfolk and Suffolk,
Oxfordshire and Berkshire. When Edward IV died in 1483 he was not at the funeral, but he was at Richard’s side on 19 June with John Howard, when Richard sat in the king’s chair in the Great Hall. Both John and Elizabeth attended the coronation, John once again carrying the sceptre.

This demonstration of support did not gain the Suffolks any more from Richard than they had received from Edward. On 14 August John was removed as constable of Wallingford and Steward of Chiltern, and the offices were granted to Francis Lovell. Suffolk does not seem to have borne any grudge against his former ward, for on 20 February 1484, with Lovell and John Russell, bishop of Lincoln and Chancellor, John founded a fraternity in the church of St Helen, Abingdon. On 1 May Richard granted Elizabeth 100 marks for the support of her daughter Elizabeth and son-in-law Henry Lovell, Lord Morley.

At Bosworth John stayed away, making peace with Henry soon after. Once again he carried the sceptre at the coronation and on 21 September he was restored to the constabulary of Wallingford. He continued to be used on commissions of the peace and in October 1485 on a commission to raise troops against rebels. His son’s rebellion had little effect on the act of attainder; it was his sons who were to suffer.

Although John continued to serve on commissions, and bore the sceptre at Elizabeth’s coronation, on 3 March 1489 he was once again deprived of the constableship of Wallingford. Given the regularity with which successive kings removed him from the post, you begin to feel that he was simply proving incompetent.

Suffolk died in 1492 and was buried in Wingfield. Large parts of his estate were forfeit to the crown as part of the attainder against Lincoln. In October 1495 his son Edmund petitioned parliament for his estates. What grants he managed to obtain were all given with the proviso that it did not prejudice his mother’s dower rights.

There are few mentions of Elizabeth before her death in 1503/4. In May 1495 her mother Cecily died, and in her will she left her ‘daughter of Suffolk the chare with covering, all the cushions horses and harness belonging to the same and all my palfreys’. This was presumably some sort of carriage. Other mentions are in the Privy Purse expenses of her niece, Queen Elizabeth. In January 1503 Elizabeth paid 4s. for a pair of buskins for her aunt, and she also sent her a buck.11 The Queen’s expenses only survive for the period March 1502 until her death in February 1503, but it is not unreasonable to assume that she showed regular small acts of kindness to her aunt, as she did to other members of her family that survived. Elizabeth was buried beside her husband at Wingfield.

* i.e., the king’s agreement was secured. The Statute of Mortmain (1279) forbade the granting of land to the church without royal agreement, as this reduced the king’s tax revenue. Land granted to the church was not subject to the ‘relief’ payable on the death of a tenant. The church did not die.

Notes

5. Thompson, p. 529.
8. PLP, vol. 1, letter 177, pp. 290-91
On the Ides of March (unlucky for some) 1971, *We Speak No Treason* sprang into the public domain, although its essence was there long before that. How far back does my obsession with King Richard III go? Beyond this present lifetime, I believe. As long as I can remember he has been prescient in my inner being, and it seems I am not alone. Of the thirty thousand or so letters which reached me even in the first month of publication, many began, ‘I have loved and admired Richard Plantagenet all my life, please tell me why?’ and ‘I always knew that Shakespeare had it wrong’. Even now, letters (and emails) keep coming, in the same vein.

A retrospective look at this book demands honesty. I am not embarrassed to say that Richard, or his spiritual presence, was with me constantly. *We Speak No Treason* was written through me as a channel, by a force which sometimes kept me up all night. In the beginning some cynics mocked this theory, but not any more because I find I am not alone in my certainties. I could never have contemplated such a mammoth work without having been guided and steadied to complete what I trusted would be a riposte to Shakespeare’s pantomime villain, in truth one of the best, most philanthropic kings England never had.

The book is a love letter to Richard. It shows him in the flesh, as a vibrant, vital man alive to passions and sorrows. It grew like an exotic plant and it was a secret work of such personal significance that I was loath to share it with anyone other than the one to whom it is dedicated. Clever, inspiring, my mother began it all. Some may know this story. Early in 1965 our conversation went like this: She: ‘I’m reading a novel about Richard the Third.’ Me: ‘Isn’t that Crookback?’ She: ‘No, indeed. He was lovely!’ An epiphany. These three words unleashed an avalanche of emotions so ancient that they blasted a hole in my subconscious. Instantly I could hear and scent and feel the sights and sounds of the fifteenth century. That ‘time of flowers and blood, courtly manners and cruel punishments’ – I knew it. I knew him. More than forty years ago a fire was lit in me which still burns as bright. In Shakespeare there is one harrowing line spoken by the ghosts at Bosworth: ‘Let fall thine edgeless sword, despair and die’. He can’t despair, I thought. He cannot die. His sword will have an edge and I will hone it. I intend to make him live again. I shall rebut the Tudor lies. As ‘the Maiden’ says, ‘this is a world of liars’. All this sounds simplistic and unsophisticated, but I did the homework. Many had written erudite tomes, sifting the possibilities of his guilt or innocence, and with one or two outstanding exceptions, coming to few conclusions. I wrote out of
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instinct, and maybe that was the book’s strength. Richard’s motivation for his major crimes made no sense nor does it now. I gave the story a fatalistic romance – something to counteract Shakespeare’s thrilling monstrosity, for romance, too, has power. I wrote nothing that could be construed as dishonest. I included Richard’s altruism and humanity, always looking towards the good of the common people, and always concealed by Tudor propaganda. It is ironic that a man who loved justice should be so slandered.

This instinct wrote of matters unresearched which proved to be fact. A small matter: I did not know of the vial of Virgin’s Milk (the ‘Maiden/Nun’ goes on pilgrimage to witness this, and is robbed of her last chance of seeing the beloved alive). ‘Treasures of Heaven’, an exhibition now at the British Museum, includes ‘a small flask of the Virgin Mary’s milk’.

I spent hours in Tewkesbury Abbey, thinking about and praying for Richard, touching the great pillars, wondering if his sword was responsible for any of the ancient battle scars in the stone. I sat beneath the great trees and wrote about The Man of Keen Sight – with whom quite a few readers fell in love! (Incidentally, this character evolved from one line in Paul Murray Kendall’s Richard III (George Allen & Unwin, 1955, p.361): ‘He called for men of specially keen sight ...’ Katherine’s mother was obviously Richard’s lover, and I conjured her from dreams. Elizabeth of York owned a Fool called Patch. All three characters existed, but were enfleshed by me.)

I wanted to show the true Richard, yet, paradoxically, had no inclination to submit the work to a publisher. I was jealous of it. It was too private, and mine. I even carried the thick folder about in my car wherever I went as if to protect it (from astral enemies?). At this point it only had a working title – To Chase a Demon – (see p.131, Wm. Collins hardback, 1971). I am unfashionable but I find the Shakespeare ridiculous, insulting, even obscene. One reader opined that ‘even in the play, I couldn’t reconcile Richard’s villainy with his strength of character’ – a valid point. However, the play yielded my perfect title, Act I, Scene 1, and spoken by Gloucester himself: ‘We speak no treason, man, we say the King is wise and virtuous’.

Publication was accidental and inevitable. I had arranged for two pristine copies to be made, one for me, one for my mother. Halfway through, the typist (with my grudging permission) showed some pages to a friend who (without my permission) leaked them to a London agent. The damage was done, and I had a contract with Collins within six weeks. It was terrifying. The Demon was out! – the magic exposed, the sacred grove invaded. And the circus took off. Thankfully, I was young enough to cope. I must have been interviewed a hundred times during those first weeks, and I seemed to be on TV or radio every day. It would be dishonest not to admit the book was a sensation. Even so I felt detached, as if I were Richard’s mouthpiece. I feel that some force continued to work behind the scenes. The first time I was asked to speak about him in public was on 2 October. This was not arranged by me but unknowingly by the publishers. Through

At the Society’s Guildhall Banquet 1983:
Rosemary Hawley Jarman, Patrick Bacon, Gwen Bacon
Richard I acquired dignity and coherence within the maelstrom of publicity. Although coming out of my sacred grove was painful, I became evangelical. I could field every question, and still praise the King – like the bishop of St David’s (where I now live):

‘He contents the people where he goes best that ever did prince; for many a poor man that hath suffered wrong many days have been relieved and helped by him ... and in many great cities and towns were great sums of money given him which he hath refused. On my truth I liked never the condition of any prince so well as his: God hath sent him to us for the weal of us all.’

To laud Richard in face of his detractors – that was the joy. Not money or personal fame – these were irrelevancies. Yet my Ides of March was filled with joy, not daggers – the sight of the big London bookshop, its windows filled with my gold-coloured book and thirty thousand copies flying off the shelves, a reprint within five days. I was so inexperienced I had no idea about sales, or if this was good.

The reviews were many. Nearly all were good. Some were stupendously good. There was a bit of gentle (?) mockery; I was called “Jarman of Arc” once, implying that I heard voices (no such luck). Yet the book itself they found too mysterious an entity to be mocked, and I was never particularly fazed. The clippings now fill eight thick scrapbooks, print yellow with age, but I keep them as I would gold. Yes, I am proud of what I did but still wish I had written Marjorie Bowen’s sublime Dickon, which I consider immaculate in portrayal and atmosphere.

Paperbacks followed quickly. Corgi was the first and gave me a sumptuous party in Crosby Hall (again, not my idea). I had a jester and a Boar’s Head garlanded with roses. At literary luncheons I was embraced by great writers.

The American hardback was published simultaneously by Little, Brown. There have been several reprints by various houses, and translations – the German one was very fine but, being German, considerably longer than the original! It was a Book of the Month choice twice, and serialised in Australia.

I was honoured with the Silver Quill for Best First Novel by the Authors’ Club. I’m now also a Daughter of Mark Twain in the US for, I presume, services to literature. A film company held an option on the book for years, but as they would not concur absolutely with my stipulation that movie Richard should be a replication of the book’s Richard the idea was shelved, rather to my relief.

The ‘sacred magic’ I had closely guarded was working. ‘Richard liveth yet’, and so did he, in bright colours. Readers who didn’t know the truth were persuaded; those who suspected it were convinced. Readers who had always loved Richard rejoiced with me. It was the happiest, most fulfilled time in my life. I shall always be grateful. The book took off, around the globe; it was seen in an Officers’ Mess in Singapore, in a submarine, possibly in space – who knows? We drank champagne. We cried. In my very early days as a Ricardian, Bosworth Field (as was then) was an unkempt, thistly pasture. There was a barbed wire fence under which one had to crawl to reach the Well (where I have planned to have my ashes scattered). Next, one had to become a matador, dodging the farmer’s bull. However, it was in 1971, at Sutton Cheney church, that the apogee of my joy and gratitude was reached and I had the great honour of hanging the wreath of white roses on the Society’s plaque. At that moment I felt Richard’s presence strongly, and I have since heard I was not alone in this. I think that We Speak No Treason has found a resonance, and may have helped to stem the tide of character assassination of this good man. The downside is that now that the battlefield is news (August 2011) pseudo-historians are popping up in the media, the mention of the battlefield spawning a kneejerk reaction of unscholarly yarning – hunchback, usurper, Little Princes, like the parrotings of some malicious bird. Other than suing for the libel of the dead (which isn’t possible but should be) there is only this: the Word. Long ago, the ‘Fellowship of the White Boar’ was called ‘indefatigable campaigners’. May it continue.

Another reason to celebrate is the bonding brought about by my book; a powerful
empathy has developed between me and so many. I have made special friends throughout the world. I’m not ashamed to say that when moving towards the end of the story I could hardly see the keyboard for tears, for by this time the book was writing itself. (And when I say ‘keyboard’, this was no computer, but a very small, ancient manual typewriter not even mine.)

