

Ricardian Register



Richard III Society, Inc.

Vol. 49 No. 1

March, 2018

King Richard III



Printed with permission ~ Jamal Mustafa ~ Copyright © 2014

In this issue:

Thomas Langton: Richard III's Character Witness

Ricardian Reading

2018 General Membership Meeting

Inside cover

(not printed)

Contents

Thomas Langton: Richard III's Character Witness	2
Ricardian Reading	23
Call for Nomination for Treasurer	33
ex libris	36
Advertise in the <i>Ricardian Register</i>	38
From the Editor	39
Submission guidelines	39
Board, Staff, and Chapter Contacts	40
Membership Application/Renewal Dues	41
2018 General Membership Meeting (GMM)	43
2018 GMM Registration Form	45



©2018 Richard III Society, Inc., American Branch. No part may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means mechanical, electrical or photocopying, recording or information storage retrieval—without written permission from the Society. Articles submitted by members remain the property of the author. The *Ricardian Register* is published two times per year. Subscriptions for the Register only are available at \$25 annually. In the belief that many features of the traditional accounts of the character and career of Richard III are neither supported by sufficient evidence nor reasonably tenable, the Society aims to promote in every possible way research into the life and times of Richard III, and to secure a re-assessment of the material relating to the period, and of the role in English history of this monarch.

The Richard III Society is a nonprofit, educational corporation. Dues, grants and contributions are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

Dues are \$60 annually for U.S. Addresses; \$70 for international. Each additional family member is \$5. Members of the American Society are also members of the English Society. Members also receive the English publications. All Society publications and items for sale may be purchased either direct at the U.K. Member's price, or via the American Branch sales when available. Papers and books may be borrowed from the US fiction and non-fiction libraries. Papers only are available from the English Librarian. When a U.S. Member visits the U.K., all meetings, expeditions and other activities are open, including the AGM, where U.S. Members are welcome to cast a vote.

To manage your account and make payments online, enter the member portal from the Member's only page on American Branch website: r3.org, or if you do not have internet access, send changes of address and dues payments to:

Cheryl Greer, Membership Chair
1056 Shady Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15232

Editor's note: The following article by Susan Troxell is the basis for her two-part article (Thomas Langton: Richard III's bishop) published in the *Ricardian Bulletin*: Part 1 in December 2017; Part 2 in March 2018.

Thomas Langton: Richard III's Character Witness

Susan L. Troxell, © November 2016

Amongst the glories of Winchester Cathedral, there is a chantry chapel of outstanding beauty and magnificence. The man who is buried there, and for whom the roof bosses provide a rebus clue, is Thomas Langton, who died of plague in 1501, only days after being elected by Henry VII as Archbishop of Canterbury.¹ Earlier, he had served as the Bishop of Winchester (1493-1501), Salisbury (1484-93) and St. David's (1483-84), and acted as a royal servant to three—or four, depending on how you count—English kings. As the information plaque at Winchester Cathedral succinctly announces, Langton had been a chaplain to Edward IV and Richard III, and Ambassador to France and Rome.²

Although his death came as a surprise in his 70th year, he did have the opportunity to make an extensive will, showing he died a very wealthy man. It runs to over 100 items, and contains monetary legacies amounting to £2000, including the provision of six exhibitions³ in Queen's College, Oxford, and more than a dozen other benefactions to the universities.⁴ “Richard Pace (*d.* 1536), the future diplomat and dean of St Paul's, who had been sent as a young man to study at Padua at Langton's expense, remembered that the bishop ‘befriended all learned men exceedingly, and in his time was another Maecenas⁵, rightly remembering (as he often said), that it was for learning that he had been promoted to the rank of bishop’”.⁶

It was “for learning” that Langton achieved his fame and reputation as an able diplomat, a proponent of the New Learning or *Studia humanitatis*, and one of the preeminent educators of his day.⁷ He was born in Appleby, Westmorland around the year 1430 to an obscure family that had no social prestige or any apparent political leanings.⁸ No one of noble birth is mentioned in his will or within his household, and none of his ancestors receive mention in the lists of household retainers of the great northern lords.⁹ In short, Langton's family was not part of that northern “squirearchy” or “bastard feudalism” written about by K.B. McFarlane and R.L. Storey.¹⁰

Despite his humble origins, he graduated with a Masters of Art degree from Cambridge University by 1456 and was a fellow of Pembroke College by 1462–3, where he served as senior proctor. He vacated his fellowship in 1464 to study at Padua University in Italy, but soon returned to Cambridge perhaps because of a shortage of funds, receiving a Bachelor of Theology in 1465. During his second stay in Italy, from 1468-73, Langton was created a Doctor of Canon Law at Bologna University in 1473 and Doctor of Theology by 1476.¹¹ In 1487, he was elected Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, becoming one of its greatest benefactors.¹² As Bishop of Winchester, he started and personally supervised a school in the precincts of the bishop's palace, where youths were educated in grammar and music. He was a good musician himself, and took talented musical children into his tutelage. It has been said he would study the various dispositions of the pupils, and would examine them at night on their day's work, “always on the look-out for merit, that by encouragement it might be made more”.¹³

Aside from this, Langton is probably best known for a letter he wrote which included some remarks about Richard III. In September, 1483, he was part of the retinue which accompanied the newly-crowned king on his royal progress from London to points west and north, and observed the following:

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 his commands in his progress. And in many great cities and towns were great sums of money given him which he hath refused. On my troth I liked never the conditions of any prince so well as his; God hath sent him to us for the weal of us all...¹⁴

As Keith Dockray has observed, private letters like Langton's are an "important quarry of information for the era of the Wars of the Roses." They often can be dated precisely, helping historians to pinpoint the timing of key events. Moreover, since private letters are not written with a conscious attempt to record events for posterity or to promote official political propaganda, they offer a less filtered and more candid commentary on contemporary issues. As such they are valuable supplements to official records and chronicles of English history.¹⁵

But letters have flaws, too, and those drawbacks cannot be ignored. People can lie, exaggerate, or speculate in their private correspondence. They can describe events they haven't seen first-hand. They can create or spread vicious rumors and hearsay. Or, they can give unwarranted praise for an individual, or describe an event or issue not as an objective bystander, but as a partisan or someone with prejudices. Historians therefore don't accept as true everything said in letters, so they submit them to an analysis of whether they *should* be deemed reliable or dismissed, in whole or part.

Langton's September 1483 letter has received critical appraisal by historians over the centuries. The "conventional wisdom" was expressed by Professor Charles Ross in his 1981 biography of Richard III:

Langton was scarcely an impartial witness. A Cumberland man who had risen in Richard's service, he had only recently been promoted to the see of St David's during the Protectorate, and was soon to receive Lionel Woodville's much richer see of Salisbury when the latter fled into exile in the aftermath of the 1483 rebellion. He had a natural and inbuilt interest in seeing Richard succeed.¹⁶

The assertion that Langton's account is "that of a partisan, and likely to be tinged with partiality" goes back to 1827 when J.B. Sheppard transcribed and wrote the introduction to *The Christ Church Letters: A volume of mediaeval letters relating to the affairs of the priory of Christ Church Canterbury*.¹⁷ That the preeminent scholar on Richard III wrote in 1981 a sentiment that was expressed 150 years earlier shows the tenacity of certain viewpoints. But more importantly, lying beneath Sheppard's conclusion is the irreconcilable idea that a man of Langton's qualities could actually praise someone who in his mind is a manipulative usurper. To Sheppard, "it is to be deplored" that he should fall into such naiveté.¹⁸ But this begs the question: who is being naïve? Can an historian objectively assess Langton's letter if he or she views Richard III as being essentially repellant or heroic?

Because of this potential pitfall, we could look to other methodologies that divorce the historian from his or her own prejudices. Scientific laboratory analysis of Richard III's skeletal remains, for instance, has already helped separate fact from fiction. This multi-disciplinary approach has debunked myths about his spinal deformity and appearance. Similarly, there is a methodology for judging the credibility of what Langton said in his letter. It comes from our courts of law where, every day, juries are instructed to apply a number of factors to sort out believable from unbelievable testimony:

Preliminary Instructions—Credibility of Witnesses¹⁹

In deciding what the facts are, you may have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses. "Credibility" means whether a witness is worthy of belief. You may believe everything a witness says or only part of it or none of it.

In deciding what to believe, you may consider a number of factors, including the following:

- (1) the opportunity and ability of the witness to see or hear or know the things the witness testifies to;
- (2) the quality of the witness's understanding and memory;
- (3) the witness's manner while testifying;
- (4) whether the witness has an interest in the outcome of the case or any motive, bias or prejudice;
- (5) whether the witness is contradicted by anything the witness said or wrote before trial or by other evidence;
- (6) how reasonable the witness's testimony is when considered in the light of other evidence that you believe; and
- (7) **any other factors that bear on believability.**

While these factors are used to weigh evidence in criminal and civil trials, they are also extremely useful in analyzing historical documents like Langton's letter. Indeed, historians apply some or all of them without realizing it. Charles Ross and J.B. Sheppard, for instance, rely exclusively on factor (4) to conclude that Langton was a biased partisan who would be motivated to see Richard III in the most favorable light. The reader is thus left with an incomplete analysis, since there is little or no attempt to apply the other items.

The goal of this essay is to give Langton's letter a more thorough analysis by applying *all the factors* that determine a witness's credibility. By doing so, we will discover much more about Langton's life than is usually described in history books, and we will see emerge a picture that is quite different from the one painted by Ross and Sheppard. But before we do this, we first need to read the entire letter²⁰ and understand its context.

From Thomas Langton, Bishop of St. David's, to the Prior of Christ Church (September 1483)

My Lord I recommend one to yow, &c. If ther hap to be ony shippis at Burdeaux at such tyme as your wyne yt shalbe clear shippyd, the Kyng wil for no thyng graunte licence to yow, ne to non other, for to ship your wyne in a straunger. If ther be non Ynglyssh shippis, ye may well in that cace ship your wyne yn a straunger; ther ys no law ne statute ayeyn it; and so by thadvyce of the chef juge, Sir Fayreford Vavasor, Sir Jervas Clifton, and Medcalf you nedys no licence; and so thai all shewyd the law. In this matter this ys the conclusion; in oon cas yow nedys no licence; in the other the Kyng wil noon graunte. The Kyng hath at this tyme ij messengers with his cosin of France. If thai bring home good tithings I dout not but the Kyng will wryte to his said cosin as specially as he can for your wyne; if he have no good tythings yow must have paciens; but how so ever it shal be send Smith your servant for your wyne, for I dout not but ye shal have it this yer. I pray you do so mych for me to take your servant iij li. Or els pray master supprior to do it, to such tyme that y shal com to London, and pray your said servant for to by me ij tun of wyne with it, and bring it home with yours. I trust to God ye shal here such tythings in hast that I shalbe an Ynglissh man and no mor Welsh—*Sit hoc clam omes*. The Kyng of Scots hath sent a curteys and a wise letter to the Kyng for [h]is cace, but I trow ye shal undirstond thai shal have a sit up or ever the Kyng departe fro York. Thai ly styl at the siege of Dunbar, but I trust to God it shalbe kept fro thame. I trust to God sune, by Michelmasse, the Kyng shal be at London. He contents the people wher he goys best that ever did prince; for

many a poor man that hath suffred wrong many days have be relevyd and helpyd by hym and his commands in his progresse. And in many grete citeis and townis wer grete summis of mony gif hym which he hath refusyd. On my trouth I lykyd never the condicions of ony prince so wel as his; God hathe sent hym to us for the wele of us al *neque...voluptas aliquis regnat...*

Our Lord have you in his keypyng. I wold as fayn have be consecrate in your chyrch as ye would have had me your

T. LANGTON.

It shal be wel do that your servant bring a certificate from the Mayr of Burdeaux that ther was no sheppis ther of Ynglond at such tymes as he ladyd your wyn.

To my Lord the Prior of Cryschyrc of Canterbury.

In order to understand the letter, we need to know three things: (a) to whom was he writing? (b) what was the nature of their past correspondence? and (c) what were the events that prompted this particular letter?

Who was the Prior of Christ Church and Why was Langton Writing to Him?

The Prior of Christ Church in Canterbury was William Selling. Like Langton, he came from an obscure family, studied in Italy, supported the New Learning, and collected books. Selling is considered one of the early Renaissance figures of England and is credited with introducing the study of classical Greek.²¹ Several of his Latin orations are still extant; particularly notable is the speech he prepared for the convocation of 19 April 1483, cancelled by Edward IV's death and funeral.²² Selling and Langton were the same age, both born circa 1430, and first met in Italy where Langton was pursuing a doctorate of canon law. Selling, a Kentish man who took on the name of his birthplace of Selling, was a Benedictine monk at the time but would become Prior of Christ Church Canterbury in 1472.²³

The two lived through the turmoil of Henry VI's mental incapacitations and the power struggles that accompanied them, the defeat of the House of Lancaster at Towton in 1461, the early uncertainties of Edward IV's Yorkist reign, the Kingmaker's 1469 defection, Henry VI's readeption and demise in 1471, and the crises brought about by the king's sudden death in April, 1483. With so many shared experiences, they must have had a natural kinship. This is reflected in Langton's statement that "*I wold as fayn have be consecrate in your chyrch as ye would have had me*". Indeed, just a year earlier, Selling gave Langton the prestigious rectory of All Hallows Gracechurch in London, so presumably he reciprocated Langton's affection.²⁴

They had been corresponding to each other for at least half a decade. In a letter written by Langton to Selling and dated the last day of the 1478 Parliament,²⁵ we learn that Selling composed a sermon for convocation and had asked Langton to deliver it.²⁶ Langton explains that Edward IV had assigned him to deal with Spanish ambassadors on "weighty" matters and regrets he might not be available to do so. He inquires after Master T. Smyth (presumably the same servant mentioned in the September 1483 letter) and then interjects "*Ther be assignyd certen Lords to go with the body of the Dukys of Clarence to Teuxbury, where he shall be beryid; the Kyng intendis to do right worshipfully for his sowle.*" He conveys the news that he was recently made Treasurer of Exeter Cathedral and states how much income he will derive from that office. He hopes Prior Selling shall be receiving "his wine" soon. The letter shows a mix of current events, personal news, and concern for a good friend.

What is the letter of September 1483 talking about? And what's all the fuss about "the wine"?

The letter written by Langton in September 1483 falls along the same general lines as the one from 1478, being a mix of current political events and personal news. More than half the content deals with the issue of the "Prior's wine" and how to get it shipped from Bordeaux without incurring customs duties. Wine was not a frivolity but a major concern for the Canterbury priory; it was expensive and it was needed for the communion sacrament. In 1179, King Louis VII of France made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket in Canterbury and in gratitude made a bequest in perpetuity for an enormous quantity of French wine (1,600 gallons per year) to the monks of Christ Church Priory. With the English invasion of France during the Hundred Years War, the French stopped honoring this grant, possibly because of the despoiling of their northern vineyards.²⁷ When Langton was sent to France in 1477 as Edward IV's ambassador, Selling gave him a petition along with instructions to do his utmost to press Louis XI ("the Spider King") for a favorable answer on acknowledging the grant. As a result of Langton's efforts, the French king not only committed himself to honoring the grant again, but he also stipulated that the wine would come from the Loire Valley—the best quality of wine produced in France. Langton's achievement was memorialized in Canterbury's records, and he was offered the living of St. Leonard, Eastcheap—an offer he declined in favor of accepting a future benefice. He'd end up waiting five years for that to happen.²⁸ If anything, Langton was a patient man.

In September 1483, with the accession of Richard III, the grant was still in operation but its future was uncertain, especially since the French had a new king in the person of Charles VIII. Langton reports to Selling that King Richard had sent two messengers to King Charles, ostensibly for the purpose, among others, of seeing whether the new French king would honor the grant of wine. Langton assures his friend that King Richard will personally write to Charles if necessary. However, the immediate concern for Selling was how to get his wine shipped out of Bordeaux without paying duties or a license to import. This was why Langton conferred with several judges and lawyers on the matter; their consensus was that Selling did not need a license to import and would not have to pay duties, even if the wine was carried aboard French ships. Langton then asks a favor: could Selling's man buy two tuns of wine in France for him and have it shipped along with the Prior's wine? Posterity does not record whether Selling agreed to this, but the upshot is that Langton was looking to evade paying duties by having his wine commingled with Selling's duty-free cargo.²⁹ One can be certain that Langton didn't intend this letter to be read by the king's agents.

