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EDITORIAL LICENSE

Carole Rike

Until 1985, every AGM the Society conducted was in New York City. We start the new millennium with a return to our roots for the 2000 Annual General Meeting in the NYC area. In the interim, AGM’s have been held in varying locations around the U.S., allowing members in far-flung locations to assemble with fellow Ricardians at least once a year. The format has grown from an informal afternoon business meeting and speaker to a full weekend of activities, with a featured speaker, workshops and field trips. No will will want to miss The Cloisters trip. Located on four acres overlooking the Hudson River, the building incorporates elements from five medieval French cloisters and from other monastic sites in Southern France. At press time, we do not know the full extent of the weekend activities for the AGM but would expect it will reflect the various advantages of the local community.

If you are able to access the internet, see www.fordham.edu/halsa/med/medny.html for Dr. Paul Halsall’s website, which includes a comprehensive guide to Medieval New York. The website was composed as a class project, groups of students taking a particular aspect of the middle ages in New York City, researching it, visiting if appropriate, and securing appropriate pictures.

With this issue we are enclosing an Index of the Ricardian Register, a real labor of love performed by Kathleen Spaltro, covering all the issues we could locate from 1996-1999. Kathleen not only used her professional expertise in assembling the information, but displayed admirable determination in running down all extant issues of the Register.

Back issues of the Register are available from the Sales Office. Some are hanging around my house. And the Research Librarian, Helen Maurer, has a copy of all in the Index.

If you ever worry about giving a party and no one comes? That’s the endless travail of an editor. This issue was very sparses, but Geoffrey Richardson, our Yorkshire correspondent, came through like a champ. Thanks so much, Geoffrey — again.

Sandra Worth will continue featuring Richard’s “friends and enemies” in the Fall issue. Her focus this time will be the Percy Family. Be sure to watch for it.

Sandra’s book on Richard has won two awards! One we can talk about now; the other we’ll mention in the Fall. The Rose of York was the First Place Winner in the Historical/western category of Authorlink’s Year 2000 International New Authors Competition. Congratulations, Sandra!

Regards to all my Ricardian friends. Look for us in the Fall! And have a great time at the AGM.

Ricardian Register - 3 - Summer, 2000
England's Chickamauga/Chattanooga

By the autumn of 1863, the South's fight to keep its traditional way of life was beginning to unravel. Gettysburg and Vicksburg had neutralised the effects of earlier military successes gained by the Confederate States and the strategists in Richmond realised that an early, hard, retaliatory blow was vital to the preservation of their hopes for the future. It was planned that the blow would be struck by Braxton Bragg's Army of the Tennessee supported by Longstreet and his Corps from the Army of Northern Virginia, against Rosecrans and his Army of the Cumberland, and on September 19/20, when Longstreet's men drove through a gap in the Union line and came within an ace of destroying their opponents at Chickamauga, it seemed the South could yet win the politico/military struggle. This last hope was shattered two months later at the even more improbable Battle of Chattanooga, and from then on, the road ahead lay only downhill.

This may well seem an unlikely introduction to a discourse on a little-known series of engagements in Picardy in the early March of 1416, less than six months after the glorious English victory at Agincourt, but the connection will, it is hoped, become clearer as the narrative progresses.

To set the scene: after his military exploits on St Crispin's Day, Henry V had completed his march to Calais and returned thence to England where, four weeks after the battle, he was attended by the Mayor, accompanied by 24 Aldermen and nearly 20,000 of the city's craftsmen, at the Royal Palace of Eltham. This welcoming ceremony was followed by a reception in his capital on a scale and of a magnificence never seen before. The celebration ended at St Paul's where 18 bishops were present with the King and a crowded congregation to hear Te Deum sung. It was a magnificent salute to a triumph of English arms, which would not be surpassed in scale or drama for more than three hundred years.

Meantime, in Harfleur, a river port on the northern bank of the Seine, the garrison, left by Henry to secure a line of retreat should it be needed, continued to make its presence felt by regular provisioning raids into the French hinterland. The occupying force was relieved and increased in January, 1416 and, in March, the King's uncle returned from a spell of leave at home to resume his post as commander of the town.