The recent Requiem Mass has been described to me, and its correlation with those last scenes in the book, the focus being the covered catafalque. By this I am linked to others in grief. Grief for a man dead nearly six hundred years? Yes, but I can only answer that he meant something to the essence of my soul, and if the book struck chords in others, this is good. It is still being read, and being passed down, often from mother to daughter, as the wheel comes full circle. I have published more books: The King’s Grey Mare was another chance to write of Richard, and The Courts of Illusion follows, rather tragically, the fate of the characters’ descendants, but – as a reviewer remarked, to my pleasure, ‘the author still has it in for the Tudors’. Crown in Candlelight was another and dealt rather gently with a Tudor (but an early one), and now I have moved into the refreshment of Fantasy. A parallel universe where I can do what I please! – and all the heroes have Richard-like traits. However, had I only written We Speak No Treason and no other word, I would have been more than content.

I am nearly 77 years old. Forty years on and nothing has changed. I am still his champion and challenger. I am relentless in my patronage and devotion. I am ‘his true bedeswoman’. When I first found Richard (or he found me) we were the same age. When my In Memoriam notice no longer appears in the press, you will know that I walk in the next world. I believe that the spirit survives and, like the magnificent Josephine Tey and Paul Murray Kendall, et al., I will continue cheering for Richard in whatever life awaits me.

And when you open We Speak No Treason what you see is my soul on paper.

[The latest edition of We Speak No Treason is published by Tempus (now The History Press) in two parts. Recommended: The Final Act of Mr Shakespeare, by Robert Winder (Little, Brown) 2010.]

© Rosemary Hawley Jarman 2011

---

Rosemary Hawley Jarman’s four historical novels set in the fifteenth century, We Speak No Treason, The King’s Grey Mare, Crown in Candlelight and The Courts of Illusion, are all obtainable via Amazon, and some have recently been republished by Tempus (now The History Press). She also wrote a non-fiction account of the battle of Agincourt, Crispin’s Day: the Glory of Agincourt, which is due to be republished by Amberley Publishing under the title Agincourt: the Story of a Battle. For up-to-date information about Rosemary, visit her website: www.rosemaryhawleyjarman.com

---

Richard III and Buckingham Palace

Wendy Moorhen writes: ‘Jane Trump and I recently visited Buckingham Palace during its summer opening. Whilst admiring the sumptuous decoration of the throne room, Jane noticed some figures on the elaborate frieze high on the walls. She called me over and wondered if she was being fanciful, but three figures had caught her eye: a medieval man lying on the ground and two standing figures, one crowning the other. Could this be a representation of Richard’s death at Bosworth? Indeed it was. The official Souvenir Guide confirmed this, though we failed to see the significance of two further scenes either side of the Bosworth depiction. On the left hand side is Richard’s accusation of Hastings and on the right the ‘murder’ of the princes in the Tower, described in the Guide as Richard’s ‘blackest deeds’. The entire plaster frieze, designed by Thomas Stothard, represents episodes from the Wars of the Roses, but sadly Stothard drew his imagery from Shakespeare. Artistically, it is a remarkable piece of work and well researched with regard to the accuracy of the ‘costume, armour and weaponry’. Shame about the history though.’
Warwick at Wells

COLIN RICHMOND

This article, one of the many incomparable jokes penned by Professor Colin Richmond, was first published in the 2011 Annual Report & Journal of the Friends of Wells Cathedral. We are very grateful to the Friends and to Professor Richmond for permission to reprint the article for your amusement in the Bulletin. Please remember: it is not wholly serious.

In flight from royalist forces in the spring of 1470 Warwick the Kingmaker stopped at the Deanery in Wells. He gave a miserly 5d. as an offering in the dean’s chapel before departing westward. Perhaps he hadn’t the cash on him to give more. It seems the obvious explanation. But is it the right one? Not surprisingly it isn’t. The obvious rarely is anything other than the first explanation that comes to mind. It won’t do here. To understand that miserable 5d. we have to go back a few years. Back in fact to the surprising marriage of Edward IV to Elizabeth Woodville in 1464. Edward did not go in for the obvious then; we shall not do so now. He liked brinkmanship. Edward also liked gamesmanship and his game was fives. It is on the fives court at Grafton Regis, in Northamptonshire, that our story begins exactly two years after the marriage day.

In his otherwise admirable biography of John Gunthorpe in the ODNB Cecil Clough neglects to mention the passion the Dean of Wells had for fives. It seems a pardonable omission until one recalls just how critical the game was in determining political alliances during the Wars of the Roses. It is all very well to dwell on Gunthorpe’s scholarship, but there is more to any man than meets the eye; in Gunthorpe’s case it was playing fives that made him the cheerful fellow he was, one who was welcomed at every fives tournament from Ferrara to Finchley. Why was he made Queen Elizabeth Woodville’s secretary and chaplain in 1466, an exacting post he held for eleven eventful years? Our narrative begins with a game of fives.

There was (of course) a fives court at Grafton. Where else would Anthony Woodville have honed his skills if not at home? By the time he was dispatched to Winchester he was already an accomplished player, school champion by the age of fifteen. It was on the court of Grafton that he played a match to celebrate becoming the king’s brother-in-law. His opponent was Edward himself, who was happy to oblige. John Gunthorpe was the umpire. This was not a match for him to participate in. John did, however, partner Anthony Woodville in the doubles match played later that afternoon against the king and another young prodigy of the game, Christopher Urswick. The new queen watched both matches with a certain air of detachment, a foretaste of her later dislike of the game when Edward took up with Jane Shore, All-England Ladies Champion.

Here then was the origin of the favour showed to John Gunthorpe by Edward IV and his queen. Two years later he was Elizabeth’s secretary and chaplain and in that post he lasted until the infamous contest of 1477. Jane Shore had arrived on the scene. As Jane’s favours were liberally cast about, it was no surprise that William Lord Hastings, and the queen’s son, Thomas, Marquis of Dorset, shared them. It is a moot point whether Elizabeth Woodville was more scandalized by her son taking up with the saucy London divorcée than by her husband doing so. At any rate when the mixed-doubles fives match was played (on a specially constructed wooden-sided court in the garden of the London Grocers’ Company) Elizabeth not only boycotted it, but also dismissed John Gunthorpe from her employ for umpiring it. The teams (by the way) comprised Lord Hastings and Jane Shore and Thomas Grey.
and the sporty Anne Neville, who had by this time ‘got over’ being the wife of Richard, duke of Gloucester. After this tumultuous match the queen and Gunthorpe were ever after at daggers drawn. As indeed were Gunthorpe and Richard of Gloucester, Richard bearing a grudge for an umpiring decision the former made ruling a shot of Anne’s out when her husband considered it in. It is on such seemingly petty grounds that momentous events are decided. In May 1483 Richard replaced Gunthorpe as Dean of the Chapel Royal not because he protested the arrest and detention of his old friend Anthony Woodville, though he did, but because he had called a fives ball out and not in half a dozen years earlier. However: what of John Gunthorpe the player?

It seems one of his more inconsequential appointments, yet the rectory of Cley-next-the-Sea in north Norfolk, when he was granted it in 1466, was a turning point in John’s fives career. Cley is no distance from Middleton, the house Anthony Woodville obtained when he married Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Thomas, lord Scales. Middleton became a favourite residence of Anthony’s and he brought the house bang up to date in terms of convenience and comfort. It had a games room, incidentally the places where the Wars of the Roses board game Kingmaker, a ‘feudal version of monopoly’, as Tony Pollard has labelled it, was invented in the 1470s, when the Wars were mistakenly believed to have been concluded, and it had a fives court. It was among the best in the land, perhaps the best; it was generally conceded to be the fastest: if one could play well there one could play well anywhere. Add to this that Anthony Woodville was also among the best fives players in the country, perhaps the best, and one need go no further in explanation of John Gunthorpe’s astonishing improvement as a fives player by 1470.

Now, it has to be said that the Kingmaker was a duffer at games. In Tony Pollard’s biography of Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, in the ODNB this is not alluded to. Not out of ignorance I am sure, but because games seem to some historians peripheral to politics, when of course they are at their very heart and soul. Whole cabinets have been formed in consequence of games of fives played at Eton, or as a result of the make-up of teams contesting the Wall Game. And many a lifelong political alliance has been sealed by a triumph at billiards in Pop, many an enduring antagonism has been the result of a defeat at table tennis in Crush. Still, there it is, or rather is not: no trace in the Pollard biography of the tetchy earl of Warwick’s contempt for games, a contempt that was (alas) only too obvious to his ward Richard of Gloucester, despite the construction of the fives court at the top of the keep at Middleham Castle solely for the boy’s pleasure.

But back to Wells in March 1470. Gunthorpe was not Dean of Wells until 1482
so Warwick’s contemptible 5d. was not because he found himself billeted on a man he had no time for. Warwick’s 5d. was his response to discovering that in all the hurly-burly of revolution and counter-revolution in 1469-70 the Somerset Fives Championships were still taking place. Regardless we might say. In the spring of 1470 the Championship was being held at Wells; one of the courts was in the Deanery. Can you imagine in: Warwick and Clarence in flight for their lives finding themselves being shunted off to back rooms and cubby holes because much-adulated fives players had all the best accommodation? Warwick and Clarence were ignored. They had to cater for themselves. Having far too few bully-boys with them to knock together heads, they had to make do with leftovers from the Deanery kitchen while hearty meals were being served to sturdy yeomen farmers from Cheddar and Charterhouse, from Wiveliscombe and Watchet. Warwick was quite sensationally furious.

Clarence was again at Wells in the spring of 1471. He did not have to endure backstairs lodgings, the County Championship that year being held at Glastonbury, on the monastic fives courts there, among them the earliest in England, some said dating from the reign of King Arthur. One of them was round: alas, no one any longer knew the rules of the round game so the Round Court as it was understandably called had become a sacred antiquity to be marvelled at, a holy site where Sir Lancelot had played fives with Galahad and Merlin had kept the score. Could Joseph of Arimathea actually have been the umpire? Clarence was oblivious to all this. He was busy mending fences with his brother Edward. Which, as we all know, he did, at any rate temporarily. Edward IV’s successful return was the saving of fives at London and Westminster.

Now, however, to John Gunthorpe. We will return to him by way of Thomas Urswick, a northerner who made a name for himself in the south. Urswick’s ‘preoccupation with the government of London lasted from 1453 to 1471, and formed the central part of his career’, writes Linda Clark. Appointed common sergeant of the city in 1453, it was only a little over a year later than he became its recorder; he held this office until 1471, when on Edward IV’s recovery of the crown he was made Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Thomas died in 1479, a year or two before John Gunthorpe began the modernization of the Deanery at Wells. He put in a magnificent new fives court. It is a pity Thomas never got to play a gentle game or two on it with his trusty old friend.

Where had they played in his lifetime? They had first met in 1467, the year that Thomas was appointed to Elizabeth Woodville’s council, a year after John became the queen’s secretary and chaplain. Being such enthusiasts, they would play anywhere, most often at one or other of the courts in Chancery Lane. Some lunchtimes they might have been discovered at the Guildhall where there was a little-frequented fives court, its location lost to sight at the Reformation until its excavation after the Second World War, when it puzzled many as to its purpose until Brian Spencer of the Museum of London came up with the answer. It was he who, having found a badge depicting a fives-playing saint on the site, put two and two together. The saint remains unidentified. I am fairly confident that I too ‘shall come up with an answer’.

Busy men though they were, both believed in fives as an antidote to that staleness of mind businessmen are liable to. They themselves were the perfect answer to their obese critics; they often replied to them with the retort that a healthy mind was the product of a healthy body, pointing to the tubby Henry VI as an example of the opposite. They also wagged their beards over Edward IV, who having given up playing had become listless, an easy prey for the predators in his wife’s family, as well as those in his own. Of the two, it was Gunthorpe who gave the more eloquent testimony to their endorsement of fives as a means to fitness of body, mind and soul. It was John’s recommendation of the game as soul-building on all and any occasion that made those who thought him a model of rationality in general wonder at his lack of moderation in this particular. He preached often, indeed ob-
cessively, on the subject, the symbolism that he found in the game supplying him with increasingly speculative comparisons between Fives, the Resurrection of the Body and the Raising of Lazarus. The sermon he preached at the marriage of Richard of York and Anne Mowbray in 1478 was greeted with embarrassed giggles by the more foppish of the courtiers present. John’s annotations in his copy of Agostino Dati’s _Elegantoliae_ lead one to believe that his sermon on that occasion might have breached even the low standards of good taste prevalent at the Yorkist court, his facetious ‘Italianisms’ being too much for English minds to grapple with. Thomas Urswick was foremost among those who chastised him that day. Richard of Gloucester, who had no time for poetry (let alone jokes), was appalled; but then Gunthorpe was never going to be the man for Richard, a prince as intolerant of sexual innuendo as he was ready to take violent measures against widows and orphans.