The remainder of the September 1483 letter deals with how the new English king is being perceived on royal progress, Langton's personal aspirations, and the situation with Scotland. Langton reports that the Scottish siege of Dunbar is still on-going, and he hopes the English will prevail in their occupation of that fortress. While the "Kying of Scots" sent a courteous and wise letter about it, Langton believes some kind of confrontation between the two monarchs will occur, in the form of a "sit up" (i.e., diplomatic parlay) while King Richard is at York.³⁰

One of the more curious things about Langton's letter is when he breaks into Latin, which happens twice. The first time is when he says "I trust to God ye shal here such tythings in hast that I shalbe an Ynglissh man and no mor Welsh—*Sit hoc clam omes*". This sentence has been interpreted to mean that Langton aspired to be translated from St. David's to an English bishopric in the foreseeable future—but *let this be secret from everybody*.³¹

The second use of Latin is more puzzling, and is confounded by the illegibility of the original document which is partially damaged by damp. In 1827, Sheppard transcribed Langton as saying: "On my trowth I lykyd never the condicions of ony prince so wel as his;

God hath sent hym to us for the wele of us *al neque...voluptas aliquis regnat...*”³² Alison Hanham made another attempt in 1975 to decipher this portion of the letter, reporting that she was assisted by a Miss Anne M. Oakley, Canterbury Cathedral’s archivist who looked at the manuscript under ultra-violet light. Hanham’s transcription reads: “*Neque exceptionem do voluptas aliquid regnat in augmentatia*” This, she translates into English as “*Sensual pleasure holds sway to an increasing extent, but I do not consider that this detracts from what I have said*”.³³ Hanham finds this observation to be consistent with the Crowland chronicler’s comments about Richard III’s court: “it should not be left unsaid that during this Christmas feast [of 1484] too much attention was paid to singing and dancing and to vain exchanges of clothing between Queen Anne and Lady Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the dead king, who were alike in complexion and figure. The people spoke against this and the magnates and prelates were greatly astonished[.]”³⁴

Viewing the totality of Langton’s relationship with Selling, the general tenor of his correspondence, and the things discussed, one can safely say they were intimate colleagues who were keenly interested in political developments and were genuinely interested in the other’s welfare. Selling entrusted Langton to deliver his sermon in convocation, to negotiate a sensitive issue with Louis XI about a lapsed grant, and to get a legal opinion about shipping his wine. With the accession of Richard III, Selling could reasonably expect to be called upon to write a sermon for the next convocation, as he had done for the one canceled by Edward IV’s death in April, 1483.³⁵ Getting an accurate temperature reading on the new king and the political climate would be critical to that task. So, the question becomes whether Selling could trust the credibility of Langton’s observations about the king and his reception, and this brings us to applying the legal methodology set out above.

Application of Witness Credibility factors to Langton’s September 1483 letter

(1) Did Langton have the opportunity and ability to see, hear, or know the things he wrote about Richard III?

Langton was remarkably well-placed to have first-hand observations about Richard III and the events of 1483. Not only was he present with the new king during his royal progress, but he was also living in London after returning from a diplomatic embassy to France in December 1482.³⁶ As Rector of All Hallows Gracechurch, Langton’s parish included the Tower and Baynard’s Castle. This put Langton in close proximity to the events occurring at the Tower, and it made Richard a parishioner of Langton’s while he lived at Baynard’s as Lord Protector and where on 26 June 1483 he was offered the crown.³⁷ Moreover, it is quite likely that he was called to consult Edward V’s and Richard III’s royal councils on matters concerning foreign policy with France; Langton had made numerous diplomatic trips to the court of Louis XI and could provide valuable insights. As Langton’s biographer D.P. Wright notes, whenever Langton wasn’t on embassy “he was busy at court”.³⁸ Since the administrations of Edward V and Richard III were notable for their continuity with Edward IV’s, there’s no reason to believe Langton suddenly found himself ostracized from court.³⁹

Langton participated, to some extent, in the coronation rituals of Richard III. He is mentioned in an indenture made between the king and Abbot of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, dated July 7, 1483. There, Langton and the Bishop of St. Asaph’s conveyed to the Abbot’s possession the reliquary ampule of St Becket’s oil that had been used during the king’s anointment.⁴⁰ From this, historians believe Langton might have also participated in the procession carrying the ampule on the Vigil before coronation.⁴¹

We can therefore conclude that Langton had an excellent opportunity to observe Richard’s conduct as Lord Protector and as king. But did he have a basis to measure Richard

against other princes? Here again, Langton had a wealth of experience to draw upon. During his diplomatic embassies to Spain, France, and Burgundy, he met King Ferdinand, Duke Maximilian, and Louis XI. Indeed, Langton had several private audiences with the “Spider King”, including one in 1479 when Louis dismissed everyone from his palace so he could speak to Langton in absolute privacy.⁴² And, of course, Langton had ample experience with Edward IV and his court, through six years of service to his administration. So when Langton states “*On my troth I liked never the conditions of any prince so well as his*”, it’s coming from a man who draws from a deep well of past experience with Europe’s most powerful leaders.

(2) How good was Langton’s understanding and memory of the events he spoke about?

Unlike Dominic Mancini, Langton was a native-born Englishman who understood its vernacular language and customs. In 1483, he was 53 years old with no apparent defects in his memory or acuity; he would go on to be elected Archbishop of Canterbury at age 70 so he must have had his “senses” even at that advanced age.

More importantly, Langton wrote his letter *contemporaneously* with the events he was reporting about. Contemporaneous writings are generally more reliable than those written “in hindsight”. The problem with hindsight is that it tends to view past events as fitting into pattern or being consistent with a result occurring much later. Many of us are familiar with the phrase “Monday morning quarterback” in American football, where a quarterback’s decision to throw a pass is criticized if it was intercepted and/or contributed to his team’s ultimate loss of the game. Most of us agree it’s not entirely fair to judge someone like that because the loss of the game was dependent on more variables than just one pass.

The same applies to historical chronicles, such as the Abbey of Crowland’s Continuations. Written by an unknown cleric in 1486, the chronicler assesses Richard III’s reign a year after his death at Bosworth. He views this outcome as evidence of God’s judgment on a scheming usurper, murderer of nephews, and evil king.⁴³ And while the continuator tries to be as fair as possible, he cannot resist judging an event, or people, by the future consequences. When, for instance, the assembled English lords took an oath in February 1484 recognizing Richard III’s son as heir to the throne, the Crowland chronicler views the son’s death in April as evidence that the oath was futile and was an “attempt[] of man to regulate his affairs without God”.⁴⁴ The Crowland chronicler observes this about Richard III’s royal progress to York in September 1483:

“Wishing therefore to display in the North, where he had spent most of his time previously, the superior royal rank, which he acquired for himself in this manner, as diligently as possible, he left the royal city of London and passing through Windsor, Oxford and Coventry came at length to York. There, on a day appointed for the repetition of his crowning in the metropolitan church, he presented his only son, Edward, whom, that same day, he had created prince of Wales with the insignia of the gold wand and the wreath; and he arranged splendid and highly expensive feasts and entertainments to attract to himself the affection of many people. There was no shortage of treasure then to implement the aims of his so elevated mind since, as soon as he first thought about his intrusion into the kingship, he seized everything that his deceased brother, the most glorious King Edward, had collected with the utmost ingenuity and the utmost industry, many years before, as we have related above, and which he had committed to the use of his executors for the carrying out of his last will.”⁴⁵

Langton’s letter of September 1483 was not written with foreknowledge of Richard III’s eventual death at Bosworth, or even the rebellion that would be put down in November.

Instead, it is offered as an appraisal of the king *during his first two months on the throne*, and rendered after the controversial way in which he acceded to the crown. What's interesting is how Langton describes a different version of why the king was so popular with the people; it's not for the "splendid and highly expensive feasts and entertainments" alone, but because "*many a poor man that hath suffered wrong many days have been relieved and helped by him and his commands in his progress*". Langton's account also differs from the Crowland continuator's statement about Richard III's rapacity for acquiring wealth. The king, Langton observes, refuses the tributes and gifts of money offered to him. While we needn't toss out the entirety of the Crowland chronicler's observations, we can concede that Langton's account is given without the 20/20 hindsight possessed by an unknown cleric in East Anglia.

(3) How did Langton offer his information?

The information offered in Langton's letter to Selling has two features. It was given in privacy ("*Sit hoc clam omes*"—*let this remain secret from everybody*) and it tries to be objective. The first item has received little recognition in historical journals. Compared to Mancini, who was being paid for his service and therefore would have a motive to exaggerate the significance of the rumors he heard on the street, Langton had nothing to prove or to gain, financially or otherwise, by telling Selling a slanted view of the king. And Langton did not report only the good things about Richard III. He broke into Latin to tell Selling that he thought "*Sensual pleasure holds sway to an increasing extent, but I do not consider that this detracts from what I have said*".

(4) Did Langton have any personal interest, bias, or motivation in seeing Richard III in a positive light only?

This is the area where most historians challenge Langton's credibility and objectivity. As Charles Ross asserts, Langton is biased in three ways: he is northern and thus would favor a king from the north; he "rose up" under Richard and thus would naturally want the "grave train" to continue; and he was favored by the king for translation to a more august English bishopric.

It is true that Langton was born in Appleby, Westmorland County, in the northwest of England, and probably lived in the north for the first two decades of life. The Dictionary of National Biography says he was educated by the Carmelite friars there; others have suggested he had a local patron. At that time, Appleby was in the lordship of the staunch Lancastrian Cliffords; they held Appleby Castle since the 13th century and a hereditary right to the shrievalty of Westmorland. They were in open conflict with the Duke of York's brother-in-law for much of Langton's early life.⁴⁶ Whether this molded Langton's loyalties or perceptions is unknown, but he did not grow up in a locality with strong Yorkist sentiments.

For the next 30 years, he was educated at Oxford, Cambridge, Padua and Bologna, traveled extensively, and served on multiple diplomatic embassies on the continent. A fondness for his birthplace is evident by the way his last will and testament provided for his deceased parents' chantry chapel there. (See Appendix 1) For his own tomb, he chose Winchester Cathedral. His last will and testament shows no veneration of northern saints nor any particular northern devotion or attachments. The most any historian has said on the subject is that, at the time of his death, his household had some individuals with the last names Machell and Warcop which are "redolent of Appleby and Westmorland", but they were probably related to his family by marriage.⁴⁷ These facts blunt the facile assertion by Ross and Pollard that Langton is a "typical northerner" who represents wide "northern opinion" which inherently viewed Richard III in the most positive light. There are too many factual hurdles to overcome in order to make such conclusions.

The only favoritism displayed by Langton was for men “of learning” and youth showing talent musically or intellectually. He also promoted his nephews, including Robert Langton and Christopher Bainbridge, to positions in the Church.⁴⁸ Nepotism aside, Langton’s life and career shows neutrality. He served Yorkist and Tudor kings. He befriended men like William Selling, a Kentish man. Whether Langton even viewed Richard III as northern is open to question, as the king was not born or raised there, and did not show any early inclination to promote his northern ducal retainers into royal administration. Nor were the people living north of the River Trent uniform in their loyalties; the Clifford and Percy families, for example, never fell completely under the thrall of the Yorkist regime⁴⁹, and Buckingham apparently found enough difference of opinion that he was actively recruiting Lancashire men to join his revolt to install Henry Tudor as king.⁵⁰ We should also remember that Richard III’s royal progress moved through Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire, and Nottinghamshire, before arriving in Yorkshire.⁵¹ Langton’s observations are not limited to what he saw in York (“*he contents the people wherever he goes*”).

Langton was never a retainer of Richard as Duke of Gloucester. Rosemary Horrox, whose book *Richard III: A Study of Service* details the duke’s affinity, makes no mention of Langton whatsoever. Nor did Langton’s relatives enjoy the level of patronage demonstrated by another Westmorland man—Richard Redman, Bishop of St. Asaph’s—whose prominent family had several members within Richard III’s northern ducal affinity.⁵² Thus, the idea that he “rose up” in Richard’s service is simply wrong. Langton first came to prominence under the reign of Edward IV. He appears to have been involved in the drafting of the Royal Household Ordinance of 1478, a set of regulations for the king’s household that were complementary to those in the earlier Black Book. Here, the warrant under the king’s signet, dated 9 July 1478, tells the chancellor that

“we by thaduis [the advice] of oure counsell have made certain ordinaunces for the stablysshing of oure howshold which by oure commaundement shal be deliuered vnto you by oure trusty and righte welbeloued clerke and counsellor, Maister Thomas Langtone” and directing the chancellor to “put alle the ordinaunces in writing seled vnder oure great sele, and the same so seled send vnto vs by oure said counsellor without delay”.⁵³

From 1476 to 1482, Edward IV repeatedly employed Langton to serve on diplomatic embassies to Castile, France and Burgundy to negotiate matters of state, including the marriage of his children to foreign princes/princesses and the tortuous negotiations with France and Burgundy. For his efforts, Edward IV rewarded Langton by nominating him to the Treasurership of Exeter Cathedral and the rectory of Pembridge in Herefordshire.

Future royal gifts and benefices were undoubtedly in line for Langton as long as he remained in Edward IV’s service. With the death of the king in 1483, however, a pall of uncertainty must have fallen over Langton’s aspirations. The new king—Edward V—was still a minor and had a retinue dominated by the Queen’s family. If the confirmation of Duke Richard as Lord Protector provided some comfort to Langton, it was not because of Richard’s northern affinity or status as an “over-mighty subject”. Rather, as Rosemary Horrox observes, support in London and Westminster for Richard’s confirmation as Lord Protector derives from the “general acceptance of his claim to represent the stable continuance of his brother’s regime” and “as a respected linch-pin of Yorkist government”.⁵⁴ Langton’s interests were in the status quo, since he enjoyed a secure place in Edward IV’s service. It is likely that he, like many prelates and lords, saw Richard as presenting the best opportunity for that continuity.⁵⁵

Finally, there is Langton's statement that he hoped to be translated to an English diocese in the near future ("*I trust to God ye shal here such tythings in hast that I shalbe an Ynglisssh man and no mor Welsh—Sit hoc clam omes*"). For a man of Langton's cosmopolitan qualities, the Bishopric of St. David's was probably viewed as a stepping stone to greater benefices, rather than a final destination. Such was the case for Henry Chichele, John Catterick, and Stephen Patrington, who briefly served at St David's before moving on to Canterbury, Coventry/Lichfield, and Chichester.

It was very early in the reign of Edward V that the Bishopric of St David's became vacant. Richard Martyn had been elected to that position by Edward IV in April 1482, but died on May 11, 1483. As the newly-confirmed Lord Protector, Richard elected Langton whose service to Edward IV had been amply demonstrated. While he surely welcomed the bishop's mitre, Langton had no connections whatsoever to Wales and it probably was not the best fit for a man with so many duties at the royal court. His predecessor, Martyn, claimed the Welsh diocese was impoverished, heavily in debt, and comprised of dilapidated buildings.⁵⁶ When Langton was given St. David's, the diocese was still so poor that some provision had to be made for him to keep his Pembridge rectory:

Harleian MS 433, Vol 1, p 35: dated May 1483, by Edward V: "Know that we of our special grace and mere motion have given and granted and by these presents give and grant to our dearly beloved and faithful clerk Thomas Langton custody of all the temporalities of the bishopric of St Davids . . . on account of the sincere love and affection which we bear and have to the person of our aforesaid dearly beloved counselor Thomas Langton clerk now elected to St Davids and considering that the goods benefices and also manors lands tenements rents and other possessions belonging to the same bishopric are so greatly diminished and reduced and suffer such dilapidation and ruin that the same now elect, when he takes upon himself the office of bishop, will not be able to support or maintain as he ought his state and dignity and other burdens incumbent on the honour of bishop, of our especial grace and of our certain knowledge and mere motion and in order that the same bishop elect may be able to support and maintain fittingly and honourable the state honour and dignity of the episcopate, we have granted and given licence for ourselves and our heirs that the same now elected may send and direct his proctor or proctors to the Roman curia and that they should make certain provision that the same elect after he has been consecrated to the bishopric of that place should be able to hold the parish church of Pembridge in the diocese of Hereford in our gift which said Thomas now holds. . . ."⁵⁷

Like Martyn, "Langton's relationship with his diocese of St. Davids was distant. Probably he employed a vicar-general to administer the diocese and used a suffragan to deputise for him in his spiritual functions."⁵⁸ Perhaps Langton had his eye elsewhere as there were other prelates who were of frail age (Thomas Bourchier, born 1411) or out of favor with Richard III (Thomas Rotherham, John Morton). If Langton wanted to be translated from St. David's to an English bishopric, he'd have to be patient, wait for a vacancy to open up, and remain in favor with the king.