He was Thomas Beaufort, Earl of Dorset and Admiral of England. Beaufort was the third son born of the liaison between John of Gaunt and Katherine Swynford and appears to have been the only one with the capacity to lead and command men in battle.

Through the early months of 1416, the garrison had continued to make raids into French territory on both sides of the Seine estuary and, on March 9th, the returned commander himself led a force of 1,000 mounted archers and men-at-arms on a three-day chevauchée into the north of Picardy. The raid ended at a small town called Cany, seven miles south of the Somme estuary, which the English looted and burned, then starting on their return ride. Their route home ran by the small village of Oainville, three miles west of Cany and here, the force was sighted by French scouts sent out by Bernard, Comte d'Armagnac to locate the raiding party. Armagnac's men were able to make their withdrawal, unseen by their enemies and, consequently, the English were completely surprised, five miles further along the road, when they found the way through the village of Valmont was blocked by more than three thousand French cavalry, drawn up in battle order.

Dorset realised that a charge was imminent and immediately ordered his men to dismount and form a line in front of the wagons and horses, as had become customary in the wars in France. On this occasion however, the formation was not a total success, since the English numbers were few and the line they formed was stretched and thin. As the French made successive attacks, holes began to appear in the line and the riders broke through the desperate defence in several places. This should have been the end since all that was necessary was for the French to wheel left and right and cut down their opponents from behind, but, as at Agincourt, at Barnet, at Marston Moor and a dozen other fields, successful cavalry are always unwilling to abandon their charge, or to renounce their claim to whatever loot is usually to be found in the rearmost echelons of any line of battle, and so it was at Valmont. The French — mainly Gascons be it noted, of the same hot-blood line as d'Artagnan — continued down the road, killing the unarmed grooms and pages and horse-holders in their way and set to looting the baggage train.

This respite gave Dorset, who had been badly wounded in the fighting, the opportunity to withdraw his surviving force into a large garden which had anchored one of his flanks and which he now found to be surrounded by a thick hedge and a ditch. It was a natural redoubt, readily defensible by his
comparatively small force, now further reduced to li-
ttle more than 800 in numbers, and he disposed his 
men in square within the shielding hedgerows.

When Armagnac had knocked his force back into 
shape and returned to finish the job they had started 
so well, he pulled up short of the new position and 
carefully reconnoitered it. He could see little point in 
making a direct assault on the “fortress,” which would 
have been very costly in men, and decided it would be 
more politic to send heralds to point out the hopeles-
ness of the English position and convey his guarantee 
that lives, at least, would be spared if the garrison 
agreed to surrender. Dorset would probably have 
agreed to the loss of their booty from Cady had they 
been offered free passage back to Harfleur, but the 
prospect of a meek surrender stuck in his throat. He 
dismissed the heralds saying “Tell your master that 
Englishmen do not surrender.” The same sentiments 
may have been conveyed more succinctly over 500 
years later at Bastogne, but, on the earlier occasion, 
the message was more clearly understood by the op-
posing commander.

Bernard d’Armagnac was not unduly disturbed by 
the English recalcitrance. He would leave them to 
think it over through the night and, meantime, rest 
and refresh his men in the village. He did not, how-
ever, post keen sentries and Dorset, casting around 
for any way out of his dilemma, noted that one side of 
their enclosure was unguarded and was able to lead his 
entire force out of the garden and head silently, and 
undetected, westwards making for the coast. The 
English marched seven miles west to Fecamp and 
then swung south following the coastline for another 
seven miles, eventually taking cover in a wood at Les 
Loges as dawn brightened the sky. And settling there 
to wait for darkness again to cover their retreat.

The French discovered 
their trap was empty at 
first light and Armagnac 
despached scouts in all 
directions to find the 
missing English, and sent 
a strong force under his 
second-in-command, de 
Loigny, to bar the road 
into Harfleur. Unhappily 
for the Comte, the en-
emy’s location remained a 
mystery and as darkness 
fell, the English again 
emerged from their hide 
at Les Loges and made 
for the coast near a village 
called Etretat, where they 
gained the beach and 
started the final leg of their march to Harfleur and 
safety. By using the shingle, Dorset ensured that at 
least one of his flanks was covered by the sea, but it 
made the going tougher and there were still 30 miles 
to go before they would reach the succour of their 
base.