John Gunthorpe died in 1498. He had lived to see better days than those of 1483-85. Better days than those of 1469-71 too. His tomb survives in St Katherine’s Chapel in Wells Cathedral. We are told that ‘the iron bar running along part of the top of this tomb seems to have held prickets for candles, which burnt before an image called Jessina ... given by Gunthorpe himself’. I have an idea that Jessina was the patron saint of fives: why else would Gunthorpe have had her image set up on his tomb? It is she whose badge was found in the Guildhall excavations, she whose shrine at Eton survived into the 18th century. Her story, fascinating as it is, will have to be left to another occasion. I cannot resist revealing, however, that it was the custom before matches at the school for competing parties to light a candle before her image and to offer up a prayer for success. It sounds conventional enough, yet Henry VI is recorded as having come out against the practice; the image was too feminine by half for him and he was scandalized that pubescent boys should kneel in adoration before it.


**Wells Cathedral in Somerset** is the seat of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who resides in the nearby Bishop’s Palace. The first church was established on the site in 705, and the present structure was built between 1175 and 1490. Bishop Robert Stillington, of pre-contract fame, was interred in the Stillington Chapel following his death in 1491; but by 1556 the chapel had been destroyed. Much of its layout was recovered during excavations in 1894, and this can still be seen today.

**The Friends of Wells Cathedral** were founded in 1933 and provide support for the chapter of Wells in maintaining the fabric, life and work of the cathedral. The Friends have contributed to projects big and small relating to the cathedral and its various activities. Membership benefits include the opportunity to become involved in the life of the cathedral, invitations to special events, outings and social gatherings; and newsletters and an annual journal. New or original work is always sought for the journal, and sometimes it is the place where learned papers first have their publication. For more information visit: www.wellsfriends.org. or write to the Friends of Wells Cathedral, West Cloister, Wells, Somerset, BA5 2PA, email info@wellsfriends.org

Wells Cathedral: tomb of John Gunthorpe, Dean 1471-1498. Drawings by Geoffrey Wheeler
Correspondence

Will contributors please note that letters may be shortened or edited to conform to the standards of the Bulletin. The Bulletin is not responsible for the opinions expressed by contributors.

The Minster Yorkist
From Sally Badham, FSA, Hon. President, Church Monuments Society
I enjoyed reading Marcus Herbert’s extremely well researched article ‘The Minster Yorkist’ in The Ricardian (vol. XXI, 2011, pp.1-22) and the subsequent correspondence in the Bulletin (September 2011, p.xx). Marcus Herbert made a most persuasive case for the effigy commemorating a member of the Cheyne family, but I think it highly unlikely that it is, as he suggests, the monument to William Cheyne (d.1487).

Marcus Herbert wrote in his article ‘the fact that preparation for medieval funerals usually took place well in advance, including the commission of a suitable monument [my italics], together with the dating of the Minster tomb to around 1475, firmly excludes the possibility that it was made for Sir John Cheyne’. He gives no references to substantiate this statement and the evidence I know of is to the contrary; i.e. that most monuments were made after death.

The best evidence for when individual monuments were made is where there is a surviving contract, but these are extremely rare: only eleven are known which date from the medieval period. Of these, just two relate to monuments made during the lifetime of the person commemorated: the contracts for the tomb in Westminster Abbey of Richard II and Queen Anne of Bohemia were taken out following the death of Richard’s much-loved queen and that for the brass to Richard Willoughby (d.1471) at Wollaton (Nottinghamshire) was made in 1466, when both he and his wife were still alive but were aware that they would remain childless and could not therefore rely on others to ensure that they were appropriately commemorated. They are, therefore, both special cases. The contracts for all the others date from after the death of the person commemorated. In only one instance was the monument in place within a year of the death of the person commemorated, but there was a much longer delay with many, including that to Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick (d.1439 but contracts taken out in 1453).

More evidence can be provided by wills, which sometimes refer to a tomb monument already made. Greater numbers request a monument to be provided after death and some of these specify by when the monument should be in place. Most analytical work on testamentary provision for monuments has been carried out in relation to monumental brasses. Most such testators who specified a time limit allowed a year, although this does vary. Brasses are one category of monument which normally include an inscription. It is possible to tell where the brass has been made in the person’s lifetime, as a gap was then left for the date to be filled in, which can be detected by the deployment of different script or spacing. Such examples form a tiny minority of all brasses.

Having disposed of the argument that monuments were normally commissioned before death, the date of the effigy needs to be considered. The key considerations here are the armour and hairstyle depicted. The best comparators are the alabaster effigies at Ryther (Yorkshire) commemorating Sir William Ryther (d.1475) and at Puddletown (Dorset) to a member of the Martyn family of Athelhampton, which has recently been dated to c.1470 (in an unpublished report by Brian and Moira Gittos to aid applications for grant funding for conservation work). Marcus Herbert’s date of c.1475 for the Minster monument is therefore entirely plausible, although a slightly earlier date is certainly possible.
In his letter in the Bulletin, Marcus Herbert says that he would expect Sir John Cheyne (d.1467) to have had an effigy with a collar of esses, ruling out the Purbeck marble military effigy as commemorating him. Surely it is him and not his son who is the Minster Yorkist?

**Serious historians and fantasy**

*From Pauline Harrison Pogmore*

I have followed with great interest the debate for and against historical novels. Personally I can see nothing against a good well-written novel as long as it is remembered this is fiction and not to be taken as pure fact. Quite a lot of fiction is well written and gives an idea of the period. No-one can claim to be really sure what historical characters were really like and most novelists do not pretend to know. They are merely writing what they imagine. Also, let us remember it is a novel that has brought many people to an awareness of a different Richard to the person portrayed by More and Shakespeare.

The same cannot be said for several so-called serious historians. Too many of them write the words ‘Richard thought’, for example. How can anyone be so arrogant as to think they know for certain what another person thought five hundred years later? Another thing that annoys me is the ‘serious’ historical writer who so often seems to go into the realms of fantasy. Michael Hicks is a case in point. How can one take him seriously when he makes the ludicrous claim that Richard and Anne’s marriage was incestuous because Anne’s sister was married to Richard’s brother? Has the man not looked at the marriages of the children of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, for instance? Here you have the eldest daughter marrying her cousin Manuel of Portugal. After her death Manuel goes on to marry her sister Maria and after Maria’s death he married the niece of both these previous wives. Two more of Ferdinand and Isabella’s brood, Juan and Juana, married sister and brother Margaret and Philip of Austria, while the youngest child, Catherine, married first Arthur, Prince of Wales and then his brother Henry VIII.

If Richard and Anne’s marriage was incestuous, where does that leave this interfamily marital tangle? Quite apart from this, all four of the principal royal houses of Europe at the time were descended from John of Gaunt, making them all related in some degree. This is only one case of the serious historian writing about a pet theory which doesn’t stand up to examination. Serious historians are supposed to stick to the facts, not crackpot theories.

**Two Ricardian questions**

*From Mike Bennett, York*

I’ve been doing some research for a possible future book and was wondering if any of my fellow Ricardians could help with the following questions:

(i) Was (Sir?) Richard Haute (a kinsman of Elizabeth Woodville and controller of the Ludlow household, I believe) arrested and executed by Richard (III) in 1483? My sources appear to vary. Annette Carson, in her excellent *The Maligned King* seems also (p.46) to suggest that there were two Richard Hautes.

(ii) Was Richard (III) actually in London when George, duke of Clarence, was executed in 1478, or was he at Middleham? Again, my sources seem contradictory.

Hopefully these matters can be swiftly resolved. In the event of yet more conflicting perspectives, I’ll happily accept a majority verdict.

**Annette Carson writes:**

Yes, two Richard Hautes. I cannot claim that the following is original research on my part. Wendy Moorhen as research officer replied to an enquiry from me several years ago, as follows: ‘There were two Richard Hautes who were contemporaries and possibly they were great-uncle and great-nephew. Richard Haute the elder was the son of William Haute who had married as his second wife Joan, daughter of Sir Richard Woodville of Kent. This was the Richard who rebelled against Richard III during Buckingham’s rebellion. He was not knighted and he was not executed following the arrests of Rivers, Grey and Vaughan. That story emanates from More, who also calls him a knight. He may however have been arrested around the time of the Stony Stratford incident. Sir Richard Haute the younger was born about
1446. Richard III knighted him in 1482 and he appears to have remained loyal to him. He was possibly the son of Edmund Haute who was William Haute’s brother.’


**Commemorating Bosworth in New South Wales**

*From Julia Redlich*

Members of the New South Wales Branch of the Society attended morning service for the anniversary of the battle of Bosworth at St Mary’s church, Waverley, Sydney. The *Parish Messenger*, handed to all members of the congregation, featured a portrait of Richard on the first page, plus a welcome to our members and an explanation of why the Society exists and why remembering Bosworth is so important for us all. Then, on the next page, we were touched to discover that the Rector, the Rev. Peter Clark, had taken Richard’s motto as a starting-point for a brief article.

“‘Loyalty Binds Me.’ That is interesting, isn’t it? Loyalty is in short supply these days. In politics, in corporate life, in marriages and families. Even in church, loyalty is a virtue which is becoming conditional – “I will be loyal to you as long as you please me”. Why is this? I believe that it is because the loyalty that binds us to God is being eroded. People are not loyal to God, or Jesus, and then the flow-on effect is that people are not loyal to each other. With that in mind, all of us would benefit from taking on for ourselves Richard III’s motto “Loyalty binds me”.

Let’s hope those attending and who expressed such interest in Richard III to us after the service will feel inspired to find out more about the man himself and why loyalty was such an important part of his life. Maybe the brochures we made available will be a good starting-point.

**An immensely enjoyable AGM**

*From Jane Grenfell*

Today I attended my very first AGM, despite being a member for over 25 years. In the past something had always prevented me from attending. I enjoyed my day immensely. I met some lovely people and had interesting and informative chats with complete strangers. I must admit that I was a little apprehensive that everyone else there would know each other and I would be just an interested bystander. Nothing could be further from the truth. All of the people I met were welcoming and friendly. A great tribute to the Society.

**A Crossbow from Bosworth Field?**

*From Patricia Payne, Berwick-upon-Tweed*

While searching the bound volumes of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, vol. 54, part 1, 1784, I came across a letter from a Richard Green, Lichfield, January 18, a collector with a private museum. It was about part of a crossbow found ‘some years ago’ by labourers in Bosworth Field. Page 79 had a drawing. It is the most elaborate thing, “made of yew with several studs of gold”. Sadly, instead of giving more information, Mr Green favours us with extracts from a scarce poem – justly scarce! – by Charles Alleyn on the battle of Bosworth Field.

I don’t think the crossbow is ‘right’. It looks like a very expensive, could be continental, hunting weapon long discarded and found in a loft or attic. It was said to be ‘carefully preserved (after being unearthed) in a private family in a neighbouring market town in Warwickshire and presented by a friend to my museum’. If the Warwickshire town was Warwick or Kenilworth, that would fit the hunting angle.

Where was Bosworth Field prior to 1784?
The Barton Library

Additions to the Non-Fiction Book Library

Edward IV and the Wars of the Roses by David Santiuste (Pen & Sword Military, 2010, pbk). This re-assessment of Edward's military role, and of the Wars of the Roses in which he played such a vital part, gives a fascinating insight into Edward the man, and into the politics and the fighting. This work is based on contemporary sources and the latest scholarly research. The author kindly donated this signed copy of his work to the Barton Library, for which my heartfelt thanks.

The Mortimers: Lords of the March by Charles Hopkinson and Martin Speight (Logaston Press, 2002, paperback). This book details the lives of all Mortimer heirs, along with other members of the family, and of branches of the family at Richard's Castle, Chelmarsh and Chirk. But it is more than just a chronicle of the family's history. Chapters also deal with family relations with the Welsh, which were not simply one of warfare and acquisition, but also of inter-marriage and of seeming interest in the Celtic world; with the spread and organisation of their estates; with their activity in castle building and borough creation. The epilogue deals with Edward IV. Thanks to Elisabeth Sjöberg for another kind donation.