It seems there was one bishopric on the verge of being forcibly vacated: Lionel Woodville's see of Salisbury. Woodville had been made bishop in 1482, and notwithstanding a brief interlude in June when he took sanctuary at Westminster Abbey with his sister the widowed Queen Elizabeth, he "did not play any significant part in the political crisis after Edward IV's death in 1483".⁵⁹ Although absent from Richard III's coronation, he "apparently came to terms with the new regime, for he was named to the commission of the peace in Dorset and Wiltshire after Richard III's accession".⁶⁰ There had

been no past history of animosity between Richard and Woodville. The register of Magdalen College suggests that Woodville personally welcomed Richard III in his role as Chancellor of Oxford University when the king visited on July 24-26, 1483.⁶¹ His last official act as Bishop of Salisbury is dated September 22, 1483, when he granted a commission to effectuate the appropriation of the chapel of St. Katherine, Wanborough, to Magdalen College, Oxford.⁶² He must have been under suspicion at this point, because Richard III ordered the forfeiture of his temporalities the next day.⁶³ Perhaps Langton was aware of the king's suspicions and knew that Lionel Woodville's days were numbered. But Langton did not come into possession of Woodville's temporalities until March 1484, following the attainder for his role in the October rebellion.⁶⁴ This was six months after he wrote his letter to Prior Selling.

The takeaway from all this is that Langton was certainly not a retainer of Richard III from his days as duke, had no explicit pro-northern bias, and was realistically ambitious as a prelate looking for advancement to a more financially secure and less "dilapidated" bishopric. So, indeed, Langton was happy to see Richard III so well received. Did this influence his observations? Probably, but not to the extent that Charles Ross and others have suggested.

(5) Is there any evidence to contradict what Langton said in his letter, by his own hand or others?

While Langton did observe "*Sensual pleasure holds sway to an increasing extent, but I do not consider that this detracts from what I have said*", there is nothing in his letter that contradicts his statement about the king's popular reception while on royal progress or the justice dispensed to the common people along the way. So his letter is internally consistent.

The only other contemporary observation about how the people received Richard comes from Mancini, in his December 1483 report to Angelo Cato. Read in its entirety, Mancini describes the London population as being ambivalent and turbulent with speculation about Richard's true intentions. At one point, they are favorably impressed with a letter to royal council written by Richard in April 1483 before he arrived in London. In it, he declared his loyalty to Edward IV's heir and asked council to take "his deserts" into consideration when disposing of the government, to which he was entitled by law, and his brother's ordinance. "This letter had a great effect on the minds of the people, who, as they had previously favoured the duke in their hearts from a belief in his probity, now began to support him openly and aloud; so that it was commonly said by all that the duke deserved the government."⁶⁵

Public opinion, however, would soon veer between support and distrust of the Lord Protector. After reports were received in London that Richard had taken Edward V into custody at Stony Stafford, "the unexpectedness of the event horrified every one. The queen and the marquess, who held the royal treasure, began collecting an army to defend themselves... But ... they perceived that men's minds were not only irresolute, but altogether hostile to themselves. Some even said openly that it was more just and profitable that the youthful sovereign should be with his paternal uncle than with his maternal uncles and uterine brothers."⁶⁶ Meanwhile, a "sinister rumor" was circulating that Richard had taken the young king into his possession so that he might usurp the crown. These rumors were met with more letters from Richard to council justifying his actions; when publicly read, "all praised the duke of Gloucester for his dutifulness toward his nephews and for his intention to punish their enemies. Some, however, who understood his ambition and deceit, always suspected whether his enterprises would lead."⁶⁷ When Richard entered the city with wagons filled with weapons to prove there was an attempt against his life, there were Londoners who disbelieved this and thought they came from storehouses of weaponry

related to the Scottish war. “[M]istrust both of his accusation and designs upon the throne was exceedingly augmented.”⁶⁸ When the public received news of a plot in the Tower and that its originator, Hastings, had “paid the penalty” by his execution there, Mancini writes that “at first the ignorant crowd believed, although the real truth was on the lips of many, namely that the plot had been feigned by the duke”.⁶⁹ The public’s pattern of alternating between trust and distrust of Richard is Mancini’s essential point.

Mancini’s final observation about the public’s perception of Richard comes shortly after Hastings’ death. By this time, Richard is riding through London surrounded by a thousand attendants. “He publicly showed himself so as to receive the attention and applause of the people as yet under the name of protector; but each day he entertained to dinner at his private dwellings an increasingly large number of men. When he exhibited himself through the streets of the city he was scarcely watched by anybody, rather did they curse him with a fate worthy of his crimes, since no one now doubted at what he was aiming.”⁷⁰ How Richard was perceived after his accession to the throne, however, is not part of Mancini’s report, as he concludes by saying: “These are the facts relating to the upheaval in this kingdom; *but how he may afterwards have ruled, and yet rules, I have not sufficiently learnt because directly after these his triumphs I left England for France*, as you Angelo Cato recalled me. Therefore farewell, and please show some mark of favour to our work, for whatever its quality, it has been willingly undertaken on your account. Once more farewell. Concluded at Beaugency in the County of Orleans. 1 December 1483.”⁷¹

Mancini’s account of what happened in London in April, May and June 1483 does not match the glowing account of Langton given in September 1483. Can we explain this inconsistency? Yes. They cover different time periods so are not necessarily inconsistent; the public might have initially viewed Richard with suspicion and hesitation, and then came to accept his rule in the months that followed. We also know that Mancini did not speak English, was relying on others to translate for him, was reporting hearsay and rumors. We have no way of knowing if he personally observed any of the events recorded. Nor do we know the identity of his sources for those events he did not witness. These “unknowns” do not necessarily disqualify his account but neither do they disqualify Langton’s.

(6) How reasonable are Langton’s statements when considered in light of other evidence?

Langton’s statements find support in other contemporary primary sources. John Rous, when creating in 1483-84 his famous Warwick Roll, wrote that the Richard III ruled his subjects “full commendably”—punishing offenders, especially extortioners and oppressors of the common people, and cherishing those that were virtuous. By his “discrete judgment” he received great thanks and the love of all his subjects, rich and poor.⁷² Later, in his generally critical post-1485 assessment of the king, *Historium Regum Angliae*, Rous observed that when offered money “by the peoples of London, Gloucester and Worcester, he declined [it] with thanks, affirming that he would rather have their love than their treasure”.⁷³

Shortly after his coronation, Richard sat with his judges and had the following exchange, as reported in the Richard III Society’s website⁷⁴:

A Year Book reports one of his most famous acts, when he called together all his justices and posed three questions concerning specific cases. This record provides an idea of Richard’s comprehension of and commitment to his coronation oath to uphold the law and its proper procedures.

The second question was this. If some justice of the Peace had taken a bill of indictment which had not been found by the jury, and enrolled

it among other indictments 'well and truly found' etc. shall there be any punishment thereupon for such justice so doing? And this question was carefully argued among the justices separately and among themselves, ... And all being agreed, the justices gave the King in his Council in the Star Chamber their answer to his question in this wise: that above such defaults enquiry ought to be made by a commission of at least twelve jurors, and thereupon the party, having been presented, accused and convicted, shall lose the office and pay fine to the King according to the degree of the misprision etc.'

Even Charles Ross, who characterized Langton as a partisan, finds support for his observations in contemporary records:

But his [Langton's] specific statements are supported by other evidence. That Richard turned down offers of benevolences from the towns he visited is confirmed by John Rous, one of the most hostile sources for Richard's reign, and record evidence confirms a similar statement by John Kendall, the king's secretary, that throughout his reign Richard was at pains to ensure the dispensing of speedy justice, especially in the hearing of the complaints of poor folk. In December 1483 John Harington, clerk of the council, received an annuity of £20 for 'his good service before the lords and others of the [king's] council and elsewhere and especially in the custody, registration and expedition of bills, requests and supplications of poor persons'; and that portion of the council's work which dealt with requests from the poor, later to develop into the Tudor Court of Requests, received a considerable impetus during Richard's reign.⁷⁵

Given the number of corroborative primary sources, the observations contained in Langton's letter are all the more reasonable and credible, rather than the product of a partisan's over-enthusiastic "spin" on what he had witnessed.

(7) Any other factors that bear on believability.

Finally, we should determine whether Langton was overawed by the pomp and ceremony of the royal progress, and whether he was a good judge of people. Although from an undistinguished family, Langton was no stranger to pomp and ceremony—he'd traveled to the grandest courts in Europe and had witnessed their splendor. He was consecrated a bishop on September 7, 1483, a day before the investiture of the king's son as prince of Wales, which raises the interesting prospect that this may have been a part of the magnificent ceremonies that occurred in York. Langton, in his letter to Selling, described them a little disapprovingly as exemplars of sensual pleasure, so obviously he wasn't that overawed and retained enough objectivity to express a critical opinion about the sensuality of the royal progress.

One of Langton's characteristics was that of a sincere educator, who placed a high priority on talent and intellect, rather than courtly display. As stated above, one of his students called him a Maecenas and, because of Langton's patronage, was able to study in Italy and ultimately become the Dean of St. Paul's. The student's name was Richard Pace, and there is a lovely tale about how Langton discovered him:

There is happily a contemporary appreciation of [Thomas Langton] still extant. This occurs in a classical treatise of Richard Pace on the advantages of Greek studies, printed at Basle at the famous press of John Froeben in 1517. Pace began life as an office boy to the Bishop at Winchester. Langton observed his genius for music, and in the musician prospected the scholar: the boy was meant for greater things. Forthwith he packed him off to Padua to be taught Greek and Latin in the

best school of the place, and paid all the expenses of his education. The work was still incomplete in 1500-1, at the Bishop's death—Pace was then at the university of Bologna [fn]—but provision was made in his will for a further seven years' study. The Bishop's discernment was justified. Pace became distinguished in the New Learning, and was a close friend of Colet and Erasmus, the latter of whom addressed to him a considerable proportion of his fascinating letters: he was employed by Henry VIII as private secretary, and, among a long list of ecclesiastical preferments, succeeded Colet in the deanery of St. Paul's."⁷⁶

Langton similarly went out of his way to support his nephews—but not all of them. He determined his nephew Robert Langton to be particularly talented and paid for his education in Italy, too. Robert went on to become a prebend at several cathedrals and a great benefactor to Queens College, Oxford. Langton seems to have had a good talent for discerning people's abilities.

Conclusion

It is hoped that this analysis has elucidated some of the arguments about the credibility of Langton's September 1483 letter. Langton is a fascinating man not only because of his meteoric rise from a modest family, but also because of his avocation of the New Learning in England, showing that his homeland was not living in the "Dark Ages" while Italy was basking in the sun of the "Renaissance". Also of interest is his friendship with William Selling, another proponent of the New Learning, which shows how like-minded men of the early English Renaissance developed intimate connections and espoused the conditions that would set the stage for future developments in education that would have a profound effect on its culture going into the next century.

Langton went on to serve Henry VII, but didn't assume his previous active role nor the one undertaken by fellow Westmerian Richard Redman, Bishop of St. Asaph's (later, Bishop of Exeter, and of Ely), who acted as the king's ambassador to Scotland in 1488-94, trier of parliamentary petitions in 1489, and royal counselor.⁷⁷ There is some thinking that Langton was present at the Battle of Bosworth, being loyal to Richard III to the end, but there is no proof to confirm this. In the aftermath of Richard III's death, he forfeited his temporalities as Bishop of Salisbury but by November 1485, had been restored to them. Henry VII first summoned him to parliament in 1487, and appointed him to commissions of the peace in Wiltshire, Hampshire and Surrey, which he served on through the end of his life. Langton was employed by the Tudor king to treat on one occasion with De Puebla (the Spanish ambassador in Westminster), was one of seven bishops on the king's great council of November 1494, and one of the guarantors of the 1496 trade treaty known as *Intercursus Magnus*.⁷⁸ In 1493, Langton was translated to the wealthiest bishopric in England, that of Winchester where he now reposes in death. Despite this seal of approbation from the Tudor king, Langton otherwise shunned the court and focused on diocesan administration and on the education of children at his new school.⁷⁹ Perhaps he had seen enough of princely politics. The rebus he adopted for himself, representing a "long tone" in musical notation⁸⁰, suggests he had turned his gaze to matters more harmonious, intellectual and spiritual.

Bibliography:

Books:

C.A.J. Armstrong (ed.): DOMINIC MANCINI'S THE USURPATION OF RICHARD THE THIRD, Oxford University Press (1936)

Keith Dockray: RICHARD III: A SOURCE BOOK, Alan Sutton (1997)

Rhoda Edwards: THE ITINERARY OF KING RICHARD III 1483-1485, Richard III Society (1983)

- Louise Gill: RICHARD III AND BUCKINGHAM'S REBELLION, Alan Sutton (1999)
- Alison Hanham: RICHARD III AND HIS EARLY HISTORIANS 1483-1535, Clarendon Press Oxford (1975)
- Michael Hicks: RICHARD III, The History Press (2009 reprint)
- Susan Higginbotham: THE WOODVILLES: THE WARS OF THE ROSES AND ENGLAND'S MOST INFAMOUS FAMILY, The History Press (2013)
- Rosemary Horrox & P.W. Hammond (eds.), BRITISH LIBRARY HARLEIAN MANUSCRIPT 433, Alan Sutton (1979)
- Rosemary Horrox (ed.): PARLIAMENTARY ROLLS OF MEDIEVAL ENGLAND 1275-1504, RICHARD III (1484-85), Boydell Press (2005)
- Rosemary Horrox: RICHARD III: A STUDY OF SERVICE, Cambridge University Press (1989)
- R.F. Isaacson: THE EPISCOPAL REGISTERS OF THE DIOCESE OF ST DAVID'S 1397-1518, VOLUME II, Society of Cymmrodorion (1917), tinyurl.com/y7vp2ptx (accessed 2 November 2016)
- Paul Murray Kendall: RICHARD THE THIRD, W.W. Norton & Co. (1955)
- A.R. Myers: THE HOUSEHOLD OF EDWARD IV: THE BLACK BOOK AND THE ORDINANCE OF 1478, Manchester University Press (1959)
- Nicholas Pronay & John Cox (eds.): THE CROWLAND CHRONICLE CONTINUATIONS 1459-1486, Alan Sutton (1986)
- Charles Ross: RICHARD III, University of California Press (1981)
- John Rous, THE ROUS ROLL, Alan Sutton (1980, first published 1859)
- Cora L. Scofield: THE LIFE AND REIGN OF EDWARD THE FOURTH IN TWO VOLUMES, Frank Cass & Co. (1967)
- J.B. Sheppard (ed.): CHRIST CHURCH LETTERS. A VOLUME OF MEDIAEVAL LETTERS RELATING TO THE AFFAIRS OF THE PRIORY OF CHRIST CHURCH CANTERBURY, Camden Society (1887 reprint of 1827 original)
- Anne F. Sutton & P.W. Hammond (eds.): THE CORONATION OF RICHARD III: THE EXTANT DOCUMENTS, Alan Sutton (1983)
- Edith Thompson (ed.): WARS OF YORK AND LANCASTER 1450-1485, London (1892)
- D.P. Wright (ed.): THE REGISTER OF THOMAS LANGTON, BISHOP OF SALISBURY 1485-93, Canterbury and York Society (1985)
- Journals and Biographical Dictionaries:**
- R. Percival Brown: "Thomas Langton and his Tradition of Learning", *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, new series, Vol. xxvi (1926), pp. 150-246 [tinyurl.com/yac6n26s, accessed 19 August 2016]
- Annette Carson: "Convocations Called by Edward IV and Richard of Gloucester in 1483: Did They Ever Take Place?", *The Ricardian* (2012), pp. 35-45
- Cecil H. Clough: 'Selling, William (c.1430-1494)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press (2004); [oxforddnb.com/view/article/4991, accessed 23 Oct 2016]
- John Hare: "The Bishop and the Prior: demesne agriculture in medieval Hampshire", *Agricultural History Review*, vol. 54, no. II, pp 187-212 [citations to M. Page, 'William Wykeham and the management of the Winchester estate, 1366-1404', in W. M. Ormrod (ed.), *FOURTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND*, vol. 3 (2004), p. 108]