The English struggled on for another 20 miles, 
rounding the Cap de la Heve as dawn was breaking, 
to commence the last stage of their arduous march 
along the bank of the Seine. And here, as they 
reached the foot of the Cliffs of St Andress, they were 
discovered. Above them they saw the glints of light 
off spearheads and armour, de Loigny’s column had 
found them and the French commander, after send-
ing riders to warn d’Armagnac, ordered his troops to 
dismount and charge down on the forlorn, ragged 
column of their enemies. The French needed no sec-
ond urging; here was easy prey and they raced, laugh-
ing and shouting, down the steep slope to finish the 
work they had started so successfully at Valmont two 
days before.

As best they could, the English formed a bat-
tle-line, their backs to the sea, and awaited the on-
slaught, which when it came was disorganised and 
piecemeal. The charge down the slope had, perforce, 
involved the attackers in taking different tracks and, 
instead of arriving en masse, it came in individual 
groups which were quickly cut down by the waiting, 
desperate Englishmen. In short space, the threatened 
massacre had been turned on the attackers and those 
who survived fled back up the hill or along the beach 
even faster than they had sallied down the cliff min-
utes before. Their task achieved, the English troops, 
being veterans of the French wars, moved to the even 
more important business of stripping the corpses of
their late adversaries of any items of value and then casting the bodies into the Seine.

Whilst engaged in this traditional pursuit, they heard trampling of hooves and clashing of armour and weapons above and looked up to see the ominous sight of Bernard d’Armagnac, with his main force of cavalry, glaring down upon them from the heights above. Salvation it seemed was still beyond the English reach.

But then, a strange resolve came over the survivors of Dorset’s raiding force. They had been ambushed, charged and ridden down by overwhelming force, their line broken, their comrades killed by this unremitting enemy. They had been pursued like a hunted stag across 50 miles of France. They were tired, footsore, hungry — many were wounded — but, above all, they were angry. They had had enough of playing the quarry and if they were to be hunted to death, here, within sight of safety, they would make the hunters pay dearly for their sport. And they formed a line and charged up the side of the cliff, brandishing knives and axes and spears and yelling their battle-madness into the faces of their astonished foes, hurled themselves on the French.

It was magnificent, but it was not the War as she is fought and d’Armagnac’s men did not stay long to argue the point. They turned and fled down the coast road which, unhappily for them led past Harfleur, whence the other half of the garrison, roused by the furious uproar of their comrades’ charge, had sallied out to join the fray and killed many fugitives and took more for ransom. The victory was complete and Dorset’s raiders returned in triumph to their base and to the plaudits of their equally booty-laden friends from the town.

They could not know, of course, that nearly 450 years later, in a place still to be discovered, their magnificent exploits would be repeated on a grander scale by other soldiers who had also been “pushed around once too often.”

“The thing that has been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun.”

[Eccl 1:2]

The account of Valmont/Harfleur is taken from original sources: Streche, Elmham and Chastelain and, of course, from the invaluable Burne. The brief relation of Chickamauga/Chattanooga comes largely from the account by Grant himself and from Catton.

Dickon’s Ballad

This be th’ tale
Of Richard the Third
and for ceries it’s quite different
From the tales you have heard
Mine is from York’s view
(or what might have been)
That in the eyes of his family
He was the most betray’d of all men.
Deceiv’d in his court
Forsaken by luck was he
the Tudors who won that fatal battle
Perhaps marr’d his history
But take heart, good gentles
I tell but my interpretation to you
if it differs from your thoughts —
Remember, ’tis by my view
It’s told by a couple,
A man and his wife
Who discuss the outcome
About the House of York’s strife
In bold print spakes th’ husband
The woman’s speech in is plain
He tries to explain to her
Why the pleas for truth be in vain:

If this is all true, why don’t they say,
“That enchantress Elizabeth has rotted away?
And that she died without mourning, entombed without tears
At last her guise caught up with her years?
But they do all say so, in the taverns my dear
Where all those who knew her do forbear to hear—
She’ll use us no more, we’ll not pay for her sins,
In the end it shall be fair Dickon who wins?
Not so either beloved, no such luck for to-day
He died un-shriven, went to Anne
’Tis better that way.
Who then shall rule, who’ll fill
Our king’s shoes?
Those York-hating Tudors, for they did not lose.
Henry says, “He’s a child-killer, an incestuous man.
I cornered him at Redmore, and from me he ran.”

How can God reward corruption?
How is it triumph to Henry goes?
Because my beloved,
History is written by they
Who hang Heroes.

Reprinted with kind permission from Renaissance Magazine, Issue #16
(www.renaissancemagazine.com)

by Nicole Pefley, age 14
Richard III reigned for only a little over two years. In commemoration of that fact, this new regular column in the Ricardian Register will profile people who are near the two-year anniversary of their membership in the Society. We thank the members below who shared their information with us — it’s a pleasure to get to know you better!

Sandra Bartkowiak of Dearborn, MI, found the Society when she saw a display in the local library and an article about the Society in a local newspaper. Sandra works as a service coordinator. In her leisure time she enjoys reading, traveling, and visiting historical sites. She would be interested in establishing communication with those having similar interests. (313-561-4536)

Wendy Bush became interested after reading a novel that took place during the Wars of the Roses; it led her to read non-fiction about that era. An A&E special on Richard III mentioned the Society. Wendy, an analyst, also enjoys reading, writing, and dogs. She lives in Lenexa, KS, and would like to start a chapter in the Kansas City area if she can find others with similar interests. (913-315-5518)

Roberta E. Craig bought a copy of Thomas B. Costain’s The Last Plantagenets during the summer of her freshman year in high school and says she “was a Ricardian by the time I turned the last page of the book.” She searched for the Society without success in London telephone books while visiting Britain. Finally she found the Society’s Web site mentioned in a letter to the editor in a British culture magazine. Roberta, a resident of Yorba Linda, CA, has a degree in history and was involved in the initial year of her college’s Oral History Program. A descendant of English settlers in Virginia and Irish settlers in Maryland, many of whom aided the cause of American Independence, she has been a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution for many years. She works as a ceramist and her leisure interests include sewing, traveling, genealogy, doll collecting, and writing. (CWCREC@aol.com)

Diane R. Franek, a historian, enjoys travel, reading, movies, gardening, and history. Diane says, “I love all history, especially British history. I just received my degree from Arizona State University — a B.A. in History. I am an Arizona native and I love to travel.” When not traveling, Diane resides in Chandler, AZ. She found the Society while taking a course in British history at ASU. Her teacher was a medievalist and also a Society member. Diane looked up the Society on the Internet and says she “signed up the same day!” (405-705-6340)

William Heuer tells how he became interested in Richard III and the Society thus: “Thomas Costain’s book The Last Plantagenets first made me aware of the controversy. Over the years, I’ve read everything I could find, buying 24 books and 9 videos to support my habit. The Internet informed me of the R3 Society and its American Branch. The rest is his story.” [Ed: sic!] William is a retired art director from St. Louis, MO, who is interested in fishing, Shakespeare, and the French Foreign Legion, as well as Richard III. (314-966-4254)

Kathleen G. Jones of Apple Valley, MN, became interested in Richard III and the Society after a visit to Bosworth Field. Her leisure time is spent in travel, genealogy, history, coffeehouses, and hiking. (doug.jones@integrityonline31.com)

William McClintic, of Boynton Beach, FL, interests himself in retirement with travel, Shakespeare college courses, and golf. He attended a Lifelong Learning Society lecture series on Shakespeare. The lectures mentioned the Richard III Society. William was interested to see how far that Shakespeare had strayed from the facts. (561-364-0710)

Frank H. North, says, “English history has been foremost in my reading, especially medieval [history]. A newspaper article lead me to the Society.” Frank lives in Roswell, GA, and, now in retirement, is interested in genealogy research. (770-993-5169)