Political Elites in South-West England, 1450-1500 by Robert E. Stansfield (The Edwin Mellen Press Ltd, 2009, hardback). The author takes the case of the South-West in order to explore the regional nature of politics in the second half of the fifteenth century. Cornwall, Devon, Somerset and Dorset were dominated from 1471 by George, duke of Clarence, until his fall in 1477 and then between 1478 and 1483 they formed the core of a regional block dominated by the king's step-son Thomas Grey, marquess of Dorset. Antecedents of this policy can be found in the last years of Henry VI's reign and again in the first years of Edward IV's; and echoes are to be found after 1485. This book is donated at cost by Dr Stansfield. It would be about £80 to buy in the shops, and therefore I think we will have to use the recorded delivery service for any member who wants to borrow it. My thanks to Dr Stansfield for his kind donation and thinking of us.

News from the Non-Fiction Papers Library

It is nice to be able to report that quite a few new papers have been added to the library this year, mainly as the result of members’ donations or requests. These include:

All the articles from the August 2009 issue of Historical Research, which was devoted to the reign of Henry VII (full contents list available online at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hisr.2009.82.issue-217/issuetoc).

‘At the King’s Pleasure: The Testament of Cecily Neville’ by Alison Spedding (Midland History, Vol 35 No 2, 2010). This article provides a useful guide to the drafting of Cecily’s will and the bequests included in it - as well as those items she chose to omit.

‘Sir Thomas St Leger, c 1439-83: the rise and fall of a royal servant during the reigns of Edward IV and Richard III’ by John T. Driver (Surrey Archaeological Collections, vol 94, 2008). This article traces the origins, rise and fall of the man who wooed and finally married Richard III’s
eldest sister Anne, duchess of Exeter, and who was executed on Richard’s orders for his part in Buckingham’s Rebellion.

‘The Career and Affiliations of Sir Roger Tocotes of Bromham (c. 1430-92): a Political Survivor in late Fifteenth-Century England’, also by John T. Driver (Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, vol 98, 2005). A detailed study of the career of Sir Roger, best known to Ricardians for Clarence’s claim that he had supported Ankarette Twynyo and John Thoresby in murdering his wife and baby, and for his involvement in Buckingham’s Rebellion.

Additions to the Fiction Library

*Tears on the Diadem, or the Crown and the Cloister: a tale of the White and Red Roses* by Anna Hanson Dorsey (hardback 1902, but first published in 1846)
The story of Elizabeth Woodville from 1470 until her death.

*The Stolen Crown* by Susan Higginbotham (paperback 2010)
A novel following the life of Katherine Woodville who, after Elizabeth Woodville married Edward IV, would marry Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham. The book covers the period 1464 until 1496 when she married Richard Wingfield.

*Virgin Widow* by Anne O’Brien (paperback 2010)
The book opens in 1469 with Anne Neville witnessing her sister Isabelle giving birth at sea. It then follows her life in exile in France, and her betrothal to Edward of Lancaster, then the battle of Tewkesbury and finally marriage to Richard of Gloucester.

*The Final Act of Mr Shakespeare* by Robert Winder (paperback 2010)
A novel about Shakespeare trying to write a play *King Henry VII*. This book will be reviewed in the next Bulletin.

Additions to the Audio Visual Library

Visual

BBC4 TV. ‘A Renaissance Education’. Helen Castor and John Guy explore the extraordinary story of Thomas More’s daughter, Margaret Roper, a woman who published a book at the age of nineteen in the male-dominated world of sixteenth-century learning.

BBC4 TV. ‘Children of the Middle Ages’. Stephen Baxter’s forensic investigation of youngsters in medieval society, who had only a 50-50 chance of reaching adulthood. As a result of this high death rate, there were not enough adults to work the land, so many boys had dangerous, life-shortening jobs. Includes a brief reference to Margaret Beaufort.


With thanks to Ann Cole, Wiltshire, for kindly donating the above DVDs.

Contact details for all the Librarians are on the inside back cover.
Australasian Convention, Melbourne, 5-7 August 2011

This report by Ann Chandler (New South Wales) was first published on the NSW Branch website, and appears here by kind permission. The event, a most successful and enjoyable weekend, was hosted by the Victoria Branch.

We met at the Victoria Hotel in Melbourne’s Little Collins Street in the early evening of Friday 5 August. The hotel is a lovely old building with much charm and character, recently renovated and the perfect venue for the convention.

Michael Iliffe, Chairman of the Victoria Branch, welcomed us all very graciously. It was great to catch up with friends from our own and other branches of the Society. We received our bags, each containing information, the programme for the weekend, and a most beautiful handmade table centre in murrey with Ricardian insignia. We were regaled with drinks and canapés and had a really enjoyable ‘meet and greet’, and then we split into various groups to head off into the cosmopolitan Melbourne night. Most New South Wales members joined with the New Zealanders, and enjoyed the evening in a fabulous and very authentic Japanese restaurant nearby.

Early on Saturday morning we met up again and, after a brief briefing when Michael also read out good wishes from the Executive Committee in the UK sent by Secretaries Sue and David Wells, Babs Creamer and the Dorset Group, and Deirdre Drysdale, Chairman of the New Zealand Branch, the programme commenced with a lively discussion about the dukes of Norfolk, given by Kevin Herbert (New South Wales). It was a fascinating insight into a long and noble lineage. This was followed by a presentation on bookbinding by Phil Ridgeway, an obviously skilled professional with a strong interest in medieval work. Phil provided us with some great examples of the work.

Then came Kaye Turnbull (Victoria Branch) with a talk on ‘Witchcraft in the Houses of York and Lancaster’, which proved very insightful, and a subject that Kaye had researched well. It left us spellbound. She was followed by David Studham of the Australian Heraldry Society who gave a terrific lecture on heraldry and accompanied it with some fantastic visuals that explained the intricacies of the subject and showed some lovely examples of Richard’s arms.

‘The Welsh Connection’ was then examined by Jenny Gee (Western Australia). A map showing many sites was provided and it was yet another example of the speaker knowing the topic well. After lunch another presentation by a Western Australian member was given; this time it was Carole Carson who stepped up to the podium to deliver a most interesting lecture on ‘Medieval Wall-painting’. This shed light and illumination on faith in the fifteenth century.

Manning Imperial took the floor and surprised us all with a recreation and re-enactment of clothes and armour worn in the late fifteenth century. They welcomed enthusiastic questions and we were amazed at how heavy the armour was and how intricately it was constructed. A wonderful display – and now we know where to buy our armour!

Gillian Laughton (South Australia) had a hard act to follow, but she rose to the challenge admirably with her talk on ‘Justices in Richard III’s time’. It was an excellent and detailed discussion to which she certainly did justice. Michael Iliffe was next with his talk on ‘Medieval Holidays and Festivals’. ‘Without festivity life can be tedious’ and that quote held true as Michael so intelligently demonstrated with an entertaining talk.

The final item on the day’s programme was a presentation of ‘Richard III: the posthumous hunchback’ given by Helen Portus and Denise Rawlings of New South Wales. This proved to be a wonderful examination of history versus propaganda and a real look at how we study history.
was a lively, articulate presentation that was provocative and motivating. A DVD showing where Richard was born, lived and died, and his recognition in many memorials, had a musical accompaniment that left many of us near to tears, inspiring us to continue to defend the truth.

After such an interesting day we had a short time out before we convened again for the banquet that was absolutely delicious, abundant and splendid, as were the wines in which we drank toasts to HM the Queen of Australia and Queen of New Zealand, to our fellow Ricardians around the world – and to King Richard III. It was a terrific night and many members had gone to great medieval lengths with costume. Julia Redlich (New South Wales) looked superb in blue and silver and fellow Branch member Kevin cut quite a dash as Pope Sixtus IV. The executioner (Victoria) and his gory handbag should also be mentioned, although thankfully demonstration of his skill never went too far. A later entertainment of young and energetic Hungarian dancers, and then some amazing belly dancers kept us entertained. Finally to see if our brains were still in working order, we split into three tables while Michael produced a mind-numbing quiz. Surprisingly, the collection of many intelligences at each table brought some interesting and often correct results.

So, on to Sunday and by 9 am we were all together to begin the session. This commenced with a talk about ‘William Marshall and the Marshall Curse’ presented by Betty Fleet (New Zealand). She had undertaken much research into the family and there was frequent audience participation as we all chanted under Betty’s instruction: ‘He had no sons!’

Annette Parry, also from New Zealand, followed with her talk about Jasper Tudor, someone who for many of us had always seemed to be on the outskirts of history, but her fascinating examination of this loyal statesman showed him to be a key player in the events of his time.

We then had a business session conducted by the Australasian Vice-President, Rob Smith of New Zealand. First he was re-elected by unanimous acclamation. He then spoke about the special committee convened by the Executive in the UK to consider publication, printing and postage of The Ricardian and the Bulletin and the possibility of the use of electronic media in this regard. As representatives from the executive were augmented by representatives from Canada, Australasia and the USA, David Bliss from the Victoria Branch had been appointed to represent us.

The next item was the venue for the next convention in 2013. Unfortunately, the South Australia Branch, who had been memorable hosts in 2001, had indicated that it did not have the personnel now to run a convention. Rob had been in touch with New South Wales Branch regarding this. Julia, the Branch Secretary, said the Branch was happy to be hosts in 2013 – although Victoria had given us a hard act to follow. They looked forward to welcoming everyone in two years’ time. Further points of discussion in this section included the advantages and otherwise of electronic downloads and the problems of using other Branch journal material in our own newsletters. Most felt that we were all fellow Ricardians happy to share information, but
recognised the necessity to acknowledge author, publication and date of its first use. In asking permission for use, any copyright should be cleared. Usually this would be cleared for private publication, but if any journal or DVD was for profit, this would need further examination.

After morning tea, the next presentation posed that very provocative question: ‘What if …?’ Hazel Hajdu (tireless Victoria Branch Secretary) handled it so well, painting a very different picture of our world if Richard had missed meeting Edward V at Stony Stratford. What a lot we had to consider – and what very different lives we would be leading today.

This led to the final presentation of the convention: an extract from the play Now is the Winter ... which took the words of Shakespeare’s Richard III and gave them a good shake. In this, actor/director Kate Saffin provided a fresh look at Richard from the point of view of one of his lowly but very loyal servants, Bess. Julia (New South Wales) gave a wonderful, stirring performance to end what had been a most memorable convention.

After lunch we said reluctant goodbyes, and gave our thanks and praise to the hard-working Victoria Branch for hosting such a successful and well-run weekend for us all. They certainly did Richard proud, giving us time, once again, to celebrate our good king and our united fight for his cause.

Ann Chandler

American Branch 50th Anniversary AGM

23-25 September 2011
A report by the Illinois Chapter of the RIII Society, American Branch

Revenge was sweet – literally – when attendees at the Friday night reception which marked the beginning of the 2011 AGM in the US, sponsored by the Illinois Chapter, were rewarded with candy for bashing a special piñata made to look (somewhat!) like Henry VII.* Of course, the candy was not released from inside the piñata until enough attendees had opened it from the strength of their strikes, in a process which was both therapeutic and entertaining. This activity was just one of several throughout the weekend which showed the thought and care that Illinois Chapter members had put into planning the 2011 AGM.

It was at the reception in the Essex Ballroom of the Doubletree Hotel in Oak Brook, outside of Chicago, that members picked up their registration packets Friday night. These contained the schedule for the weekend and a magazine listing nearby attractions. They were accompanied by favors: decorated bookmarks, RIII pencils and pens, a crossword puzzle, and small, handmade magnets.

AGM Chair Nita Musgrave and Chapter President Jane Munsie were on hand to greet people, along with other chapter members – Janice Weiner, Mary Ann Dion, Debbie Guptill, Marcy Ladrach, Mary Nair, Kate Skegg, Marie Stanley, Joyce and Tony Tumea, and Mary Ann Vissers. Guests began the evening by browsing the sales tables, buying raffle tickets, and enjoying a variety of snacks. They admired the sheet cake decorated with white roses and lettered to say, ‘Happy 50th Anniversary, American Branch of the RIII Society’. Nita led all present in a toast to Richard and the Society, after which the cake was cut and served.