- Ken Hillier: “The Rebellion of 1483: A study of sources and opinions,” *The Ricardian*, (September 1982)
- Rosemary Horrox: ‘Rotherham , Thomas (1423–1500)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press (2004) [oxforddnb.com/view/article/24155, accessed 23 Oct 2016]
- Jonathan Hughes, ‘Martyn, Richard (d. 1483)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [oxforddnb.com/view/article/18236, accessed 27 Oct 2016]
- David M. Luitweiler, “A King, A Duke, and A Bishop”, *The Ricardian Register*, Vol. XVIII, No. 4 (Winter, 2004), pp. 4-10.
- Richard K. Rose, ‘Redman, Richard (d. 1505)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2010 [oxforddnb.com/view/article/23260, accessed 17 Nov 2016]
- John A. F. Thomson, ‘Woodville, Lionel (c.1454–1484)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press (2004); online edn, Sept 2011 [oxforddnb.com/view/article/29938, accessed 23 Oct 2016]
- Susan L. Troxell: “Rulers, Relics and the Holiness of Power: A review”, *The Ricardian Bulletin* (December 2014), pp. 55-57 (transcription of Westminster Abbey Muniments, 9482, 7 July 1483, relating to the reliquary oil of Thomas à Becket, by T. Erik Michaelson)
- D. P. Wright: “Langton, Thomas (c.1430–1501)”, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press (2004); online edn, May 2009 [oxforddnb.com/view/article/16045, accessed 23 Oct 2016]

Other Sources:

“Richard By His Contemporaries”, from Richard III Society website, richardiii.net/2_1_0_richardiii.php (accessed 31 Oct 2016) [scroll down to the Richard by His Contemporaries section]

Model Civil Jury Instructions, District Courts of the Federal Court of Appeals, 3d Circuit (2010)

Overview—Federal Jury Instructions & Evidence, federalevidence.com/node/893/ (accessed 1 November 2016)

Pattern Criminal Jury Instructions, Superior Courts of New York

Note about links: The referenced links have been shortened for readers of the print edition who wish to access the references without having to type a long string of characters. To access, just type the link exactly as printed in the address line. If you are reading this electronically, click on the link to go to the page.

Endnotes:

- ¹ *Cardinal Morton died in the Autumn of 1500. “Henry VII sent to the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, for them to elect their friend Langton as their next archbishop, an election which, we may suppose, they were happy to make, on 22 January 1501. But on 24 or 25 January, Langton fell ill with the plague, and on 27 January 1501 he was dead.” Wright, Register of Thomas Langton, pp. xiii-xiv. Langton’s will is dated 25 January 1501. Id.*
- ² Later, Richard III sent him to the Roman curia to swear obedience to the pope, and empowered Langton to negotiate a truce with Charles VIII.
- ³ This provided for six scholars in the space of twenty years to study “*in scienis liberalibus et theologia*” at Queens College, Oxford. This was a only one of a dozen benefactions

to the universities made by Langton in his will.

- ⁴ Wright, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- ⁵ Maecenas is a man who is a generous patron, especially of arts and literature.
- ⁶ Wright, *ODNB*, citing J. Wegg, *Richard Pace: a Tudor diplomatist* (1932), pp. 4-5.
- ⁷ Brown, p. 156. Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, pp. vii-viii.
- ⁸ Brown, pp. 156-157.
- ⁹ For the full Latin text of Thomas Langton's last will and testament, see Brown, Appendix 2, pp. 215-220, and for the English translation, see Appendix 1 herein. "The earliest record found of his family in the Appleby district is a fine of 19 Edw. I (1290) by which an 'Alan de Langton and his wife Alice' conceded lands in Milburn to John de Helton and Agnes his wife. The manor of Langton at an Inquisition of 1 Edw. III. (1326) was found to be of no value. In 1428 William de Langton was Rector of Long Marton. A rent-roll of 1454 in the Machell MSS. (Vol. V, p. 394) preserves the names of Thomas and Nicholas Lanton [sic]. John Langton Senr., and Jr., appear in a will of 1568...; and other chance notes of Appleby include a Richard in 1599 and Robert in 1634. It appears therefore that the family persisted for several centuries." Brown, p. 155. "There is no evidence that his family had any social prestige. His sisters passed by marriage into some of the best families of the district, but probably only at the outer fringe. There is no Langton among the sixty-three 'gentlemen within the Schyer' in 1539." Brown, p. 156.
- ¹⁰ R.L. Storey, "The north of England" in *Fifteenth-Century England 1399-1509*, S.B. Chrimes, C.D. Ross, R.A. Griffiths (eds.), Alan Sutton (1995), pp. 129-144.
- ¹¹ Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, pp. vii-viii.
- ¹² Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xii. As Langton had been excluded from Henry VII's first parliament in 1485, D.P. Wright suggests that his appointment as Provost at Queen's indicated that Langton had "made his peace" with Tudor by 1487.
- ¹³ Brown, pp. 157-58. Richard Pace eulogized his patron, Bishop Langton, in his book *De Fructu qui ex Doctrina Percipitur Liber*, in which he wrote: "the science of music also demands her place, particularly from me, whom she distinguished when a boy, among other boys. For Thomas Langton, whose *manu-minister* I was, noticing my advance in music far beyond my years, would pronounce and assert (being perhaps biased in his favour by his love) 'This boy's talents are born for higher things.' And soon afterwards (*paucos post dies*) he sent me to Italy, to Padua University, then at the top of its fame, to study Letters, and generously provided for the annual expenses, for he befriended all learned men exceedingly, and in his time was another Maecenas, rightly remembering (as he often said), that it was for learning that he had been promoted to the rank of bishop. . . And he valued the Literary Humanities so highly that he provided for the teaching of them to boys and youths in his own private school (*domestica schola*). And most of all he delighted in hearing the boys repeat to him in the evening what they had learned that day from the schoolmaster. And in this examination he who did well was nicely complimented, and given something he wanted. . . . And if a boy seemed dull, but willing, he did not treat it as a fault, but with kindness urged him on, that diligence might strive with nature, quoting the example of others who had succeeded under similar difficulties." Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, pp. xiv-xv.
- ¹⁴ Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 151-52.
- ¹⁵ Dockray, *Richard III: A Source Book*, pp. xiii-xiv.
- ¹⁶ Ross, *Richard III*, pp. 151-52. A.J. Pollard wrote the same thing in his 1981 essay "North, South and Richard III" for *The Ricardian*, Vol. V, No. 74 (September 1981), pp. 384-389: "Bishop Langton came from Appleby in Westmorland and was in the process of benefiting from the King's patronage when he wrote in 1483 that 'God has sent him

to us for the weal of us all.’ This could perhaps be taken as an authoritative statement of northern opinion.” Pollard, p. 387.

¹⁷ Sheppard, *Christ Church Letters*, p. xxx.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ **Model Jury Instruction 1.7, 3d Circuit Court of Appeals, 2010.**

²⁰ Sheppard, pp. 45-46.

²¹ Scofield, pp. 349-50.

²² Cecil H. Clough: ‘Selling , William (c.1430–1494)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

²³ Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. viii.

²⁴ Wright, *Register*, p. ix.

²⁵ The full text of the 1478 letter reads: “My Lord, I commend me to your good Lordship. I am not yet acerteined whether I shall [or] may have ony leyser to attend the sermon at the Convocation or no. The Kyng hath assignyd my Lord of Norwich, my Lord of Senct Jamys, and me to comyn with thambassadors of Spayn in such matters as thai be com for, the which be right weghty. If I wer sure that your Lordship attend to the drawing of it I shuld com to say it in x . . . days, if your Lordship labour in it. If I may have leyser to say it your Lordship shal do me right gret worship; if I say it not, yit your Lordship shall not leese your labour, for in the meane season ye shalbe vertuusly occupyed, as ye be ever; and yf it do no servyse at this tyme it shall at a nother. If I take it on hand, forthwith I will send on to yow. My Lord [Archbishop Bourghier] went yesterday to the Knoll, but I spake not with hym at his departing, but as I understond he hath not assignyd it to noman, nor he is not certen of me. I trust Master T. Smyth shalbe ryd and so delyveryd. Ther be assignyd certen Lords to go with the body of the Dukys of Clarence to Teuxbury, where he shall be beryid; the Kyng intendis to do right worshipfully for his sowle. On Tewisday last passed my Lord of Excytyr gafe me the tresurership in his church of Excytyr; as I am credibly infourmyd, it is worth by yer, all charges borne, lx li. I pray God send yow your wyn sune and suerly home. Please it your Lordship commend me to Master Supprior, and to al my masterys your brethren. This day the Parliament shall fynyssh. On Saturday at London at viij of the klok. Your own, T.L. —To the Right Reverend fadre in God my Lord Prior of Chrychyrch at Cantyrbury.” Sheppard, pp. 36-37.

²⁶ Sheppard, pp. xxix-xxx.

²⁷ Sheppard, pp. xxiv-xxviii.

²⁸ Sheppard, pp. xxvi-xxviii.

²⁹ *Sheppard*, p. xxx. *According to Sheppard, Langton “was willing to defraud the King to whom he was so much attached; for there can be no doubt that the wine purchased with the two pounds borrowed of the Prior was intended to slip through the Custom House under cover of the Convent’s privilege”.* *Ibid.*

³⁰ “The Castle of Dunbar was at that time in possession of the English, and was besieged by the Scots. A three years’ truce was concluded in 1484.” Thompson, p. 138.

³¹ Thompson, p. 138.

³² Sheppard, p. 46.

³³ Hanham, pp. 49-50. Dockray, p. 4, adopts Hanham’s transcription and translation.

³⁴ Pronay, *Crowland Chronicle Continuations*, p. 175.

³⁵ On 16 May 1483, a warrant was prepared by King Edward V to the Archbishop of Canterbury, commanding him to summon a convocation to St. Paul’s. The warrant has the following preface: “The king to the most reverend father in Christ, Thomas, by the same grace Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury, greeting. Having carefully considered and weighed certain difficult and urgent matters closely concerning us and the state of

our realm of England and the honour and benefit of the English church, we command you in the faith and love . . . to be summoned all and singular bishops . . .” Horrox & Hammond, *British Library Harleian MS 433*, Vol. One, p. 16. This convocation was likely to be convened around the date set for Edward V’s first parliament on 25 June 1483, following his coronation on the 22nd of June. The wording used, of “certain difficult and urgent matters”, seems to be a boilerplate used in prior writs for convocation (see, e.g., the writ issued for convocation by Edward IV on 3 February 1483, which states “certain difficult and urgent matters concerning us, the security and defence of the English Church and the peace, tranquility, public good and defence of our kingdom and of our subjects”). Carson, pp. 41-42. Following Richard III’s accession and coronation, on 26 June and 6 July respectively, and the October rebellion, the convocation had to be postponed along with parliament. It met on 3 February 1484, during the time of Richard III’s first parliament, when a grant of tax was made. Carson, p. 43.

³⁶ Scofield, vol 2, p. 355.

³⁷ Edwards, p. xi; Sheppard, p. xxxvi-xxxviii. Sheppard observes the rectory of All Hallows Gracechurch was “a benefice which was usually in the hands of clerks with an interest at the Royal Court”; *ibid* at xxvii-xxviii.

³⁸ Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, Introduction, p. x.

³⁹ Horrox, pp. 105-6, 136.

⁴⁰ Troxell, “A review of ‘Rulers, Relics and the Holiness of Power’”, *Ricardian Bulletin*, Dec 2014, pp. 55-57.

⁴¹ Sutton, *The Coronation of Richard III*, p. 10.

⁴² Scofield, vol 2, p. 256.

⁴³ Pronay, p. 185.

⁴⁴ Pronay, p. 171.

⁴⁵ Pronay, pp. 161-163.

⁴⁶ “Appleby”, tin An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Westmorland (London, 1936), pp. 4-14. British History Online british-history.ac.uk/rchme/westm/pp4-14 [accessed 1 February 2018]. Henry Summerson, ‘Clifford, John, ninth Baron Clifford (1435–1461)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011 [oxforddnb.com/view/article/5654, accessed 28 Nov 2016]

⁴⁷ Brown, p. 162-163. It is likely that “Master Machell”, one of the beneficiaries named in Langton’s will, is his nephew and the son of Langton’s sister Elizabeth who married a Roland Machell. *Ibid*, at ff p. 160. Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xv.

⁴⁸ The advancement of Robert Langton and Christopher Bainbridge, however, was not based solely on nepotism. Both had already been beneficed in the diocese of Salisbury when Langton became bishop there. “These two intelligent and well-trained clerics would have been advanced by any wise bishop”, according to D.P. Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xvi. Bainbridge would later become Archbishop of York and Cardinal under the Tudor kings. He was an executor of Henry VII’s will and attended the coronation of Henry VIII. Langton also advanced the careers of three other male relatives who were in the clergy; but their benefices were of accordingly lesser value and commensurate with their abilities. For a full discussion of Langton’s generosity towards his nephews, see Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xv-xvi.

⁴⁹ Horrox, *Richard III: Study of Service*, p. 39.

⁵⁰ A letter from Edward Plumpton to his master Sir Robert Plumpton, knight, was written on the very day on which the Duke of Buckingham first openly took up arms against Richard III. Information is given of the duke’s attempt to gain allies in Lancashire: “People in this country be so trobled, in such commandment as they have in the Kyngs

name and otherwise, marvellously, that they know not what to do ... The Duke of Buck: has so many men, as yt is sayd here, that he is able to goe where he wyll; but I trust he shalbe right withstanded and all his mallice: and els were great pytty". Hillier, "The Rebellion of 1483: A study of sources and opinions," *The Ricardian*, September 1982.

⁵¹ Edwards, pp. 4-7.

⁵² Edwards, p. xvii, footnote 24, citing J.C. Wedgwood ed., *History of Parliament: Biographies....1439-1509* (1936) pp. 709-10.

⁵³ Myers, *Black Book*, pp. 56-57, 211.

⁵⁴ Rosemary Horrox (ed.), *Richard III and the North*, Studies in Regional and Local History No. 6, University of Hull (1986), p. 4.

⁵⁵ Horrox, *Richard III: A Study of Service*.

⁵⁶ Hughes, 'Martyn, Richard (d. 1483)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Martyn's background is remarkably similar to Langton's as he was another cleric whose time was consumed either at Westminster or on foreign diplomatic embassies; it is likely Langton served with Martyn on these endeavors.

⁵⁷ Horrox & Hammond, *Harleian MS 433*, Vol 1, p 35.

⁵⁸ Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xi.

⁵⁹ John A. F. Thomson, 'Woodville, Lionel (c.1454–1484)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. There had been no hostilities between Richard III and the Woodvilles prior to April 30, 1483 and the only report about Lionel taking sanctuary comes from one of the Stonor letters, placing him there as of the 9th of June. Higginbotham, pp. 120-1. On August 28, 1483, Richard III appointed Buckingham to head a commission to enquire into treasons and felonies in London, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Middlesex, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Hertfordshire. Higginbotham, p. 142. "The king's next move came on 23 September, when Richard ordered the seizure of Bishop Lionel Woodville's temporalities—i.e. his ecclesiastical possessions. He had good reason to be suspicious of the bishop, who is recorded as being at one of Buckingham's manors, Thornbury, on the day before the king issued his order. While Lionel was Buckingham's brother-in-law, it is probable that he was not at Thornbury merely for a family visit." Higginbotham, pp. 151-52 [citing Louise Gill, *Buckingham's Rebellion*, p 13-14 and Thomson, J.A.F., "Bishop Lionel Woodville and Richard III", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 59 (1986)].