Attendees then viewed a slide presentation and took part in a discussion on achievements and highlights of both the national branch and individual chapters, which was lively and informative. A few people had their pictures taken with the Fabric Photo Figures, inserting their own faces in holes cut into suspended, life-size cloth depictions of a jester and a medieval lady (created by Joyce Tumea and Debbie Guptill and visible behind the piñata in the photo on the next page).

The next morning began with a Continental breakfast, followed by the first speaker at 9 a.m.; this was RIII member Jonathon Hayes, who spoke very knowledgeably about heraldry, and had several very helpful handouts. The next speaker was Dr Robert Holst, a music director and teacher who talked on ‘Music in England in the time of Richard III’. He also had handouts and
played selections of music to illustrate the points he was making. The third speaker that morning was scheduled to be Barbara Underwood, but she had had to cancel because of health complications. Debbie Guptill did a very nice job of stepping in and presenting Barbara’s talk on ‘A History of Otherness: Disability in the Middle Ages’ in her stead.

These workshops were followed by a break and then luncheon, after which attendees were treated to Mary Miller’s very well-researched talk on ‘The Role of Scotland in the Wars of the Roses’. Dave Luitweiler handled the Power Point aspect, as he did for the talk on disabilities, while Mary enthusiastically shared all she had unearthed about how the politics within Scotland affected that country’s relations with England and hence impacted, in ways both big and small, Richard’s career and the War of the Roses.

The business meeting which followed was well-attended; National Chair Jacqueline Bloomquist presided, and much of the agenda centered on finances as they affect membership, the amount of publicity which can be produced, upkeep of a website, the publications, and so on. A by-laws committee will be formed and other actions taken to keep the organization on track and viable. The board then held its own meeting, while others used the time to regroup or explore before the evening’s festivities began, which they did at 7 p.m., followed by dinner at 8 p.m.

In addition to good food and socializing, the meal was enlivened by the announcing of raffle and silent auction winners, who were all delighted with their loot. At about 9 p.m., the entertainment took the stage. Illinois Chapter member Joyce Tumea wrote the 45-minute ‘Modern-Medieval’ play, ‘Rescuing Richard’, as well as the six original songs in it. The cast of ten (which included Joyce and her husband Tony) was rewarded at the presentation’s conclusion with a standing ovation and many compliments. Then the final drawings were made for the remaining raffle and silent auction items, bringing the evening to a happy conclusion.

The Sunday morning Schallek Breakfast featured a talk and Power Point presentation on the Oxford Wars of the Roses weekend by attendees Dave Luitweiler, Nita Musgrave, and Pam Butler. Dave mentioned highlights of the event, and Nita and Pam added their perspectives and observations for a very thorough and thoughtful program.

IL Chapter Chair Jane Munsie then closed the AGM by thanking everyone who attended. IL Chapter members were applauded for their efforts, but wish to share credit for the event’s success with those who attended. Although registrations numbered only thirty-one, income from the raffles and sales added up to an impressive amount, enabling the chapter to make a profit. Indeed, the generous nature of Ricardian members was apparent as far back as the previous year’s AGM when IL Chapter members were already scouting out potential speakers and topics for this year, and those approached all agreed to present. The Illinois Chapter thanks all those who attended, presented, donated, bought items, and participated in any way in this year’s AGM. Thank You!

* Joyce Tumea tells us that a piñata is a papier-mâché construction, covered with colourful paper on the outside, usually made to look like a donkey or some other animal. Used mainly at birthday parties, it is a Mexican custom. The cavity is filled with candy. Children are blindfolded, given a bat and allowed to take a swing at it in turn, until it is broken open and the candy falls out.
Visit to Sutton Hoo and Raedwald of East Anglia

Saturday 30 July 2011 saw nearly twenty of us visit Sutton Hoo, a National Trust property that overlooks Woodbridge from across the Deben. Members travelled from London, Ipswich or elsewhere by themselves, using booked taxis from Woodbridge station. We were there for three and a half hours, joining an official tour of the burial grounds and visiting the indoor Exhibition Hall.

The main grave is supposed to be that of Raedwald, at least a third-generation Anglo-Saxon immigrant from Angeln. Like his grandfather, Wuffa, Raedwald was a ‘Bretwalda’ or high chief of all Saxons south of the Humber and east of about Birmingham, and his ‘Wuffing’ successors became kings of East Anglia as part of the Heptarchy. Raedwald ruled from 599 to 624/5 and converted to Christianity late in life, yet was still buried in pagan style, possibly at the behest of his sceptical widow. Two of his great-nieces are St Ethelreda (aka St Audrey) who is buried in Ely Cathedral, and Sexberga, who married Earconbert, king of Kent, whose great-granddaughter was the mother of Egbert III of Wessex, grandfather of Alfred. Raedwald’s brother Eni is, therefore, an ancestor of every undisputed monarch of England (except possibly from 1066-1189). The Wuffings ruled until 20 November 869 when their last king, Edmund, was martyred by the Danes.

In summer 1938, the widowed Edith Pretty was overtaken by her own curiosity about the estate and hired an amateur archaeologist and tenant farmer, Basil Brown, to investigate. Other authorities, at county, University of Cambridge (Charles Phillips) and University of London levels became involved – before war was declared and the task was suspended, the artefacts already discovered being stored in disused Tube stations. The British Museum, under Rupert Bruce-Mitford, resumed the process in 1965.

On arrival at Sutton Hoo (a Saxon word for hill), we booked our places on the official tour. It started at twelve thirty and was barely supposed to exceed an hour but lasted about ninety minutes. Our guide was Neil Montgomery of the Sutton Hoo Society, who was knowledgeable and enthusiastic with a good voice. We first passed Tranmer House, formerly the home of Colonel and Mrs Pretty, and reached the seventeen mounds. In the first, Brown found a random selection of rivets because grave-robbers had beaten him to it and no other evidence remained.

In the second, he found rivets arranged in the shape of a wooden ship (a ‘clinker vessel’), together with soil that had absorbed the wood and changed its chemical characteristics. Knowledge of pre-conversion Anglo-Saxon burial rites, the personal possessions (a helmet, bows and spoons by the head; weapons, a purse, shoulder-clasps and a great buckle by the torso; drinking vessels and other artefacts lower down) and the size of the ship showed that only a prominent chieftain could have been laid here. Brown found no human remains, save for phosphates in the soil, but many of Raedwald’s successors were Christians and thus would have been buried differently. The important mounds were reconstructed in the sixties, to heights calculated trigonometrically, but have started to erode again.

After viewing the principal mounds, we were shown the grave of a younger man, who died in his twenties during the same era and could be Raedwald’s son, buried with his horse. There are also the graves of a number of people who were hanged or beheaded in the later Saxon era. The Exhibition Hall features a lot more information and artefacts from the Wuffings’ era, including a recreation of the burial chamber and a film shown at regular intervals.

We had hoped to spend just under an hour exploring Woodbridge but there was insufficient time for this although there some old buildings such as the Shire Hall and sixteenth-century Bull Hotel, visited by Defoe. Edward Fitzgerald, the translator, is also commemorated in the town. During the summer, an open-top bus runs hourly around Woodbridge on Wednesdays and Saturdays, stopping at Sutton Hoo.

Stephen Lark
Chalk and Cheese: Denny Abbey and Anglesey Abbey

A goodly company of us set off from Charing Cross Embankment on Saturday 3 September (an historic date, the outbreak of World War Two in 1939) on our way to two contrasting Abbey sites, only a few miles away from each other and Cambridge.

Denny Abbey: There has been a settlement here since Roman times as evidenced by the discovery of coins, and it is recorded in Domesday. What happened afterwards is not known until about 1159, when a few monks from Ely set up a Benedictine Priory here, endowed by a rich landowner, Richard, earl of Richmond, who became a monk himself. Quarters for the brethren were probably of wood but the church they started was constructed in stone; there would have been a cloister, other offices and a garden. For some reason, in 1170, the monks left here and returned to Ely.

The Knights Templar then established a preceptory here as a rest home for elderly members of the Order. They completed the building of the church and adapted it to their devotional and living needs. When, in 1308, the Order was suppressed, the Templars arrested and then eventually taken to London for trial, that all came to an end.

Then Mary St Pol, Countess of Pembroke (and foundress of the Cambridge college) took over the site in 1342 and brought with her some nuns and the abbess from nearby Waterbeach and set up a Franciscan nunnery. They adapted the existing church for their accommodation needs and built their church on to its east end and a refectory in the grounds. That community remained here until the site was confiscated in 1539 by the Crown during the Dissolution. The then abbess, Dame Elizabeth Throckmorton, with two or three of the sisters, retired to her family home at Coughton Court, Warwickshire, and continued her religious life in seclusion there.

The first impression the site gives is of a random set of farm buildings but there are hints of monastic and later occupations. The abbey building itself was a typical cruciform church with crossings and transepts in both Norman and Gothic architectural features: two columns have different capital decorations: scallop pattern (Benedictine); waterleaf (Templar). The arches are still sturdy and strong; above them, what were clerestory windows. The Franciscans added a floor, approached by a modern wooden staircase, as the countess’s accommodation with its own window (extant), plus a guest room, of which only the rafters now remain. The nuns’ church was probably wider and longer than the original building. Today its position is shown only by markings in the grass; there would also have been a night stair, leading into it, and a cloister. The refectory, later converted into a barn, is a large and impressive building still and has stood the test of time well as has its fourteenth-century diamond-patterned tiled floor.

From the number of windows (blocked up) it was light, with the pulpit (also bricked in) high on the wall, and this, together with vestiges of table supports and decoration, suggests the contemporary surroundings were much more congenial than we see them. The nuns’ tables would be set around it and the abbess, with her guests, on a dais at the east end. An artist’s impression, attached to the wall, aids one’s imagination.

Following the site’s purchase by Edward Elrington, an Essex property speculator, the Franciscan church was demolished, modifications were made to the old church, a brick chimney added to the south side and the building adapted as a farmhouse; a barn built and (later) sash windows inserted. It then passed through several hands, including Thomas of ‘Hobson’s Choice’ fame; its last resident owners being the Dimmock family (1833-1929). Pembroke College (Cambridge), the then owner, handed it over to the Ministry of Works in 1947. Archaeological work took place here in 1960 and the site came into the care of English Heritage in 1984.

Anglesey Abbey: Situated within the village of Lode, mentioned in Domesday, it became the site of a hospital in 1135, and converted about 1212 into an Augustinian priory, endowed by Richard Clare, earl of Gloucester. It would have had the usual monastic layout of church, cloister,
dormitory and ancillary offices. The brethren observed the religious life here until, in 1536, it also fell at the Dissolution.

Set in a vast estate, any resemblance to the original priory has disappeared under later alterations and additions. The house has an Elizabethan south front and is entered by a side porch decorated with the Fairhaven coat of arms. The interior is very impressive with much ‘medievalisation’ (quadripartite arches and marble columns abound) and houses an eclectic collection of artefacts of the highest standards of craftsmanship. The Long Gallery has a set of rooms leading off it, furnished as befits a graciously lifestyle. Still, some link from its monastic past lingers, for example, in that the dining room, dating circa 1236, was probably the calefactory.

There is a large selection of pictures, among them works by Claude, Constable and Gainsborough, and many examples of the silversmith’s craft as in the ‘Shield of Achilles’ from 1821. For the horologically inclined, the clocks are a joy! At 3pm daily, the Regency Clock chimes as its tower of flowerpots revolves. Among the many pieces of fine statuary is one of St Jerome, with a somewhat kittenish lion at his feet.

So, onwards, by the spiral staircase, to the next floor. It also has a set of rooms off the corridor, mostly bedrooms and the ‘usual offices’; and an ‘Abbot’s Room’ (what abbot?). The pièce de résistance must, however, be the Library – a bibliophile’s delight! Packed with books of all kinds from floor to ceiling, along several sides, many in fine leather binding and gilt-edged, it is spacious and well lit and (considerately) has settees for the weary. The manuscripts are kept locked away but some may be seen on request. Among the pictures here are those of (‘moon faced’) Edward IV and (‘ring fiddling’) Richard III.

After the monks left, there followed a progression of owners: the Fowkes family (1596), who adapted it as a ‘dwelling’; and, in 1625, Thomas Hobson – again. Then, in 1926, two brothers, Huttleston Rogers and Henry Rogers Broughton, bought the site, more to pursue their shooting and horse racing (Newmarket) interests than to develop it. However, Huttleston (the first Lord Fairhaven) became its sole owner from 1932. It was he who embellished the site and built up its wonderful collections and, in 1966, bequeathed Anglesey ‘Abbey’ to the National Trust, as also the garden, with its majestic trees, lush lawns and (especially at this time of year) the very colourful array of dahlias, which he created out of a vast expanse of fenland.

So, with thanks to the Visits Team, and in particular, Marian Mitchell, and our driver, we cast a lingering look back . . . . .

Tom Wallis

**Ricardian Crossword 1**

by SANGLIER

Cryptic clues, mostly with a Ricardian or Wars of the Roses reference.

Answers on page 71.

**Across**

7 One drink too many for the Duke of Clarence? (7)
8 'Tis news abroad: ‘No credible one for the “murder” of the Princes’ (7)
9 Post held twice by Richard is praiseworthy – be gone! (7)
10 Architectural style that Richard decided to avoid (7)
13 Now plenty of evidence for this at Bosworth, mapping without survey (8)
15 Confused – no sort of corresponding family? (6)
16 Richard’s biggest problem after 1484: lack of one of these (5,8)
18 Castle well found in ruins away from fen (6)
20 Two short men together made up a serious loss by Henry VI (8)
24 Upset heart of damsel, livened up Richard’s mother for one! (7)
26 Richard, according to Henry. Henry, according to Ricardians (7)
27 Larry painted our hero black (7)
28 Familiar correspondence of Richard of Shrewsbury to Richard of Gloucester (6)

**Down**
1 Poor reward, and Buckingham was a poor one for the Bishop of Ely (6)
2 Ambition: without it, Richard perhaps may not have stood on the hill (6)
3 Put man on the payroll to earn it the hard way (6)
4 King’s in-law his joker found too high (6)
5 Mrs Richard, a 24A (4)
6 Detect something rolled up in tapestry with tart! (4)
11 Subject of young princes’ letter of complaint (and enclosure) (5)
12 Swords to get one’s paw around (7)
14 Obligation at the heart of bastard feudalism (3)
16 Accommodate 24A for example (5)
17 Nothing is said of what became of Princess Bridget (3)
19 Possibly Orson, a Lincolnshire loser (6)
21 Castle that cost lives of 19 followers (6)
22 Rub Pat up the wrong way, very much in Richard’s style (6)
23 Considered distempered – strip off and turn around! (6)
24 Norfolk’s traditional arrival time at Towton is roughly consonant, with scant exceptions (4)
25 27 famously not in a giving one (4)
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Web site: http://members.iinet.net.au/~hhardegen/home.html

Worcestershire  
Mrs Pam Benstead, 15 St Marys Close, Kempsey WR5 3JX  
Email: pb@richardi3worcs.co.uk. Website: www.richardi3worcs.co.uk

Yorkshire  
Mrs P.H. Pogmore, 169, Albert Road, Sheffield, S8 9QX  
Tel: 0114 258 6097. Email: yorkistrose2@hotmail.com
### Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>Mrs Rose Skuse. 12 Brookfield Rd, Newton Longville, Bucks, MK17 0BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Tel: 01908 373524 Email: <a href="mailto:mskuse@aol.com">mskuse@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Keith Stenner, 96 Allerton Crescent, Whitchurch, Bristol, Tel: 01275-541512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in affiliation with Gloucestershire Branch) Email: <a href="mailto:Keith.stenner@airbus.com">Keith.stenner@airbus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>in process of formation; contact Rita Diefenhardt-Schmitt at Ulmenweg 8, 65520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad Camberg-Oselters/Ts, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>Miss Denise Price, 190 Roundwood Rd, London NW10 Tel: 020 8451 7689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>John &amp; Marjorie Smith, 26 Clifford Road, Penrith, Cumbria, CA11 8PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Babs Creamer, 27 Baker Road, Bear Cross, Bournemouth, BH11 9JD. Tel: 01202 573951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:riidorset@talktalk.net">riidorset@talktalk.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Mrs J McLaren, 11 Sefton Avenue, Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 5QR Tel: 0191 265 3665. Email: <a href="mailto:jumikmac@yahoo.co.uk">jumikmac@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Mercia</td>
<td>Miss Marion Moulton, 6 Shrewbridge Crescent, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 5TF Tel: 01270 623664 Email: <a href="mailto:moul.dabber@yahoo.co.uk">moul.dabber@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Mrs Anne Ayres, 7 Boots Yard, Huthwaite, Sutton-in-Ashfield Notts, NG17 2QW Email: <a href="mailto:ajayres@fsmail.net">ajayres@fsmail.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Derbyshire</td>
<td>Liz Robinson, 14 Queen’s Park Rise, Brighton, BN2 9ZF, tel. 01273 609971, email: <a href="mailto:shezcounihan@hotmail.com">shezcounihan@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>Rollo Crookshank, Old Willows, 41a Badshot Park, Farnham, Surrey, GU9 9JU Email: <a href="mailto:crookshank@starkmann.co.uk">crookshank@starkmann.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Media Retrospective from Scotland**

**The ‘world’s oldest foot race’**

*From Marilyn Garabet, Oban*

*Daily Mail, 25 June 2011, ‘We’ve run out of steam’, by Stuart MacDonald*

In 1508 King James IV of Scotland introduced a foot race to find the fastest runner in the Lanarkshire village of Carnwath. This was the Red Hose Race, run ever since (almost) ‘only ever abandoned in times of war and pestilence’ ... ‘[James] chartered Carnwath to Lord Somerville on the condition that he held the race every year and awarded a pair of red hose, or socks, as a prize. A fast runner could bring news of any approaching invasion from the south to Edinburgh, and the red hose would be the insignia by which he would be recognised.’ The hose were to be made of half an ell of English cloth and awarded to the man ‘running most quickly from the east end of the town of Carnwath to the Cross called Cawlo Cross’ at midsummer.’

Three years ago, for the 500th anniversary of the race, it was opened to entrants from all over South Lanarkshire. Last year the winner clocked up a time of 16½ minutes. But this year the organiser, the chief of the Clan Lockhart, has had to cancel the event because not enough people applied to compete.

**Flodden chicken farm put on hold**

*also from Marilyn Garabet (and the Daily Mail, 9 July 2011)*

‘Plans to house up to 24,000 free-range chickens close to the site of Scotland’s worst military defeat have been put on hold. ... It is claimed the smell would disturb visitors to the battlefield.’ Locals feel that a large chicken shed is not a fitting way to remember those who fell in the battle.
Branches and Groups

Devon and Cornwall Branch
Saturday 14 January
There will be a lecture by Professor Anthony Musson, Director of the Centre for Legal History Research, Exeter University, entitled ‘Frankenstein’s Monster? Bringing Medieval and Early Tudor Lawyers to Life’. Non-Branch members are welcome to attend and will be made very welcome. If you wish to attend please contact the Branch Secretary to book a place by 29 December 2011. Anne Painter, email: aepainter@aol.com or phone 01326 562023.

Lincolnshire Branch Report
The season began in bright April sunshine at Eton College and St George’s Chapel, Windsor. We were shown the life of an Eton scholar and were told that the carved graffiti on walls, furniture and woodwork in the classrooms built by Henry VI were the result of the rule that required each boy to provide his own penknife for sharpening his quill pen. In St George’s Chapel we touched the stall plate identifying King Richard’s seat as a member of the Order of the Garter. A misericord shows Edward IV and Louis XI conversing on the bridge at Picquigny, signifying the treaty of 29 August 1475 that ended the Hundred Years War. We then overlooked the choir from the window used by both Katherine of Aragon and Queen Victoria. Our guide described Victoria’s memorial chapel to her beloved Albert ‘As a general view it’s horrible, but every detail is a masterpiece’.

Our long weekend in Bristol and Bath in May was based at the beautiful Ramada Grange country house hotel. In June we visited Suffolk for a private tour of Little Hall, Lavenham, a rare survival of a fourteenth-century wool-merchant’s house, followed by an examination of the fifteenth-century carvings in Clare church. A generous and lengthy cream tea led to a quiet homeward journey.

The Zarosh Mugaseth Memorial Lecture in July, given by Dr Joann Fletcher, emphasised the military and political strategy of ‘Cleopatra the Great’, whilst ‘The Arnolfini Marriage – The Story of a Painting’, presented by Jean Townsend for her August lecture, provided an interesting interpretation of this famous and enigmatic work by Van Eyck.

Our picnic at Sutton Scarsdale and Renishaw Hall, Derbyshire, all aboard a big red London bus, allowed us to draw breath before our extended tour of Ireland which took in Limerick, Killarney, Clare, Kerry and Waterford.

Our thanks go to Jean Townsend for another successful season.

Maureen Wheeldon, Publicity Officer

London and Home Counties Branch Report
Details of forthcoming branch meetings:
January: Saturday 28 January 2012, at 2.30 p.m., in the Torrington Room, Senate House. Helen Castor will speak on ‘Margaret of Anjou, She-Wolf of France’.

Helen is an historian, writer and broadcaster, and author of She-Wolves; The Women who ruled England before Elizabeth (Faber and Faber) and Blood and Roses: the Paston family and the Wars of the Roses. She is one of the presenters of Radio 4’s ‘Making History’, broadcast on Tuesdays at 3.00 p.m. She has appeared on Radio 4’s ‘The Long View’ and ‘Woman’s Hour’, and has filmed a series of three documentaries based on her book She-Wolves. The programmes are being made for BBC4 by independent producer Matchlight, for broadcasting early in 2012.
She made her debut as a presenter for BBC4 in August 2011 with a film entitled ‘A Renaissance education: the schooling of Sir Thomas More’s daughter’.


Lisa Hilton has supplied the following abstract: ‘Elizabeth of York had every reason to hate Richard III. He had murdered her brothers, usurped her father’s throne and had her declared a bastard, yet, during the Christmas court of 1484, the relationship between uncle and niece “caused the people to murmur and the nobles and prelates to greatly wonder thereat”. Amidst rumours that Richard was planning to poison his queen, Anne Neville, the king was forced to make a public declaration that he had no intention of marrying Elizabeth, yet Elizabeth’s own wishes seem to have accorded with this incestuous scheme. Documentary evidence strongly suggests that she was prepared to give herself to her greatest enemy, in order to preserve the Yorkist claim to the crown.’


From Ancient China, to Crécy, to the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, this will be a brief history of the invention, development, and use of “the Devil’s Distillate”. Rosemary is a member of the London and Home Counties Branch Committee and has spoken to the Branch before, on communication before and after Caxton (November 1991, February 1992 and January 1993), ‘Here be Dragons’ (February 1997) and the earl of Oxford’s estates (March 2007).

The London and Home Counties Branch Annual General Meeting, 2012, will precede the March 2012 lecture. Nominations for the Committee, or motions for the Agenda should be sent to the Branch Secretary by the beginning of March 2012.

Please note: non-branch members are welcome to attend: please contact Branch Secretary, Elizabeth Nokes (Elizabeth_nokes@hotmail.com / 01689-823569) for further details.

Elizabeth Nokes

North Cumbria Group Report

We have never enjoyed a large membership, and we are particularly straitened now as we lost one of our members recently, and another faithful member is unable to attend meetings because of poor health. However, the five of us soldier on, and manage to have some interesting meetings and enjoyable outings.

This year our visits started in June with Great Salkeld church, which has a pele tower and an ancient ‘yatt’ (the door into the pele tower), and then Edenhall with its evidence of pre-Norman building. After a lunch at Brief Encounter, we went to remote Ousby, where there is a carved wooden sculpture of a knight. From the church there are sweeping views of the Pennines. The last visit that day was to the thirteenth-century Melmerby church, a building of red sandstone with a plain glass east window and beautiful views of the fells.