⁶⁰ J.A.F. Thomson, *Lionel Woodville*.

⁶¹ Luitweiler, pp 5-6; the Magdalen College Register notes from this visit: "*Twenty-fourth day of this month the most illustrious King Richard the Third was honourably received, firstly outside the University by the Chancellor of the University and by the Regents and non-Regents . . .*" It was the opinion of Dr. Robin Darwall-Smith, archivist of Magdalen College, that the Register proves Chancellor Bishop Woodville personally greeted the king.

⁶² Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. 84.

⁶³ Higginbotham, pp. 150-1.

⁶⁴ Wright, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. "On 24 September, according to the 1484 Act of Attainder against the rebels, Buckingham wrote to Henry Tudor to ask him to invade England. Lionel Woodville took sanctuary at Beaulieu Abbey around the time of Buckingham's capture on 31 October/execution on 2 November. Richard III attempted to prise Lionel out of sanctuary and on 15 December 1483, sent a letter to the abbot demanding his right to offer sanctuary; this was followed with a demand on 13 February 1484 that his two chaplains be allowed to bring Lionel into the king's presence; J.A.F. Thomson has suggested that Richard meant to allow Lionel to answer the charges against him that had been brought in Parliament in connection with the

1483 rebellion. Nonetheless, Lionel remained in sanctuary. By 1 Dec 1484, however, he was dead, as indicated by a letter where Richard III authorized the election of a successor. His cause of death is unrecorded. A 17th century manuscript stated that he was buried at Beaulieu, while another source claims that a damaged tomb at Salisbury Cathedral is his.” Higginbotham, pp. 151-152.

⁶⁵ Armstrong, p. 89.

⁶⁶ Armstrong, p 97.

⁶⁷ Armstrong p. 101.

⁶⁸ Armstrong, p 103.

⁶⁹ Armstrong, p 113.

⁷⁰ Armstrong, 115-117.

⁷¹ Armstrong, p. 129.

⁷² Rous Roll, item 63.

⁷³ Dockray, pp 67-68.

⁷⁴ “Richard By His Contemporaries”, from Richard III Society website, http://www.richardiii.net/2_1_0_richardiii.php (accessed 31 Oct 2016).

⁷⁵ Ross, 151-52.

⁷⁶ Brown, “Thomas Langton and his Tradition of Learning”, *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, new series, Vol. xxvi (1926), pp. 150-246.

⁷⁷ Rose, *Richard Redman*.

⁷⁸ Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xii. Langton’s name was mentioned in the disclosure of a plot to assassinate Henry VII in the name of Perkin Warbeck in March 1496, however, the king evidently discounted this report. Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, p. xii (footnote 20).

⁷⁹ D. P. Wright, *Register of Thomas Langton*, pp. x-xiii.

⁸⁰ “Antony-à-Wood relates that Thomas Langton, when he built his extension to the Provost's residence at Queen's College, Oxford, introduced a memorial of himself by a sculptured rebus of his name and See. The foundation of this was a tun in contact with which was the obsolete musical note called a ' long ' —for Langton—while out of the bung grew a vine for Winton.” Brown, p. 161 (citing Wood’s *Athenae Oxonienses*).

~ToC~

Ricardian Reading

Myrna Smith

There's a skeleton in every closet.—Common saying.

LOST BODIES: A CHRONICLE OF DEATHS, DISAPPEARANCES, AND DISCOVERIES—Jenni Davis, IMS Books, NY, 2017

This is a coffee table book, with more concentration on illustration than text, but quite useful for all that. It is divided into three sections: 'Well and Truly Lost:' those bodies that have been misplaced for so long, centuries or millennia, that it is unlikely they will ever be found: Alexander the Great, Harold II, Genghis Khan. Even in this section, there are some exceptions: Did Davy Crockett's body really go missing? He has a gravestone in the San Francisco Cathedral in San Antonio, but are his charred remains in there really Davy's?

The next section is "Lost and Found." Richard is not the only ruler whose skeleton has come to light. Oliver Cromwell and Henri IV of France have also been found—or at least parts of them. And of course, there are the Romanovs, and Eva Peron.

Finally, there is 'Lost for Good' persons who simply disappeared, and are unlikely to be found because they have no known burial places. These include the Princes in the Tower, Louis Le Prince, who was not a prince, but who may have invented the motion picture camera, Roald Amundsen, Amelia Earhart. This is not to say the mysteries surrounding these long-missing persons will never be solved. Lord Lucan might even still be alive. After all, he would be only 84.

All very interesting, and a good thing, if it gets people interested in the mystery, and in history. Recommended as a good gift-book selection, if you have to give it to yourself.

Blood cannot be obtained from a stone—Charles Dickens

BLOOD ROYAL: The Wars of the Roses 1462-1485)—Hugh Bicheno, Pegasus Books, NY, 2017

Bicheno provides about a page of 'primary sources' found online, which seem a lazy man's way of doing research, and approximately four pages of 'secondary sources' in a bibliography. At times, a source, such as Mancini, is referred to in the text, but the only footnotes amplify the text; they do not give a source for any of the author's statements. The only way of discovering where he gets his information for any statement is to read every word of every source. Few academics are going to do that, never mind the casual reader, for whom this book is designed.

There are some good points to the book. Bicheno does provide a lot of maps, family trees, charts of various sorts (e.g. a list of 'Protagonists and marriages,' running to 14 pages). Chronologically, the book omits the earlier battles of the Wars of the Roses, as these are covered in his earlier book BATTLE ROYAL.

He announces his theory early on. "Was the Yorkist cause dishonorable? Well—yes." Bicheno describes how Richard II had arbitrarily taken Henry Bolingbroke's inheritance from him, and how Henry (who ruled as Henry IV) took the throne from Richard. Henry VI, whose "...only offense (other than chronic weakness) was a cautious refusal to hand over the administration of his kingdom to a haughty cousin with as good or better right by blood to the throne." But the Lancastrians are the good guys, and Yorkists are the baddies. No room for moral equivalencies here. Hugh Bicheno has picked a side and will stick with it.

Sometimes this leads him to make statements that are factually untrue. For example, on Pg. 64: "George was two years older than Richard." Actually, it was just about three weeks short of three years. But what's a year or two between friends. Pg. 297: "The most

regime-threatening part of the conspiracy (Buckingham's) was among the Yeoman of the Crown..." who were not organized, or not known as such until Henry VII's reign.

"The discovery of Richard III's bones has only underlined the durable fascination of a period that culminated in one king buried with full honours in the magnificent chapel he built at Windsor, and his successor brother's naked body cast into an unmarked grave...28 months later." But Richard's grave was not unmarked at the time, and the author should know this.

It is not Bicheno's minor inaccuracies that are troubling, as much as his major errors of argumentation and logic. For instance: "The issue of blood became crucial after York was killed in battle. There was good reason to believe that Edward, his heir, was not his son...parents of slight builds and average height does not engender burly sons 7-8 inches taller than they." This betrays only a superficial knowledge of genetics. "Richard conspicuously slighted Edward in favour of his second son, Edmund." No source is given for this statement, and Edward remained the heir.

The author gives much valuable insight into politics on the continent, as they affected events in England and elsewhere. But his sense of omniscience leads him into drawing conclusions about the motives of his subjects, both political and personal, that may not be warranted.

Bicheno consistently refers to the Duke of Brittany as Frañcez (with a tilde over the n). This may be the way it was written in Breton, if you assume that that language, rather than French, was spoken at the ducal court. It just seems odd, since there is no contemporary Francis or Francois that he could be confused with. Who is going to think he and Francis Lovell were the same person?

"It is not difficult to deduce what tipped George into outright malignancy. ...at some point, the enraged Duchess Cecily must have told him that Edward was not his father's son, and that he should properly sit in his place." This is not reasoning backwards. This is what I think happened, so it must have happened. OK if one is writing a novel, but Mr. Bicheno is presumably not.

"The idea that Rivers, his brothers and his nephews worked to a plan concocted by Elizabeth to increase their power and influence is manifest nonsense. To the contrary...Rivers spurned opportunities to make himself a magnate." Occasions when he did not spurn them are dismissed as exceptional.

"One of the most persistent myths about the Woodville ascendancy is the supposedly scandalous nature of the marriage...between the elder of the two dowager duchesses of Norfolk, 65-year-old Katherine Neville, and the queen's 19-year-old brother John. This is based on a misunderstanding of women's property rights. What actually took place was that Katherine—who had another scandalous liaison between her marriages...bought herself a young husband, and with him influence at court." Oh, that makes everything all right. Move along, folks, no scandal to see here. Poor Johnny, victimized by a Medieval cougar! Besides, hasn't the author just informed us that the Woodvilles exercised no particular influence at court?

"If Duchess Cecily, in her fury at losing her precedence at court to a woman she could not dominate did indeed tell [George] at this time that Edward was the product of her adultery, it would explain a great deal of what ensued." This is called begging the question.

A little bit of psychoanalysis: "...Edward's lifelong philandering may be seen as an obsessive fixation on an unattainable partner by someone emotionally crippled from childhood. Pursuing the thread, another manifestation of the same psychological deprivation would have been a subconscious attempt to build himself an alternative family—which

incurred the potentially murderous hostility of his biological mother and half-brothers.” This, of course, carries the question-begging a little further.

Pg. 150: “Sociological studies of the posturing hyper-masculinity known as machismo occur in the paradoxical role of mothers in perpetuating it as a form of revenge on philandering fathers. They teach their sons that all women —apart from the sainted mother—are bitches on heat and all men treacherous dogs. Throw in the high testosterone levels commonly found in homosexual men, add almost unlimited wealth and power, and you get Charles ‘the Bold.’ Where are these studies? And isn’t this supposed to be about the English Wars of the Roses, not continental history?”

Pg. 201: “When [Henry VI’s] bones were examined in 1910 the skull was found to be shattered, with residual scalp and dried blood suggestive of a heavy blow to the back of the head. Edward probably ordered it done as mercifully as possible, and somebody hit him with a club as he knelt, head bowed in prayer.” All invented details.

Pg. 242: “Gloucester was 8 years old when Richard of York was killed and would have remembered him as a distant, god-like figure...the contrast between how he believed a son of York should behave and what he observed in Edward was stark. He did not keep away from court because of the Woodvilles, far less favoured and powerful than he, but for fear his mask would slip.” Again, attributing motives Richard may not have had, and certainly not at the age of eight. This doesn’t even pass the smell test for fiction.

Pg. 272: The siren song of ‘After which therefore because of which’ must be resisted during the last months of Edward’s reign.” Yet this is a principle which he will often violate.

Pp. 273-4: “Thomas More knew Jane (Shore) in her old age...Jane told More that the king spoke of only three long-term lovers...” That More could have and probably did see Jane in her later years does not mean that he had any conversation with her. He never credits the information about the king’s three mistresses to her, though Bicheno does. Even if he did get the information from her, More was perfectly capable of inventing conversations which he could not possibly have overheard.

Pg. 279: “Cecily...had waited nearly twenty years for revenge on Elizabeth, and threw discretion to the wind when Gloucester summoned the late king’s executors to Baynards castle...The truth was that Cecily told the gathering that Edward had been conceived in adultery, and Bouchier and the others were convinced it must be true....” No proof that she told them anything at all. Besides, Edward was definitely her son, even if he wasn’t her husband’s. Why should she hate him and wish to disgrace him, and herself?

Pg. 285 footnote: “A Freudian would argue that R’s vindictiveness was displacement activity for his ambivalent feelings about his mother.” In other words, I wouldn’t say this about this awful person, but some people will.

Pg. 289: “Even if Stillington’s statement had been true the princes in the Tower were born after Eleanor died...so they were free of the taint of bigamy.” But Edward’s marriage to Elizabeth was bigamous in its origin, and did not become automatically legal when Eleanor died.

Pg. 290: Why did Duchess Cecily not attend Richard and Anne’s coronation? “Perhaps she was ashamed to show her face after being publicly branded an adulteress, but possibly it had dawned on her, much too late, that she had put her grandsons in mortal peril. The ostentatious piety of her later life suggests belated repentance for the great evil she had wrought, and when she died her will mentioned her husband and Edward IV, but not her youngest son.” But her ‘ostentatious piety’ had begun years before. And the much-vaunted piety of Margaret Beaufort is simply piety

Pg. 302: “Psychopaths are polarizing individual, mesmerizing to weak personalities but repulsive to those who can see them as they are. Richard commanded a loyalty from his northern retainers that went far beyond hope of gain...the personalities of his northern followers were per-shaped by submission to the will of the no less psychopathic Kingmaker. Nor should we overlook the fact that Richard was physically unimpressive.” Richard was ugly, Warwick was ugly, (a conclusion based on a stylized representation of him on his father’s tomb) therefore they were both psychopathic. And on top of that, the author manages to tar an entire geographic area with the same brush.

Pg. 312: “One of the strongest modern Ricardian arguments against the guilt of their hero is that Henry Tudor never specifically accused Richard of having murdered his nephews...suspicion and rumour were already doing all the damage that could be hoped for, and an open accusation risked the possibility that Richard might produce the princes like a rabbit out of a hat.” But if there was the remotest possibility that he could have produced them, this argument fails.

Pg. 305: Any ‘progressive’ or good legislation instigated by Richard is considered ‘cosmetic.’ “or ‘playing to the gallery.” Even facts that do not show Richard in a good light, or in any light at all, are treated cavalierly. Pg328: “Uncle Jasper was left in Wales, perhaps to act as governor but probably because he was unwilling to take orders from younger and abler men.” While there is no evidence that Jasper was at Bosworth, there is no evidence that he was anywhere else, much less of the reason.

Pg. 330: There is a chart of men named in the ballad of Bosworth Field and other credible sources. What these credible sources are we are not told.

Pg. 351: “History is the mistress of life, and I have tried to make love to her as she deserves.” This is the last line of the book, and I wouldn't dare to add to it, or even comment on it!

Never speak ill of the dead—English version of a Latin proverb

SIX OF ONE: A TUDOR RIFF—JoAnn Spears, Kindle Edition, 2011

Our heroine, Dolly, has decided to become the 7th bride of a much-married multi-millionaire, Henry, who in his youth was with a band called Good Company. (Chapter Heading: Six chicks had already been nixed in the mix.) At her wedding shower, attended by her assorted female relatives—and his—she passes out. “I could just imagine the headlines: ‘Bride Chokes to Death on Cocktail Olive.’ I would never live that down.” While unconscious, she is transferred to another plane, where she meets a number of Tudor/Plantagenet ladies, who seem to have odd parallels in the 21st century. (Chapter heading: The Sweet Smell of Six Ex's.)

She is introduced to Margaret Beaufort and Elizabeth of York, and finds out what really happened to the princes, and is also privileged to meet Bess of Hardwick. “I wonder if anyone ever called Bess of Hardwick redoubtable to her face. I redoubted it.”

Mostly, though, she engages in a symposium with Henry VIII's six wives, who reveal the true story of their marriages. Which wife was a lesbian? Which was a witch? Which a murderess? And which one was hot to trot? Her conclusion: Henry was terribly misunderstood. No, she doesn't marry him. Dolly meets an old sweetheart, Wally Rolly, and becomes Dolly Rolly. Her ex-fiancé Henry joins a monastery.

SEVEN WILL OUT: A RENAISSANCE REVEL—JoAnn Spears, Kindle edition, 2015

Dolly Rolly, due to receive academic recognition for her seminal work on Henry VIII, passes out again at the ceremony honoring her (chapter heading: Dear Me, Syncope), and comes to, as before, on an astral plane, where she meets a number of later Tudor ladies, including queens, and three—count them, three—Grey sisters, plus Arabella Stewart, who,

in the opinion of her contemporaries, is 'a few stays short of a corset.' These ladies have opinions on everything, as does Dolly, and they quote freely from Gilbert & Sullivan, P.G. Wodehouse, and the Bard. Well, that would be easy, since they wrote the works commonly attributed to William Shakespeare. All three queens (including Jane Grey) were busy constructing plays, as were the other Grey sisters. Did Shakespeare write any of Shakespeare? Well, yes, the sonnets, and possibly Antony and Cleopatra.