Our second day out in July started at Ormside church, which incorporates building work from the 11th, 12th and 14th centuries. A Viking silver bowl found here is now in York Museum. Our next call was to Kirby Stephen church, a fine large building thought to have been re-built in the 1230s. On display are carged stones of eighth-century cross shafts, a tenth-century hogback tombstone and the curious Loki stone, a carved man in shackles. After lunch, our last visit was to the remote village of Crosby Garrett. Here the church is on a steep hill above the village, with a spectacular view of the viaduct on the Carlisle-Settle railway. The church was started in the 12th century, with 13th- and 14th-century additions. The east window, not unlike Melmerby, has plain glass, which allows a superb view of the countryside.

A few years ago, the group produced a Richard III Walking Trail around Penrith town centre. The Tourist Information Office (T.I.C.) has accepted these pamphlets and sold them for us. I gather they have done very well. Now the T.I.C. has a computer whizz-kid on their staff and he
Our first meeting of the year took place at the home of Wendy Moorhen in early January. We watched the DVD of Mystery Files Royal Murder ‘The Princes in the Tower’, followed by a discussion and refreshments. In early February we enjoyed our post-Christmas lunch at a new venue, The Frog at Skirmett, near Henley. A good number of members turned out and we had a very enjoyable time. Our thanks to Ann Tetlow who organised it. Our meeting in March was at our home base at Wendy’s house, where member Mary Mason gave us a very interesting talk on ‘The Appearance of Richard III’.

At the end of April we met for lunch at The Shepherd’s Hut in Ewelme, after which we met the headmistress of the school at Ewelme, who proceeded to give us a tour of the church, almshouses and school. The church, St Mary the Virgin, holds the remarkable cadaver tomb of Alice Chaucer, duchess of Suffolk (see the June 2011 Bulletin, p.48). We were invited to lie on the church floor and peer through the bottom part of the tomb to share Alice’s view of the wonderful, colourful painted underside. We had a walk through the outside of the almshouses and into the school, which was founded in 1437. We very much enjoyed the tour which included seeing some medieval posts in the headmistress’s study, followed by afternoon tea.

We were very saddened when two of our members died within a week of each other. Brian Moorhen and Peter Lee will be greatly missed.

Our June visit took us to Mapledurham House and Mill. We commenced our visit with a look around St Margaret’s church. The parish church, which was restored in 1863, is separated from the private Bardolf Aisle. The aisle is little changed from when it was built in the late fourteenth century by Sir Robert Bardolf. The Blount family bought the manor in 1490 and the aisle became their burial place. The present Mapledurham House was built in the sixteenth century, with fragments from the thirteenth century remaining, and restorations dating from 1828 and 1960. Our visit concluded with a visit to the fifteenth-century working mill and a delicious cream tea, which we enjoyed in the tea room during a very heavy shower of rain.

In July we met at Baddesley Clinton in Warwickshire, home of the Ferrers family for 500 years, which dates from the fifteenth century. We particularly liked the wood panelling and heraldic stained glass. After a walk round the garden and lunch we moved on to nearby seventeenth-century Packwood House. During the visit we saw the alleged bed of Margaret of Anjou which was transferred to Packwood House from Owlpen Manor. Tradition states that Margaret spent the night of 2 May 1471 at Owlpen manor, en route to the battle of Tewkesbury.

A number of us met at The Royal Arms in Sutton Cheney for a meal in August, before we ventured on to Bosworth for the Battlefield Anniversary Re-enactment. An enjoyable day was had by all.

Marjorie Smith
For our weekend away in September, we headed west and enjoyed our stay at the Charlton Arms overlooking Ludford Bridge in Ludlow. On the Friday we met for a meal at The Crown Country Inn then ventured on to Stokesay Castle, meeting up with Christina McNaughton, a former member of the Thames Valley Branch, now a resident in Herefordshire. It was a lovely sunny day which made Stokesay Castle all the more striking. The following day we visited Ludlow castle which was very enjoyable, followed by lunch at the Feathers Hotel and a tour of the town. On the Saturday evening we had a very good meal at the Unicorn in Ludlow. We packed a lot into our final day starting with a short drive to the site of the Battle of Mortimer’s Cross. We had a walk, checking the maps for where the battle lines may have been. We then went on to Croft Castle where we visited the church and had two ‘taster’ talks and a short guided tour. The church had a fine tomb of Sir Richard Croft (d.1509) and his wife Eleanor. For lunch, we met up with Christina at the Corners Inn in Kingsland and after an enjoyable meal Christina took us to see the nearby church of St Michael and All Angels. The present church was built around 1290 – 1310 by the Mortimer family. We were especially interested in the Volka chapel, which was probably built as a chantry in which masses could be said for those killed at the battle of Mortimer’s Cross which was fought nearby in February 1461. A Eucharist is celebrated in the small chapel each year on the anniversary of the battle. A welcome cup of coffee at Christina’s set us on our way for our journey home.

As I write, we have just had our October meeting at Wendy’s home, where she gave us her very interesting talk on William Hastings. The meeting concluded with tea and cake.

We are having our AGM at the November meeting and a group of us plan to join the throngs at Fotheringhay for the lunch and carol service in December.

Thanks are due to Wendy for her kind hospitality and hosting the meetings. Thanks also to our secretary Sally and to the members who have arranged this year’s visits, and also to Wendy and Mary for their talks.

Judith Ridley

Worcestershire Branch Report

July saw a number of members make their customary visit to the battle of Tewkesbury commemoration and re-enactment. The marquee where their stall was situated was more crowded than usual, with a number of new groups, and there was plenty of interest in the Society and the Branch. Robert Hardy was a notable visitor and for one lucky member kindly signed a copy of the new book about the re-enactment to which he had contributed. As ever, the battle re-enactment was very exciting with a huge number of participants. While the weather was kind in the morning, it unfortunately rained in the afternoon.

A small group took an evening walk in August around the historic village of Wolverley, on the Severn in Worcestershire. They visited the church, which is a Georgian building, but contains the sadly mutilated tomb of a crusader. They then viewed a number of interesting buildings, including some houses built into the rock face and some actual cave dwellings, which are not uncommon in parts of the county and in Shropshire. They also saw the former mill owner’s house and a number of fifteenth-century cottages. Finally they walked along the canal, back to the appropriately named hostelry, The Lock, where they had sensibly parked their cars on arrival, for a well-earned supper.

In September, at Inkberrow Education Centre, the Branch was delighted to welcome Dilip Sarkar, the re-enactor who played Sir Richard Croft of Croft Castle at Tewkesbury. Dilip is an historian, author and supporter of the Richard III Society who has been awarded the MBE for his services to history. Assisted by his wife Karen, who is an artist, Dilip demonstrated the arms and accoutrements of a knight of Sir Richard’s status in the later fifteenth century. Arming took him a considerable amount of time, and would, he said, have been impossible without the assistance of a squire, a role usually played by his son, but on this occasion by Karen. She came in costume and had been a water carrier at Tewkesbury. Dilip’s tremendous enthusiasm, fund of fascinating
stories and deep knowledge and understanding of the period made for a memorable afternoon. Karen has also done a great deal of research into late medieval arms and armour and the Battle of Tewkesbury; using this information and understanding, she has painted a large, detailed and exciting picture of the battle, of which the Branch is now the proud possessor of a signed and numbered print.

The present writer was delighted to attend the Society’s Annual General Meeting at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London on 1 October and to hear David Starkey’s excellent lecture on Yorkist sentiment in Henry VII’s reign. It was a pleasure to meet members from around the country and to meet Chairman Phil Stone again, who, in his Chairman’s address, gave the Worcestershire Branch’s Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Banquet, which he had attended, a special congratulatory mention.

Carol Southworth

Yorkshire Branch Report

Our Branch commemoration of the battle of Bosworth was held, as usual, at St Alkelda’s church in Middleham, which King Richard had intended for his own collegiate church where priests would pray for the souls of himself and his family. Like the king’s planned chantry chapel in York Minster, however, his intention came to nothing. Our informal act of remembrance was attended by several members, including (we were very pleased to see) some who had seen the event advertised on our website. It is always a pleasure to meet members and fellow Ricardians, especially in a place which was so important to the king. Flowers were placed below the window to King Richard, Queen Anne and Prince Edward, and the Chairman gave a short address linking the idea of the light of justice by which Richard had tried so hard to reign with the contrasting darkness of Tudor tyranny, suspicion and death-by-association.

The following weekend, some Committee members braved the extreme climate of Sheffield once more (you would think we’d had enough in May) and had a Branch stall at the Norfolk Park Bank Holiday event which attracts hundreds of re-enactors of all periods. Once again the weather left much to be desired, but we did manage to make some sales, sign up new members and interest passers-by in the aims and activities of the Society. One of the best-informed people on the Wars of the Roses we met was a South Yorkshire police officer. He was also quite sympathetic towards King Richard.
The Yorkshire Branch AGM took place in York on 3 September. The Committee for 2011-12 will be declared following the result of a ballot of those present at the meeting, since for the first time in several years we had more nominations than Committee places. Details of the new Committee will, it is hoped, appear in the next issue of the Bulletin. In the meantime the existing Committee has ‘acting’ status.

We held our medieval banquet this year at one of York’s oldest and most atmospheric pubs, the Black Swan on Peasholme Green. It was a return visit to a venue where we have held two successful banquets since the Millennium, and though the inn is now under a different management we still enjoyed a good welcome and an excellent meal. Although it was not a specialised medieval menu, guests could choose from traditional dishes such as steak and ale pie and rabbit stew. I think we all found the portions extremely generous.

As before, we had our meal in the panelled room upstairs, which we decorated with banners showing the arms of such loyal Ricardian families as the Scropes; the Royal Arms were strategically placed to hide a tapestry featuring the Fat Tudor who smirks at people across the room. Members and friends had come from far (Penrith and London) and not so far (Leeds and Knaresborough), as well as places in between, and had gone to great trouble to appear in splendid clothes for the occasion. Those who say that fifteenth-century female headdresses aren’t practical can’t have drawn a raffle from a modified steeple hennin.

The Black Swan is first referred to as an inn in 1763, and had been altered and extended by then, but it was originally built in 1417 by the family of Sir William Bowes, who was Lord Mayor of York in that year and also in 1428. The most notable member of the family was Sir Martin Bowes, who made a good career for himself in London as a goldsmith in the sixteenth century and was eventually goldsmith to Elizabeth I. He followed family tradition in becoming a Lord Mayor, this time of London, in 1545. It is said that because of this position (as well as his family’s connections with York) that he was able to prevail on the York authorities not to demolish St Cuthbert’s church, Peasholme Green, which was connected to his house over the way by a ‘secret’ passage. Sir Martin showed his thanks by presenting the city with a valuable sword, still in the possession of the city council, as well as giving generously to the poor of York at Martinmas (11 November) each year. Thanks are due to all those members who helped to make the evening so enjoyable, joined in the quiz and bought raffle tickets. We hope to hold our banquet at the Black Swan another year.

May we remind subscribers to our magazine Blanc Sanglier, and also those Branch members who wish to pay £3.50 to receive just our newsletters, that their subs are now due and should be sent to our acting secretary Pauline Pogmore if they haven’t yet done so.

The Branch’s commemoration of the battle of Wakefield will take place at Sandal on Saturday 31 December with a wreath-laying at the duke of York’s statue at 2.00 for 2.15 p.m.