Now prohibited by their non-corporeality from being playwrights, these ladies not run a sort of supra-natural advice bureau, consulted by the great and good, such as the Empress Josephine, Mary Todd Lincoln, Greta Garbo, Katherine Hepburn, and Lucille Ball.

Good, clean, punny fun. At the end, we learn the reason for Dolly's fainting spell. Yes, the Rolly marriage is about to be blessed by a bouncing baby Rolly.

Every baby born in the world is a finer one than the last.—Charles Dickens

ROYAL BABIES: A History 1066-2013—Amy Licence, Gloucester, UK, 2013

Ms. License gives us case histories of selected royal babies. In chronological order, they are

- Matilda, born 1102; grew up to become “Lady of the English” and mother of Henry II
- William, born 1153, son of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine; died in infancy.
- Eleanor, born 1215, daughter of John and Isabella of Angeulome; grew up to marry Simon de Monfort.
- Edward, born 1284, son of Edward I and Eleanor of Castile; grew up to be king Edward II.
- Edward, born 1330, son of Edward III and Phillipa of Hainault; grew up to be the Black Prince, died at 46.
- Henry, born 1386, son of Henry IV and Mary de Bohun; grew up to be Henry V, died in his 30s.
- Edward, born 1453, son of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou; died at 17.
- Edward, born 1470, son of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville, died (?)
- Arthur, born 1486, son of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York; died at 15.
- Henry, born 1511, son of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon; died in infancy.
- Elizabeth, born 1533, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Bolyen; became Queen, died at 70.
- Edward, born 1537, son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour; became King Edward VI, died in his teens.
- James, born 1566, son of Mary Queen of Scots and Lord Darnley; became King
- Henry, born 1594, son of James I and Anne of Denmark; died in his teens.
- Henriette (Minnette), daughter of Charles I and Henrietta Maria; grew up to marry Philippe of Orleans, died at 26.
- James, born 1688, son of James, Duke of York, and Mary of Modena; grew up to be the “Old Pretender
- George, born 1788, son of the much-hated (by his parents) Frederick, Prince of Wales, and Augusta of Saxe-Gotha; grew up to be George III, died at 80.
- Amelia, born 1783, last daughter of George III and Queen Charlotte; died of TB at 27.
- George, born 1817, son of Princess Charlotte of England and Leopold of Sax-Coburg, grandson of George IV; stillborn.

- Victoria, born 1840 (Princess Vicky), daughter of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert; grew up to marry and become the mother of Kaiser Wilhelm.
- Edward, born 1894, and
- Albert, born 1895, sons of the Prince who would become George V, and Mary of Teck, great-grandsons of Queen Victoria. Grew; up to become Edward VIII and George VI, respectively.
- Elizabeth, born first in 1926, daughter of George VI and Lady Elizabeth Bowen-Lyon; grew up to be Elizabeth II, at this writing 91 and counting

(The book was published before the Duchess of Cambridge's children were born, so they are hypothetical in this context.)

What we can learn from this: Royal or commoner, try to arrange to be born no earlier than the 20th century of course, the royals of previous generations had the benefit of the best medical literature of their times, e.g. books of “leechcraft.” Such a book of the 11th century advised expectant mothers 'not to eat salt or drink beer.' Hmmm, I was told that too. But they were also warned off sour foods, as well, not so much for their own health but for fear it might mark the child. It was widely believed that the pangs of childbirth could be transferred to another woman (but not to a man?) by witchcraft. If only...

Ms. Licence bypasses poor Queen Anne, who lost all of her many children, but the Stuarts in general were not great obstetric subjects. James II had eight children by Anne Hyde, of whom only two daughters survived (Mary II and Anne). By Mary of Modena, only one of ten survived—the so-called 'warming-pan baby.' (aka The Old Pretender).

Query: Why do Americans say someone 'gets pregnant,' as if it were a great accomplishment, while the British say 'falls pregnant,' as if “oops, how did that happen?”

Adults are really not wiser than children, they're just more cunning—Anonymous

SHAKESPEARE'S HENRY VII, David Collard

The premise of this play is that the “Henry VII” written by William Shakespeare and then somehow mislaid, like all those Sherlock Holmes stories that John H. Watson carelessly left lying around for generations. Mr. Collard argues that it may not have been simple carelessness. “To have revived questions about the legitimacy of the Tudor succession... would have been foolish. Yet he wrote *Julius Caesar*, a dangerous play if ever there was one... There are also *artistic* arguments. First there is the question of whether Henry provides sufficiently interesting material... Bosworth, the most glorious episode, had been covered in *Richard III*... Our principal was no Henry V and there was no Agincourt.” In fact, Henry’s life, though having natural turning points, doesn’t have them in the right places for the dramatist’s purpose. What is unique about the life of Henry Tudor is that he was an anomaly: the successful pretender. John Ford wrote that play. He called it *Perkin Warbeck*. Though Perkin was not successful as a pretender, he would have been, and was, a star turn as a play.

The author does his best by Henry, including most of the major events of his life and even inventing a few. For example, there is no evidence that Elizabeth of York requested him to marry again, or, for that matter, not to. But she could have. Henry is not caricatured. He has some admirable qualities and even a sense of humor, though it is what the Scots would call a pawky one. Example: Elizabeth, understandably skeptical about astrologers, still wants to know if she will live to see the coronation of her younger son. Henry interrupts acidly, “It’s certain that I won’t.”

Minor characters are more stereotyped. There is a Greek chorus led by Henry’s fool, commenting on events, explaining how Morton’s fork worked, etc. Henry’s advisers are divided into the Good (Giles Daubney) and the Bad (Morton, Fox, Empson, Dudley, et al)

Mr. Collard speaks of opportunity cost. “The opportunity of writing one play was the loss of another. The opportunity cost of Henry VII might have been the loss of *Julius Caesar* or *As You Like It*, or *Hamlet*, or *Twelfth Night*, or... What more do we want? Blood? Well, perhaps.”

Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it.—Proverbs 22:6

SECRET SON OF YORK—Maureen Fairbank, Kindle Edition

Sir Thomas Moyle is fascinated by his new employee, a bricklayer called “Old Dick.” Obviously an educated man down on his luck, he is old enough to have a fund of stories about the late unpleasantness (The Wars of the Roses) as well as the reigns of the first Tudors. But he can be a little long-winded. Sir Thomas frequently interrupts him with “I know all that.” Then Old Dick drops a bombshell. He is the son of Elizabeth of York and Richard III. The two have a conventional uncle-niece relationship until Elizabeth is about twelve years old, when she begins to become self-conscious. By the time she is 15 ½ she feels like a spinster who will never be married, and is becoming very frustrated, especially as she is well aware of her beauty.

Richard convinces himself that their relationship is perfectly all right, since Edward IV was only his half-brother, and therefore Elizabeth is only his half-niece. The story is loosely based on the so-laced Buck letter, the Croyland Chronicle, and 'legend.' The story is narrated by Old Dick (Richard Plantagenet of Easstwell) and by Elizabeth herself. It will require a willing suspension of disbelief to accept their stories, and also a suspension of grammar and punctuation. Many words that are usually written as one, or hyphenated -erg. *somehow*, *out-numbered*, are divided into two words: *some how*, *out numbered*. Paragraph breaks are inserted apparently at random, often in the middle of a sentence. And the whole, though written in the 21st century, is in full Victorian lady-novelist style.

For the completest.

Living is being born slowly. It would be a little too easy if we could borrow ready-made souls.—Antoine de Saint-Exupery

HEARTS NEVER CHANGE—Joanne R. Larner, Kindle edition, Part III of the RICHARD LIVETH YET trilogy

The cover of this book shows Richard in motorcycle leathers, and very fetching he looks, too. If he has a few gray hairs, at 50+, or 550+, they are not visible under the helmet. This is how he looks when he turns up on the doorstep of his third wife, Rose, after 15 years. They have been trying to get together during all that time, but the fact that they are in different times (literally) has made it difficult. In some ways, their troubles are just beginning. Richard has been, through no fault of his own, an absentee father to his adolescent twins, as well as an absentee from modern times in general. There are adjustments to be made. Talk about a generation gap!

To some extent, the story is combined with a travelogue of Norway, a country Ms. Larner is obviously enamored with, as much as with Richard III. In the middle book of the trilogy, she made her heroine, A FOREIGN COUNTRY, she has her heroine, Rose, pretend to be a Norwegian princess

This brings the series to a satisfying, happy-ever-after, close, with all loose ends tied up. What more could you ask for? Well, if you do want more, check out Ms. Larner's facebook page, DICKON FOR HIS DAMES.

Paper bleeds little.—Earnest Hemingway

THE SURVIVAL OF THE PRINCES IN THE TOWER: MURDER, MYSTERY AND MYTH—Matthew Lewis, The History Press, UK, 2018 (Hardcover), Kindle Edition 2017

Asking to be taken more seriously, and deserving to be, is Matthew Lewis' seminal work on the boys (they were not both Princes) in the Tower. Lewis tries to be impartial, in spite of his natural bias as a Ricardian, and succeeds most of the time. He has four main theses of what might have happened to them, which we might as well take in order.

Instead of killing them, their uncle Richard spirited them away to safety. Lewis quite accurately and devastatingly shows up the holes in the traditional (More) story, but doesn't seem to realize that there are holes, though not so glaring, in his own theory. If the boys were alive and well in a distant castle, why did the King not say so when the rumor first surfaced? He doesn't have to say where. He can keep them separated, and keep moving them from one place to another, lessening their danger. Why not say this, even if it were not true? I find it difficult to accept someone who was unprincipled enough to murder close relatives for personal gain, and too principled to tell a lie. At least he could buy time. Instead he let himself to be forced into a position of eternal stalling.

Then there is the matter of Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke. Here is where things get confusing. Lewis says that the Duke of Clarence planned to send his son to safety in Ireland as early as 1477. Did he succeed in doing so? Was it this boy, now an adolescent, who went with the Earl of Lincoln to Stoke, and was captured there? Or was it Edward V, supported by his Aunt Margaret and his cousin John (Lincoln)? Was the rebellion in favor of the boy in the Tower in 1487, presumed to be Edward of Warwick, but who was maybe a changeling? Was the boy at Stoke really 'Lambert Simnel,' as Henry VII claimed? Lewis thinks that that name was so comical that it must have been made up by Henry to make fun of the whole affair. But don't real people also sometimes have odd-sounding names? After all, there was a contemporary Bishop Lambert Fossey, which to my ear sounds rather snicker-worthy.

I made the mistake of going to bed right after reading this chapter, and couldn't get to sleep for all those Edwards chasing around in my brain. I had to get up and read a few more chapters. Why didn't the Irish lords, a few years later, recognize Lambert/Edward when he served them wine? Maybe they were afraid to, or were too embarrassed to. Surely Lambert, whoever he was, would do everything he could to avoid being recognized, for his own safety.

The story Lewis seems to favor, and the one most Ricardians believe, because it makes Henry VII unquestionably guilty of the (judicial) murder of at least one of the princes, is that the man known as 'Perkin Warbeck' was really Richard of Shrewsbury, the younger of the two princes. The arguments for this are almost convincing: Margaret of Burgundy, Maximilian of Austria, the royal families of Spain and Scotland recognized him as such. With the exception of Margaret, how did any of them know what he looked like? And of course, they were such snobs that they would surely not support a low-born impostor. Which only means that they believed him to be the real thing, not that he was. As the author himself points out in the section on Stoke, the Royal Duke of Clarence was plotting to substitute a relatively low-born stand-in for his son, whether he actually succeeded in doing that or not.

Other arguments in support (not necessarily proof) of this identification don't ring quite true, either. Henry had Perkin/Richard beaten up so he would not be recognized in London? This presumes that everyone in London, from the beggars on the street, to his own family members, would recognize the 9-year-old boy as the grown man? And a black eye and a few bruises would prevent any recognition. Why did the queen not denounce 'Perkin'?

Perhaps he was Richard, but equally, she may have been simply unable (because of the time that had passed) to say one way or the other, or unwilling. No doubt she was aware that recognizing 'Perkin' as her brother, or definitely saying he was not her brother, was effectively signing his death warrant. She also, at this point, had several children of her own. Would she wish to endanger them by making any positive statement? Or even a negative one?

I have to say that in his only portrait, 'Perkin' does resemble, not so much Edward IV as Elizabeth herself. This means little, except that both of them may have had a somewhat androgynous appearance. 'Perkin' is often referred to as 'beautiful,' while Elizabeth was referred to as a 'very handsome woman.' In any case, chance resemblances mean very little. The More family fool, whom Lewis refers to in the next section, had an uncanny likeness to Henry VIII (Lewis merely describes this—there may be an illustration in the print version) but nobody suggested that Henry Patenson was any relation to the Tudors whatever.

To be fair, if Lambert Simnel was not necessarily a made-up name, it is possible that 'Perkin Warbeck' was the code name devised by Henry and his spies for the young gentleman, whoever he was. The reasoning goes like this: Perkin = Peregrine = Pilgrim, or wanderer. That this was something like 'Piers Osbeck', the pretender's real name, or what the Tudor authorities decided was his real name. Another argument is Henry's own attitude toward the pretender. He seemed to alternate between leniency and cruelty. After all, Henry had been a pretender himself, in the sense of someone with pretensions to a throne, even though he was who he claimed to be. Henry was well aware that nobody had asked for his *bona fides*, his long-form birth certificate. He was accepted by the royal family of France and the ducal family of Brittany as the Earl of Richmond because he, and his uncle, said that he was, and because it suited their political policies. Henry was afraid of Perkin, even panicked by him, but not necessarily because he was 'Richard of York.'

This brings us to the next theory, that both boys survived and were hidden in plain sight at the Tudor court—the Leslau hypothesis. This doesn't call for anybody to be a villain—neither Richard, nor Henry, nor even Thomas More. Edward became 'Edward Guildford,' and Richard 'John Clement.' There are some interesting sidelights here. John Clement appears on a list of jousters, along with Henry VIII and the king's illegitimate uncle, Arthur Plantagenet, and the king's good buddy, Edward Brandon. This was surely an unusual honor for a middle-class scholar. Clement, if he was Richard of York, would be about 35 at the time, Arthur probably about the same age, Brandon in his late 20s or early 30s not too old to be jousting, as Henry did in his 30s. Leslau's idea of having Guildford and Clement's DNA followed up seems to have been abandoned since his death, but I think they should be carried out. I hate mysteries, unless they are solved.

Basically, the Leslau theory is picking a conclusion, and cherry-picking proof to fit it. An interesting puzzle, but unfalsifiable and therefore unprovable. This applies to all the theories about their identification.

My theory, also unprovable, is a combination of the Baldwin theory (which Lewis mentions in passing—Richard of Eastwell could have been Richard of York) and a theory that was put forward by a Professor or Dr. Murphy at an AGM some years back.

To wit: Richard comes to the Tower to take the boys to a place of safety just too late. Edward, deeply depressed, (testified to by Dr. Argentine) has committed suicide, which adolescents are vulnerable to. His brother, having witnessed this, is deeply traumatized, perhaps unable to speak. Not knowing what else to do, they inform Elizabeth Woodville. She will have hysterics later, but in the crisis she keeps her cool. She and Richard agree that the only thing to be done with the surviving boy is to send him to a place where he will

be safe and have the best care possible, someplace like the monastery at Colchester. Now having one boy dead and one alive is the worst possible scenario. He cannot bury Edward in consecrated ground, and cannot say masses for him, so he cannot benefit by his death, and young Richard is more of a liability than ever. He has to act as he did, in fact, act, and do nothing to acknowledge or deny their existence. Even today, there is a tendency to cover up a teen-age suicide, feeling that it reflects badly on the family. Among deeply religious medieval Catholics, the impulse to silence must have been must stronger. Elizabeth Woodville will still hate him, hate him for driving her son to self-murder, but she realizes that he poses no direct threat to her or her family, and will eventually come out of sanctuary.