Angela Moreton
## New Members

**UK  1 July to 30 Sept 2011**
- William Alexander, Edinburgh
- Sally Bailey, Hemel Hempstead, Herts
- Godfrey Bloom, Selby
- Nina Boyd, Huddersfield
- Jayne Brumpton, Weston-under-Wetherley, Warwick
- Barbara Buddle, Peterborough
- Debbie Byrne, Stuntney, Cambs
- Sarah Cissell-Kent, London
- Jess Cully, Gosport, Hants
- Sophie Day, Stoke-on-Trent
- Brenda de Gruchy, Buckhurst Hill
- Raymond Edwards, Bath
- Christine Fellows, Doncaster
- Helen Hall, Beckingham, Notts
- Catherine Harper, Swansea
- Pamela Hodges, Seaton, Devon
- Christine Holmes, Barnsley
- Susan Hots, London
- Diane Johnson, Rhymneywyn
- Colin Lee, Altrincham, Cheshire
- Matthew Lewis, nr Bridgnorth, Shropshire
- Laura Liddington, Coalville, Leics
- Edward Mottram, Berkhamsted, Herts
- Kaori O’Connor, London
- David Pogmore, Sheffield
- Julie Roberts, Weybridge, Surrey
- Helen Salter, London
- Jacki Shorley, Kibworth, Leics
- Chris Skidmore, Bristol
- Andy Smith, Ashtead, Surrey
- Angela Smith, Mansfield
- Bethany Smith, Upminster, Essex
- David Snowden, Evesham
- Michael Taylor, Bletchley, Milton Keynes
- Meg Twycross, Lancaster
- Andrew Ward, Castleford
- John Westwood, Manchester
- Philip Whittemore, London
- Deborah Youngs, Swansea

**Overseas  1 July to 30 Sept 2011**
- Susan Bradshaw, Koonawarra, NSW, Australia
- John Gray, Calgary, Canada
- Richard Havers-Strong, Belphe, France
- Nancy Moore, Connecticut, USA

**US Branch  1 July to 30 Sept 2011**
- Vickey Binkerd, California
- Carole Brown, Pennsylvania
- Marci Cleveland, Colorado
- Mariah Hale, New Jersey
- Michael Schaedle, Pennsylvania
- Deborah Schoeneman, New York

## Recently Deceased Members

- Lesley Marshall-Williams, Dorking, Surrey (joined 2005)
- Dorothy Wilsher, Hull, E. Yorks (family member, joined 1991)
Obituaries

Anne Buyers, 1915-2011

Current Canadian Ricardians do not know whether it was the impulse of Anne or William Buyers which led to the placement of the first In Memoriam in the national Globe and Mail newspaper to mark Bosworth Day in 1966. Certainly William is credited with having the perseverance to persuade many levels of officialdom at the paper to accept the ad, and we can only assume that his wife was solidly behind him in this venture. After a flurry of publicity following this small notice, Bill and Anne graciously hosted a gathering of twenty interested folk at their home in Toronto on 27 November 1966.

By the following April, they had gathered enough commitment to hold the first regular meeting, and work began on increasing awareness of the real Richard among the general public. In the summer of 1967, the Stratford Ontario Shakespeare Festival staged a production of Richard III, with Alan Bates in the title role; efforts by the Buyers to have a mention of Richard’s possible innocence included in the program were not totally successful, but they soldiered on. As a team, Bill and Anne organised meetings of the Society in Canada, including an extremely enthusiastic debate mounted in a local library, which was attended by over two hundred people, and resulted in great press coverage. By March 1968, the "RIII", the journal of the Society in Canada was being published. Further media attention focused on the legendary early banquets mounted by the Toronto group; one notable evening featured costumed guests parading grandly down busy Yonge Street, accompanied by two attention-grabbing Irish wolfhounds.

After Bill died in the late 1970s, Anne continued an enthusiastic member well into her 90s. She hosted many of the annual Founders’ Day Picnics (so called to recognise the contributions of pioneering members in Canada) at the lovely historic house they had restored as their retirement home in Niagara on-the-Lake, Ontario. (For those who have visited Niagara Falls, this idyllic community lies about 10 miles distant, in the heart of a lush wine-producing area.) At each gathering Ricardians enjoyed her hospitality and a stroll through the gardens, which featured glorious examples of white roses. No picnic was complete without a visit to Anne’s home library, which housed many works on Richard and his times, as well as her other great passion, the life and exploits of Napoleon. (Anne regretted that she had never been able to make a pilgrimage to the island of St Helena.)

Anne spent her formative years in nearby New York State, and Toronto. With the kind of coincidence famous among Society adherents, current Toronto member Sheilah O’Connor once mentioned to her father the name of the neighbourhood where Anne had grown up; it turns out the two families occupied the same house, one after the other, in the 1930s.

Anne’s death in July 2011, aged 96, marks an important transition for our Society, as all our ‘first’ members are now gone. Her name lives on in the Society’s Buyers Library, which was named to honour the couple who took up the challenge of rehabilitating Richard’s reputation in Canada. Members who attended her memorial service had the opportunity to meet Anne’s family, who were most grateful for the arrangement of white roses sent with great affection by the Canadian Society.

I am told that each night, Anne would smile at the photo of her husband which sat beside her bed, and say ‘Good night, Bill’. The grateful Society in Canada echoes this with, ‘Good work, Anne ... and our thanks!’

Christine Hurlbut-Carelse, Editor, RIII
Joyce Croft, 1920-2011

It is with great sadness that I have to report the death of Joyce Croft, who passed away on 10 March 2011 at a residential care home in Herne Bay, Kent.

Joyce first became interested in Richard III after reading The Daughter of Time. Shortly afterwards, in 1973, she visited the Richard III exhibition at the National Portrait Gallery, found the Society’s address, and joined.

After a career in local government, Joyce retired in 1980 and was able for several years to join in meetings and outings arranged by our Society. In 1983 she visited an exhibition on Richard III at Gloucester, where she saw Richard’s letter to Bishop Russell requesting the Great Seal, realised she couldn’t read it and determined to learn to do so. She joined the palaeography course run by Dr Rosemary Horrox and was fascinated by the contracted forms of fifteenth-century handwriting, as they reminded her of the evening shorthand classes she used to teach during the war.

After completing the course, Joyce was, in her own words, ‘glad to take part in the Society’s work at home through the wills project’, especially as she was falling victim to the disabling arthritis which would, sadly, worsen with the years.

I first met Joyce in the early 1980s, when I moved to Kent and joined the Kent Branch of the Society. She was unmarried and lived in Herne Bay with her mother, for whom she was a full-time carer, and she also cared devotedly for an elderly aunt who lived nearby. Joyce moved into her own flat after the deaths of these relatives and, as well as her work on the wills project, was one of that marvellous army of helpers upon whom the church relies so heavily. Joyce had a deep and abiding faith and her local church was St Martin’s, Herne, which she would visit several times a week to clean and get everything ready for the services. I treasure a copy of Kent Branch’s magazine for June 1980 in which Joyce wrote an interesting article about Sir Matthew Philip of Herne, who was a goldsmith and supplier of jewels to Henry VI and Edward IV, became Lord Mayor of London 1463-64, and had close connections with Herne church, where the brass to his second wife, Christina, still survives, though his own monument has vanished.

Joyce loved cats and, after her beloved pet Minnie died, she visited an animal sanctuary and adopted first Jinny, then Amber, giving these cats the happy lives they would otherwise not have had. One of my fondest memories of her is at a Kent Branch medieval-style banquet in Canterbury. She wore a gauzy hennin and a golden gown trimmed with light-brown fur and looked like a princess from a Book of Hours. After I moved to Scotland I corresponded with her, and she kept me up-to-date with all the Ricardian happenings in Kent. Sadly, she had to enter a care home when her health continued to fail, but, in her last letter to me, she mentioned the joy the wills project had brought her, and commented, ‘Most people transcribed less than ten wills, but I did, at least, transcribe initially forty-three, and cross-checked several others’.

I shall miss you, Joyce! Uncomplaining, serene, and quietly capable, you were that rare type of person who leaves footprints on the heart.

Marilyn Garabet

CORRECTION TO CALENDAR

The sharp-eyed among you will already have spotted that we gave the wrong dates for the Bruges visit in the September Bulletin. In 2012, the last weekend in August (Saturday to Monday) will be 25-27, not 26-28. The Visits Team—and the editor—regret missing this slip when checking.
Margaret York
On 22 August 2011, members of the East Midlands Branch sadly attended the funeral of our founding Chairman Margaret York, known to many as the author Margaret Abbey.

Margaret joined the Richard III Society in 1957 when, in the absence of local branches, she regularly travelled to London for meetings, rushing back by a late train to be at her teaching post the next day. Since the foundation of the East Midlands Branch in 1971 she was an inspirational leader, with her good humour and vast Ricardian knowledge she guided the branch during its early years.

Margaret had many talents and interests. She taught English, history and drama and is still remembered with affection by former colleagues and pupils alike. She had a beautiful soprano voice and took part in many amateur productions. She travelled extensively and was a pioneer organiser of overseas school visits. Her interest in Egyptology was reflected in some of her novels, although it is her Ricardian themes that formed the basis of her published work. The branch was proud that her services to King Richard were honoured when she was presented with the Robert Hamblin award last year recognising her work for Richard’s cause for over fifty years.

At the service of thanksgiving to celebrate Margaret’s life, our chairman, Phil Stone, paid a moving tribute to her, which fully echoed the affectionate remembrances of the many friends and admirers of this remarkable and inspirational lady.

Marion Hare and Sally Henshaw

In the March 2012 Bulletin
In spite of this being a much larger Bulletin than usual (to accommodate the minutes and reports from the AGM), we are sorry that we have had to hold over the second part of Judith Ridley’s article on ‘Katherine Courtenay, Plantagenet princess, Tudor countess’ until March 2012. In that issue there will also be a shortened version David Baldwin’s talk from this year’s study weekend, on John de la Pole, earl of Lincoln, and a piece by Toni Mount on ‘The Pitfalls of Time Travelling’. Lesley Boatwright will be writing about another miracle performed posthumously by Henry VI, which took place at the self-same Denny Abbey about which Tom Wallis has written on p.57 of this issue.

By March, too, we hope to have news of the seminar we are hoping to arrange at the Leeds International Medieval Congress. We have submitted our application for sponsor a session but will not hear if it has been accepted until early December. Our proposed session is on the miracles attributed to Henry VI. We are hoping to present three papers, Lesley Boatwright on the general background to the miracles, Christopher Whittick on his discovery in legal records of an account of a particularly nasty mugging in Sussex which features in one of the miracles, and Heather Falvey on how the miracle narratives have much to teach us about ordinary people’s lives in the fifteenth century. It is very likely that Heather will be dealing with that fundamental part of everyday life: football.

Also in March there will be a progress report on the York Wills Project, on which the typing volunteers are doing sterling work. And for fans of Brian Wainwright’s hilarious novel The Adventures of Alianore Audley we have a real treat in store with a newly-discovered further adventure of the intrepid Alianore.

Answers to the crossword on pp. 58-59:
Across: 7 Malmsey, 8 Witness, 9 Admiral, 10 Regency, 13 Ordnance, 15 Stonor, 16 Heirs apparent, 18 Ludlow, 20 Normandy, 24 Neville, 26 Usurper, 27 Olivier, 28 Nephew.

Down: 1 Warder, 2 Ambion, 3 Retain, 4 Rivers, 5 Anne, 6 Espy, 11 Croft, 12 Weapons, 14 Due, 16 House, 17 Nun, 19 Welles, 21 Rising, 22 Abrupt, 23 Deemed, 24 Noon, 25 Vein.
We run a calendar of all forthcoming events notified to us for inclusion. If you are aware of any events of Ricardian interest, whether organised by the Society (Committee, Visits Committee, Research Committee, Branches/Groups etc.) or by others, please let Lesley Boatwright 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>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 December</td>
<td>Christmas at Fotheringhay</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 December</td>
<td>Wreath-laying at the duke of York’s statue, Sandal, 2.00 pm</td>
<td>Yorkshire Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jan</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Branch Lecture by Anthony Musson</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(see p.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jan</td>
<td>London and Home Counties Branch lecture by Helen Castor, Senate House, London</td>
<td>London and Home Counties Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(see p.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(see p.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March</td>
<td>London and Home Counties Branch AGM, and lecture by Rosemary Waxman, Senate House, London</td>
<td>London and Home Counties Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(see p.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22 April</td>
<td>Triennial Conference at Burleigh Court Conference Centre, Univ. of Loughborough</td>
<td>Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(see p. 15 and centrefold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27 August</td>
<td>Visit to Bruges for the Golden Tree Pageant</td>
<td>Visits Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE THE CORRECTED DATES**