Years pass. Henry Tudor becomes king. The surviving boy recovers to some degree, and Elizabeth Woodville believes it would be better to be the King's Mother, rather than his mother-in-law. She supports Lincoln/Warwick's bid, which she regards as a stalking horse for her son. Her daughter (her oldest two girls were surely in on the plot) doesn't go along with this, not believing that the boy is completely recovered yet, and fearful for her own children. Little Arthur would be demoted to Heir Presumptive. But she can't bring herself to tell Henry the truth either. On the one hand, she doesn't completely trust him; on the other, she doesn't trust her mother either. If she did confess what had happened, Henry would say "Why didn't you tell me in the first place, and save me a battle?" There would be no answer to that. Elizabeth no doubt sighed with relief when l'affaire Simnel blew over.

Too soon. 'Warbeck' comes along. If it was awkward to tell Henry the truth before, it is much more so now. She can only stonewall, refuse to either recognize or deny 'Perkin Warbeck.' This may have been entirely truthful. But her brother remains safe, in a house of religion.

More years pass, with them Henry, Elizabeth, and many of 'Perkin's' own generation. The former Prince Richard, long adjusted to being an anonymous lay-brother/monk/bricklayer, realizing that his best guarantee of a long and happy life is to be nobody, is queried closely by Sir Thomas Moyle. Does he claim to be what he appears to be, an educated man, a former monk, down on his luck? He doesn't know how Moyle feels about Catholics in general and monks in particular. Does he admit to being a Plantagenet prince? Hardly safe in Henry VIII's England? But being someone of royal but of illegitimate birth may get him certain perks and comforts in his old age. Even if he is proved to be a fraud, it is unlikely that he will be punished severely. He would simply be no worse off than before.

Yes, quite fanciful and unprovable, but it fits all the facts and is psychologically likely. At least, if I were writing a novel or short story (which I may yet) it is the tack I would take. I have certainly seen more fanciful recreations, in serious books as well as fiction.

Whether reading Mr. Lewis' thoroughly-researched and well-written speculative history inspires you to come up with your own theory or not, this is well worth reading, though if you have eyesight problems, it might be worth the wait and the money to get the print copy.

All right, just one more.

There is nothing more certain than death, and nothing more uncertain than the hour of death.—John Dalton, English merchant, quoted by Ms. Johnson.

SO GREAT A PRINCE—Lauren Johnson, Head of Zeus, UK, 2016; also available in a Kindle edition.

Not a biography of Henry VIII, nor a history of the early years of his reign and the political moves therein, though these certainly play a part; this is more a social history of the scene in England in the first decade of the 16th century. Ms. Johnson frames the book in terms of the canonical calendar, which can be a great puzzlement to us in the 21st century.

Although people living in 1509 called January 1 New Year's Day, and celebrated it, mainly by the giving of gifts within the household, from employer to employees and vice versa, and among family members, the year did not turn (e.g. from 1509 to 1510, until Lady Day, the Feast of the Annunciation, on March 25. Official pronouncements were usually dated by regnal years, e.g. 24 Henry VII. And events in any large town might be dated by the name of the mayor at the time. No doubt post people knew when and where they were born, and made a note of it, but there were always those who fell between the cracks. (My mother, for example, knew when and where she was born, but the State of Kansas didn't, since registration of births was not required until the next year. In order to prove her age so she could get Social Security, she had to get an affidavit signed by an eye-witness of her birth—her mother!)

Ms. Johnson follows the citizens of London, native-born and incomers, through the year: Midsummer Eve, All-Hallows, the Twelve Days of Christmas etc. Each chapter covers some aspect of life at the time: the status of women, the merchant or middle-class, exploration, books, clothing, and of course, Henry himself, and his dying father. The author highlights selected citizens, some of whom will be fairly well-known to us: the Pastons, the Plumptons, the Duke of Buckingham, noted for consumption conspicuous even by the generous standards of Henry VIII

But there are others, including John and Alice Middleton (you may know Alice better by the name of her second husband, More). There is Thomasine Percyvale, who came from the wilds of Cornwall to work as a maidservant, married and was widowed by three tailors, and wound up with her own tailor shop and enough money to become something of a philanthropist. Bess of Hardwick could have taken her correspondence course..

Well-researched and good background material for the period. England, and anything but dry-as-dust. England in 1510 was not so different from England in 1483, or 1450, or even 1409. The England of 1547 would be very different. But that is all in the future, as Ms. Johnson pulls back to give the reader an overview and leaves 1510 behind., perhaps with an air of regret. It would not be surprising if the reader feels that same regret.

~ToC~

Call for Nomination for Treasurer

Our current Treasurer, Joanne Smith is retiring from the position at the end of the term, October 2018. Therefore, we are soliciting nominations for this position prior to the GMM in Detroit, October 5-7, 2018, to vote at the business meeting scheduled for October 6 2018.

The duties of the Treasurer are listed in Section 6.6 the American Branch By-laws, reprinted here:

6.6. Treasurer: The duties of the Treasurer shall be as follows:

- (a) To receive all monies due to the American Branch.
- (b) To deposit all monies into the appropriate bank or other financial accounts.
- (c) To oversee and report on any investment accounts.
- (d) To maintain and have charge of all financial records.
- (e) To make digital scans of any paper documents for eventual transfer to the next Treasurer.
- (f) To identify any critical financial documents which should be passed on to the Richard III Society archives in hardcopy format.
- (g) To pay all debts of the American Branch from the appropriate account.

- (h) To file the appropriate Federal Tax returns as required by the Internal Revenue Service.
- (i) To file State Tax returns in the state where the American Branch is incorporated, if required.
- (j) To consult IRS websites and publications to maintain compliance with regulations for tax exempt organizations.
- (k) To prepare a Budget yearly for the next fiscal year, to be presented and approved at the GMM.
- (l) To have on file an accounting of the balances for all funds established by the American Branch for its purposes.
- (m) To be willing and able to get a signature guarantee when necessary. A signature guarantee requires a good relationship with a bank or other financial institution where a specially qualified officer will compare the Treasurer's identification documents and witness the Treasurer's signature. Signature guarantees will be required at the end of the Treasurer's term when authority over financial accounts is passed on to the next Treasurer, and may be required on other financial transactions as well.
- (n) To assist the next Treasurer during the transition period.
- (o) To perform other financial duties as required by the Executive Board.

While the treasurer has the ultimate responsibility to file and comply with the IRS requirements for a 501 (C) (3) non-profit, Joanne Smith did engage an accountant to assist the American Branch Treasurer. The accountant is Massachusetts based, but all communications and transactions are electronic. It would be most beneficial to the incoming treasurer to maintain the current Bank of America (BoFA) small business checking account. From this account, there are automatic deposits and payments set up. As well, this account receives paper check membership deposits, issues expense checks, and wires payments to the UK. There is a Vanguard investment account, as well as a PayPal account which also are accessed electronically. All print communications and membership checks are sent to the Treasurer's address. The time commitment is about 10 hrs/mo.

Joanne Smith is happy to assist the new Treasurer, across a reasonable time frame to assure a smooth and successful transition. This will include transfer of all required documents, print and digital, along with any required cooperation to transfer name, address and signing authority on all accounts.

Please submit your nomination to Compton Reeves at chairperson@r3.org (post: 1560 Southpark Circle, Prescott, AZ 86305) and copy Cheryl Greer at membership@r3.org (post: 1056 Shady Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15232). Also, please don't hesitate to nominate yourself.

Other Board Nominations:

The entire executive Board began their two-year term October 2016 and with the exception of our Treasurer, are planning on remaining for a second two-year term, after which the positions of Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary, and Membership Chairman will need to be filled at the 2020 GMM. The ballot that will be emailed to the membership in August (six weeks prior to the 2018 GMM will contain the names of the current office holders for all but the Treasurer: A. Compton Reeves, Chairman; Deborah Kaback, Vice Chairman; Emily Ferro, Secretary; and Cheryl Greer, Membership Chairman. Any member may submit a name including qualifications for any position, bearing in mind that we MUST fill the Treasurer position at this time.

By-law excerpt of Article V. Officers

- 5.1. Eligibility: Any member in good standing, who is eighteen (18) years of age or older, shall be eligible to hold any office in the American Branch or to serve on any committee. No prospective officer can be in arrears of membership dues or other financial obligations on February 1st of the year in which the elections are to be held.
- 5.1.1. A candidate for Chairman shall have been a member of the American Branch for at least **three (3) years*** continuously prior to nomination and shall have served previously as:
- An officer or member of the Executive Board, or
 - The president of a chapter with at least ten (10) members, or
 - Chairman of a standing committee.
- 5.2. Officers: The Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Secretary, the Membership Chairman and the Treasurer of the Executive Board shall be elected by the membership by proxy ballots sent from the Chairman of the Nominating Committee to the members at least six (6) weeks prior to the GGM.
- 5.2.1. Officers shall serve for two years from the date of their election.
- 5.2.2. No officer shall be eligible to serve in any one office for more than four (4) consecutive years. If, after an officer has served four years consecutively, no candidate for that office is found, the incumbent may continue in office while the Board, at its discretion, decides whether to fill the office by appointment, reorganize, or dissolve the Society.

*Bold font replaces following typo—here (3) tears—that appears on our website.

By-law excerpt of Article VI. Duties of the Executive Board

6.1. The Executive Board

- 6.1.1. Members: The Executive Board will consist of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Secretary, the Membership Chairman, the Treasurer and the Immediate Past Chairman. The Executive Board shall have full power to manage the business and affairs of the American Branch unless otherwise provided in these Bylaws.
- 6.1.2. Meetings: The Executive Board shall hold at least four (4) meetings each year for the general transaction of business or for consideration of matters as may be specified in the agenda for the meeting. The Board may meet more often as needed. The meetings may be in person, by telephone conference call, or by similar communications equipment that allows all persons participating in the meeting to hear each other at the same time. The Webmaster and the Editor of the Register are ex-officio members of the Executive Board. Appointed Board members and Committee chairs may attend any meeting.

~ToC~



ex libris

Research Library Book Acquisitions—2017

Susan Troxell

researchlibrary@r3.org

The Non-Fiction Library is pleased to announce the acquisition of several exciting new titles, all available to our members to borrow. Please contact Susan Troxell (researchlibrary@r3.org) for inquiries into that process. Rules for borrowing are on the American Branch's website.

J. L. Laynesmith, *Cecily Duchess of York*—This is the first scholarly study of the life of Cecily, written by the Richard III Society's current research officer. Laynesmith draws on numerous rarely considered sources to construct a fresh portrait of a remarkable woman, mother of Edward IV and Richard III and great-grandmother* to Henry VIII, who proved herself an exceptional political survivor. Skillfully manipulating her family connections and contemporary ideas about womanhood, Cecily repeatedly reinvented herself to protect her own status and to ensure the security of those in her care. There is an extensive bibliography.

*Previously published in the December 2017 *Ricardian Chronicle* stating Cecily Neville was Henry VIII's grandmother instead of great-grandmother.

Harry Schnitker, *Margaret of York: Princess of England, Duchess of Burgundy*—This started as a PhD thesis about Richard III's sister, Margaret, whose marriage to Duke Charles of Burgundy would alter the course of European geopolitics. A woman in a world of men, she was nonetheless able to establish and maintain her authority and influence through her household and affinity, through patronage of the arts, of religious orders, and of humanist learning. A detailed analysis of her famous library is included, as well as an examination of the role of women who influenced her, and her support of Yorkist pretenders. This is a "must read" for anyone interested in Margaret or the lives of late-medieval noblewomen.

Nathan Amin, *The House of Beaufort: The Bastard Line that Captured the Crown*—The author sets out to examine the fortunes and tribulations of the Beauforts, progeny of the illicit love affair between John of Gaunt and Kathryn Swynford. Though legitimized, Henry IV forbade them from being in the line of succession to the crown. The Beauforts were energetic supporters of the Lancastrian regime and its cause in the Wars of the Roses, and ultimately would produce the House of Tudor.

K. L. Clark, *The Nevills of Middleham: England's Most Powerful Family in the Wars of the Roses*—A comprehensive account of the northern family whose rise, and later fall, would profoundly impact the state of English politics in the 15th century. The author also focuses on the women of the Nevill(e) clan, showing that they were just as active as their male counterparts. An extensive bibliography is provided as well a numerous family trees and photographs.

Kathryn Warner, *Richard II-A True King's Fall*—This author is known for her work in reassessing the life and reputation of Edward II, and she has now undertaken a reassessment of Richard II. The deposition of this king in 1399 gave rise to the Lancastrian regimes of Henry IV, V and VI, and ultimately would give rise to the Wars of the Roses. Richard II, like Richard III, was the subject of one of Shakespeare's most memorable plays, and his reputation in the popular imagination as a narcissist and

tyrant was largely because of it. Warner takes a fresh look at this deeply misunderstood king.

Matthew Lewis, *Richard, and Duke of York*—This is the first full biography of Richard, 3rd Duke of York, to be published in over a decade. It covers all the ups and downs of his dramatic, and historically important, life. There are no footnotes, endnotes, or bibliography, but primary sources are cited in the main text. This would be a good place to begin for anyone looking for a readable account, from an author who has written other books for general readers of English late medieval history.

Noel Fallows (trans.), *Ramon Llull's The Book of the Order of Chivalry*—This is the first time that anyone has translated into modern English Ramon Llull's influential treatise on knighthood and chivalry. Although written in the late 13th century by a Catalan *jongleur*-turned-scholar/monk, this work remained enormously popular into the 15th century. Richard III owned Caxton's translation of it; Caxton dedicated the book to him. Llull writes of the duties of the knight to defend the Christian faith, defend his lord, and maintain justice, as well as serve the common weal.

Matthew Ward, *The Livery Collar in Late Medieval England and Wales: Politics, Identity and Affinity*—This appears to be the first book published on the very important subject of the livery collar—its origins, manufacture, and political symbolism especially during the Wars of the Roses. The author provides a comprehensive inventory of all church monuments in England and Wales where one can still view such livery collars. A detailed bibliography and numerous color photographs supplement the text.

Nicholas Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The education of the English kings and aristocracy 1066-1530*—This book from 1984, while not particularly positive about Richard III, is considered a definitive study of how English kings and nobles were educated in the medieval and early renaissance ages. So little is known about the specifics of Richard III's education, that this book can provide useful background information for anyone interested in that topic. Orme is considered an authority on the early history of education, and scholars today still cite this text.

Ruth Mazo Karras, *Sexuality in Medieval Europe—Doing Unto Others*—published in 2005, this book takes up the subject of sexual practices in the medieval age and analyzes such controversial topics as the practice of homosexuality, chastity within marriage, the role of the church, and non-reproductive activity. Lately, some authors have been speculating that well-known persons from the Wars of the Roses might have had sexual relations that defy our presumptions. Karras's thesis is that, like today, medieval people saw sex from a number of viewpoints, and that there was no single medieval attitude towards sexuality any more than there is one modern attitude.

John Ashdown-Hill, *The Private Life of Edward IV*—this is the tenth book published by Ashdown-Hill, and he aims to analyze the love life of Edward IV, challenging the traditional notion that he was a ladies' man who had an extraordinarily large sexual appetite. The author disagrees, and can only identify three mistresses during his life. The author also asserts that Edward IV had an openly homosexual relationship with Henry Beaufort, based on his reading of primary sources. Edward IV's secret marriage to Eleanor Talbot is given focused analysis, even providing the precise date and location of where the marriage took place. The author provides a detailed itinerary for Edward IV's whereabouts from birth to death, making it as potentially useful as Rhoda Edwards' *Itinerary of Richard III*.

Final amount made during the sale of the library's duplicates is \$299.65. The more rare copies will be kept with the library. The rest were donated to the Kentwood (Richard L. Root) branch of the Kent District Library. Thanks to everyone who made a purchase!

The money has already come in handy as I was able to purchase:

Kingmaker: Kingdom Come, by Toby Clements, the fourth in his *Kingmaker* series,

Rue and Rosemary, by Mary Sturge Gretton,

The Ragged Staff by CM Edmondston,

The Golden Longing by Francis Leary (it is written in such a way that you can't tell if it's supposed to be fiction or non-fiction),

The Claws of Time, by Jason Charles,

Semper Fidelis (The Page of Middleham), *When Truth Sleeps*, and *The Flowers of York* by C. J. Lock,

The Order of the White Boar, by Alex Marchant, and

A Man Who Would Be King: The Duke of Buckingham and Richard III, by J. P. Reedman (her latest book).

Older publications:

The White Boar and *The Sun Splendour* by William Browse, and

A Mystery to This Day, by Michael Barrington.

Finally, a shout out to the authors who made the following donations:

The Gods Were Sleeping: A Romance of the Days of King Richard III, by Charles Edward Lawrence, and

Loyalty Binds Me (The Rose of Middleham), by Christine Smee.

I'm hoping that more books will be written about Richard in the near future so that they, too, can be added to the collection.

~ToC~

Advertise in the *Ricardian Register*

Your ad in the *Register* will reach an audience of demonstrated mail buyers and prime prospects for books on the late medieval era, as well as for gift items and other merchandise relating to this period. They are also prospects for lodging, tours and other services related to travel England or on the continent.

Classified advertising rates for each insertion:

Back Cover color (about third page size): \$80, Full Page: \$80; Half Page: \$40; Quarter Page: \$20, dedication box (2.25" x 1" approx.): \$10; memorial box (to fit): optional donation.

Send digital files to Joan Szechtman at info@r3.org. Do not send payment until you agree with the ad format and placement and receive instructions as to where to send payment.

Copy Deadlines:

January 1–March Issue

July 1–September Issue

Submission guidelines

- Word doc or docx file type or Open Office Writer odt file type, or rtf file type
- Prefer tables in spreadsheet or database format–file type examples: xls, xlxs, csv, txt, mdb, htm, html
- Use standard fonts such as Times New Roman, Calibri, or Verdana. Avoid fonts that you had to purchase. I use Times New Roman throughout the publication.
- Images that are in the public domain should be stated as such, those that are not require permissions and attributions
- Image size should be at least 300 dpi, which means a 1" X 2" image at a minimum should be 300 pxls X 600 pxls
- Paper must have references in the form of endnotes or footnotes (which I'll convert to endnotes) and/or Bibliography. Papers that do not require references are travel notes (e.g. report on a Ricardian tour), review of a lecture, and essays.
- Copy deadlines (submissions may be accepted for each issue after stated deadline, but not guaranteed):
 - March issue is January 1
 - September issue is July 1

~ToC~

From the Editor

Schallek Fellowship

We are in the process of reviewing how to best promote this graduate student grant. It is administered by The Medieval Academy and they have the details for the fellowship on their website here: medievalacademy.site-ym.com/page/Schallek. Currently, the only reference to the Schallek Fellowship is a link on the r3.org home page to the Medieval Academy. This is a \$30,000/year award to a qualifying student. If you are on Facebook, like our page ([facebook.com/r3dotorg/](https://www.facebook.com/r3dotorg/)) for notifications about this and other discussions related to the American Branch, Richard III, and fifteenth-century English culture.

Many thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the Ricardian Register. The quality of the *Register* depends on these and future contributions. Please note the submission guidelines (below) to help me concentrate on the content instead of the format. Do contact me if you have any questions about formatting your document. I'd be delighted to help

Board, Staff, and Chapter Contacts

EXECUTIVE BOARD

CHAIRMAN: **A. Compton Reeves**

1560 Southpark Circle
Prescott, AZ 86305 • chairperson@r3.org

VICE CHAIRMAN: **Deborah Kaback**

415 East 52nd St., Apt 4NC
New York City, NY 10022
vice-chair@r3.org

SECRETARY: **Emily Ferro**

235 Pearl St., Apt. 301
Essex Junction, VT 05452
secretary@r3.org

TREASURER: **Joanne Smith**

4 Gates Street, Framingham, MA 01702
treasurer@r3.org

MEMBERSHIP CHAIRMAN: **Cheryl Greer**

membership@r3.org
1056 Shady Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15232

IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIRMAN:

Jonathan Hayes

5031 SW Hollyhock Circle, Corvallis, OR 97333
541-752-0498 •
immediate_past_chairman@r3.org

COMMITTEES

CHAPTERS ADVISOR: **Nita Musgrave**

630-355-5578 • chapters@r3.org

LIBRARIAN: Fiction: **Gilda E. Felt**

3054 Lantana Court SE, Kentwood, MI 49512
fictionlibrary@r3.org

LIBRARIAN: Research, Non-Fiction, and
Audio-Visual: **Susan Troxell**

114 Lombard Street
Philadelphia PA 19147
researchlibrary@r3.org

RESEARCH OFFICER: **Gil Bogner**

300 Fraser Purchase Rd., St Vincents College
Latrobe, PA 15650
research_officer@r3.org

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER: **Wayne Ingalls**

public_relations_officer@r3.org

ON-LINE MEMBER SERVICES: **Open**

(Contact Jonathan Hayes at
immediate_past_chairman@r3.org for access
to member's only page on r3.org)

SALES OFFICER: **Bob Pfile**

• sales@r3.org

WEB CONTENT MANAGER: **Open**

WEBMASTER: **Lisa Holt-Jones**

508 Chebucto St. • Baddeck
Nova Scotia • BOE 1BO Canada
902-295-9013 • webmaster@r3.org

REGISTER STAFF

EDITOR: **Joan Szechtman**

info@r3.org

ASSISTANT EDITOR: **Diana Rubino**

assistant_editor@r3.org

Copy Editor: **Ruth Roberts**

copy_editor@r3.org

RICARDIAN READING EDITOR: Myrna Smith

401 Northshore Blvd, #713, Portland, TX 78374
361-332-9363 • ricardian_reading_editor@r3.org

CHAPTER CONTACTS

EASTERN MISSOURI: Bill Heuer

111 Minturn • Oakland, MO 63122
(314) 966-4254 • bheuer0517@sbcglobal.net

ILLINOIS: Janice Weiner

6540 N. Richmond St. • Chicago, IL 60645
jlweiner@sbcglobal.net

MICHIGAN AREA: Larry Irwin

5715 Forman Dr • Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301
(248) 626-5339 • fkatydc@yahoo.com

NEW ENGLAND: TBD

• contact@r3ne.org

Website: r3ne.org

NORTHWEST: Jim Mitchell

richardiiinw@yahoo.com

NEW YORK-METRO AREA: Maria Elena Torres

3216 Fillmore Avenue • Brooklyn, NY 11234
elena@pipeline.com

Tidewater (VA): Bob Pfile

rpfile43@gmail.com

Texas Regional: Elizabeth York Enstam

Enstam@sbcglobal.net

Arizona: Marion Low

dickon3@cox.net

Rocky Mountain (CO): Dawn Shafer

dawn_alicia_shafer@yahoo.com

Note: If you do not see a chapter near you and you would like to reach out to other Ricardians in your area, please contact the Membership Chair at membership@r3.org. She will circulate your email address to members in your area. If you later decide to go ahead and form a chapter, please contact the Chapters' Advisor at chapters@r3.org.

Membership Application/Renewal Dues

Regular Membership Levels

Individual \$60.00 \$ _____

Family membership: add \$5.00 for each additional adult
at same address who wishes to join. \$ _____

Please list members at the same address (other than yourself) who are re-joining

For non-U.S. mailing address, to cover postage please add: \$15.00 \$ _____

Contributing and Sponsoring Membership Levels

Honorary Fotheringhay Member \$75.00 \$ _____

Honorary Middleham Member \$180.00 \$ _____

Honorary Bosworth Member \$300.00 \$ _____

Plantagenet Angel \$500.00 \$ _____

Donations*

Judy R. Weinsoft Memorial Research Library \$ _____

General Fund \$ _____

Morris McGee Keynote Address Fund \$ _____

Schallek Special Projects Fund \$ _____

Total enclosed \$ _____

*The Richard III Society, Inc., is a not-for-profit corporation with 501(c)(3) designation. All contributions over the basic \$60 membership are tax-deductible to the extent allowed by law.

Circle One: Mr. - Mrs. - Miss - Ms. - Other: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Country (if outside of U.S.): _____

Residence Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

New Renewal Please check if new address

If this is a gift membership please place the following message on the gift acknowledgement email: _____

Make checks payable to: THE RICHARD III SOCIETY, INC. (U.S. Funds only,
please.)

Mail to:

Richard III Society Membership Dept.
c/o Cheryl Greer
1056 Shady Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15232

Mail membership application to:

Richard III Society Membership Dept.
c/o Cheryl Greer
1056 Shady Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15232

2018 General Membership Meeting (GMM)
Presented by The Michigan Chapter of the Richard III Society,
American Branch
October 5—7, 2018

The Michigan Chapter has been planning for months to bring you an interesting and entertaining GMM. We intend to show you a view of our city, the victim of so many missteps and problems, as we present the “Comeback City” as an exciting place to be! (We know many problems in the neighborhoods still have not been addressed, but they’re working on it!). A new and renewed downtown and a thriving city “suburb” show what has been accomplished- especially by a dynamic mayor and several “fairy godfathers”. For our Chapter's fourth General Meeting in Detroit we have planned a two and a half-hour guided bus tour of the city center and the historic “suburb” named Corktown (for the many Irish that settled there). The only stop will be historic St. Anne’s church, founded by the French who settled Detroit in 1701.

For those who can stay a bit longer, Chapter members have volunteered to drive those wishing to visit the world-famous museums in Dearborn. Greenfield Village has homes and workplaces of significant Americans such as Thomas Edison, the Wright Brothers, Henry Ford and the Goodyear farm. Also featured are: a train round-house, and historic industrial and craft buildings. You need to be able to walk well to manage this one! An alternate tour choice on this property is the Henry Ford Museum, which has great automobile and transport exhibits, American Innovations and other historic inventions for home, business and farm. We will return you to the hotel in time for a late afternoon or evening plane home. Because some interest was shown in Denver, we will include in our packet a pamphlet about the Detroit Institute of Arts, which may require another night’s stay and transportation (your own car, a taxi or a rental car).

Our hotel will be the Detroit Metro Airport Marriott, completely redecorated since our last AGM there in 2010, close to both the airport and to I-94 and I-75. The rooms are priced at \$119.00 (plus tax) which includes a full breakfast buffet each morning as well as free shuttle service to and from the airport. The usual other amenities are also included.

To book additional night(s) as available, please call or Email the Hotel Sales Manager (Group rates apply only to October 5 and 6)

Jennifer Silich—Email: Jennifer.silich@marriott.com

Phone: 1-734-893-6683

Book online for the Richard III Society group rate (\$109 - \$119) here: tinyurl.com/ybdc45mk (if you are copying from the printed publication, type in the link exactly as you see it here—the original link was 235 characters)

HOTEL: Detroit Metro Airport Marriott

30559 Flynn Drive

Romulus, Michigan 48174

marriott.com/hotels/travel/dtwrm-detroit-metro-airport-marriott/

Reservations: Toll free 800-228-9290 or direct 734-729-7555

Remember to identify yourself as a member of the Richard III Society.

The rooms are “double-doubles” or “double-Queens”. If you have special needs, please arrange this when you make your reservations.

There is free parking in the hotel lot for those driving to Detroit. The hotel has an indoor swimming pool, a whirlpool and a fitness center.

Last day to book room: September 25, 2018

Last day for reduced rate registration: must be received by August 1, 2018
(allow time for mail)

Last day for full rate registration: September 25, 2018

Directions:

for those driving: Get on I-94 if coming from the north, the east or west. As you approach the airport, take the Merriman Road Exit going north and stay to your right. The first exit on the right is Flynn Road. Follow it to the hotel, only a quarter mile on the right (There are two Marriott hotels here—we are NOT at the Comfort Suites).

If coming from the south, take I-75 to I-275 and exit onto I-94 East, then follow the above instructions. (Merriman Road is the first exit).

For those arriving by air: After deplaning, take either the monorail or the moving walkways to the center of the terminal. Walk, following Baggage Claim signs, to the escalator going down to Baggage Claim. Find the appropriate carousel for your flight on the board facing you as you enter this area. Phones are located in this area- call the hotel for a Courtesy van pickup (they run every 15 minutes- 24/7). Ask where to stand to be picked up. Call: 734-729-7555

SCHEDULE: *Workshops and Events*

Friday, October 5:

3:00 pm—Hotel and GMM Registration Begins

3:00 to 6:00 pm—English Tea Reception

8:00 to 10:00 pm—Evening Program, TBA

Saturday, October 6:

7:00 to 9: am—Buffet breakfast at the Hotel Buffet Room

9:00 am to 10:00 am—Dr. A. Compton Reeves will present “An Introduction to Paleography”

10:00-10:15 am—Morning Break

10:15 am to 11:15 pm—TBA

11:30 am to 1:30 pm—Buffet Lunch and Keynote address by Kenneth Shepherd “Richard III and the Teaching of History.”

1:45 pm to 2:15 pm—Business meeting. Financial report, Officers’ reports, individual Society members’ input.

2:30 pm to 5:00 pm—Bus tour of Old and New Detroit provided by Step On Tours.

6:30 pm to 7:00 pm-- Cocktail Hour with Cash Bar

7:00 pm to 10:00 pm—Ricardian Banquet, (medieval dress encouraged, otherwise business casual). Society members who have good voices and an ability to “ham it up” are asked to volunteer for the presentation of two segments from the York Mystery plays, our entertainment for the evening. (No memorization required and one short rehearsal).

Sunday, October 7:

7:00 am to 9:00 am—Breakfast at the Hotel Buffet Room

9:15 am to 10:30 am—Dr. Katherine French, “Interior Design In Medieval England After the Plague Years: 1350-1500”

11: 00 am to ? Official GMM programing over.

2018 GMM Registration Form

Detroit, Michigan

October 5-7, 2018

Registration is \$90.00 per person, if received prior to August 30, 2018, and \$95.00 per person after that date. Registration at door as space permits.

Please note: the hotel rate includes hot breakfast, so this registration fee does not include breakfast. Hotel rooms are to be reserved with the hotel, and it is requested that reservations be made on or before September 20, 2018. If you wish to find a roommate, please call Dianne Batch at (734) 675-0181 or email diannebatch@wowway.com, and we will see what can be done to assist you.

Include advance Branch raffle tickets payment—need not be present to win, but delivery must be arranged by you. Authors are welcome to bring copies of their books to be offered for sale—10% of the proceeds will be shared by the Chapter for this arrangement.

Yes, I would like to participate in the York Mystery Play.

Name(s): _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Registration fee \$90.00* x _____ = \$ _____

*\$95.00 after August 30, 2018

Saturday Night Banquet \$50.00 x _____ = \$ _____

Select choice(s):

Apple Jack Chicken # _____

Portobello with Roasted Vegetables # _____

Beef Short Ribs # _____

Morris McGee Program \$5.00 x _____ = \$ _____

Greenfield Village Tour \$30.00 x _____ = \$ _____

Branch Raffle tickets (6 for \$5.00) x _____ = \$ _____

Total Enclosed \$ _____

Mail this form and check or money order made out to **Rose Wiggle, Registrar**. Do not send cash or dues.

Address envelope to:

Rose Wiggle, Registrar
22153 Francis St.
Dearborn, MI 48124



Mail to:

Rose Wiggle, Registrar,
22153 Francis St.,
Dearborn, MI 48124

Inside back cover

(not printed)

Front cover:

***King Richard III* by Jamal Mustafa**

Stained Glassic Studio, Birmingham UK , stainedglassic.com, email: theportraitartist@gmail.com

Richard III

Photo of reconstruction from skeleton taken by Joan Szechtman from display at York Museum

Richard III Forever



Printed with permission ~ Mary Kelly ~ Copyright © 2012

Richard III Boar and Banner website: boarandbanner.com

The Michigan Chapter of the Richard III Society,
American Branch
presents the 2018 General Membership Meeting (GMM)
October 5—7, 2018



Go to pages 43-44 for hotel and meeting details
and page 45 for registration form