Mary Reighney of West Monroe, LA, has always been interested in Richard III after studying him in history. She’d heard about the Society, and then found it on the Internet. Mary writes, “I use my position as a history teacher to correct the lies told about Richard III in most texts and history classes.” Her leisure interests include history, science fiction and fantasy, and reading. (reighney@hotmail.com)

Marilyn Starrett is a Public Relations Director with Kaiser Permanente in Denver, CO. She occupies her leisure time with medieval history, photography, and writing. She teaches a P.R. course at the local four-year college and says, “I wanted my students to learn research...
as well as P.R. strategy. I have them research the mysteries of Richard III and write a paper and develop a P.R. campaign for him. I found the Society while researching the topic on-line.”

Barbara J. Underwood, a speech-language pathologist in Clawson, MI, found the Society during her former career as a professional actress. While researching the role of Duchess of York in Richard III, she became aware of the conflicting stories about Richard. A librarian in Houston, TX, directed her to The Daughter of Time and, she says, “… eventually I stumbled upon the Society”. Barbara was a member of the Society some years ago when she lived in Texas, and took a one-month Ricardian-focused tour of England in 1976, later moving to Michigan. About 5 years ago she learned of the active Michigan Chapter, which a friend encouraged her to join.

Barbara’s leisure interests include community theatre, writing, and pen pals. She says, “I currently write [to] 35 people around the world, many of them in Britain. ‘They’re all ages and from all walks of life. I’ve been privileged to meet most of them.”

“I have just had a non-fiction article published in a local history of Wool, Dorset, and am working on two magazine articles. My pride and joy, however, is the suspense novel I have in the works. It’s set in the N.Y.C. theatre community — but the leading man is named Richard!”
No sooner than Spring issue of the Register hit the streets did I receive a telephone call from a member, who advised me of the condition of the snapshot of Pole’s tomb (upside down!) in that issue and then proceeded to delight me with stories of his stay in Canterbury. I fully expected to hear from other members, but to date Rev. Cannon is the only party who has pointed it out to me. I asked that he share at least one of his experiences/stories with us. And I am including the picture here in the correct orientation. It’s a notable difference — before it looked like a mantlepiece!

Dear Ms. Rike:
You must have heard, by this time, from more readers than myself of the upside down condition of the picture of the tomb of Cardinal Pole. I noticed it first because the shield on which the arms are blazoned is upside down!

During a year in Canterbury, studying, I fell in love with the Cathedral. Going to Evensong almost daily. Often in the winter there was a full choir, the Dean and clergy and a congregation consisting of one old man, an old woman and me! It was wonderful to find the worship of GOD going on that way and I hope that it does to this day.

There are many fascinating things in that great church. Here is one of them which impressed me.

The body of the great Archbishop Stephen Langton, who led the barons at Runnymede in forcing Magna Carta on King John, is buried in the Chapel of Saint Margaret Holland (I think) who had influence with the Pope and two husbands (not at once) wanted all three of them buried, side by side, before the altar in the same chapel. The result was that the body of the Archbishop had to be shoved all the way under the altar, feet first, to make room for a priest to celebrate Mass there. Stephen Langton was taller than the foundation of the Cathedral is thick so that his feet stick outside the wall. If you go to Canterbury you can see what looks like a small doghouse attached to the wall of the transept. It is housing for Archbishop Langton’s feet!

I can give you another little-known example of medieval practicality and humor in St. Peter’s Rome if you like.

Looking forward to meeting you one day and with every good wish to you and the cause of King Richard, I am . . .

Sincerely yours,
Rev’d Cannon Robert S. S. Whitman

Dear Ms. Rike:
I have recently launched “Forget-Me-Not Books,” a second-hand history book business, covering the period ca. 100 – 1600 by mail order. ... I am happy to send books overseas.

Judith Ridley
11 Tamarisk Rise
Wokingham • Berkshire • RG40 1 WG

[Ed. Note: I have few catalogs for members who may be interested — contact me direct.]

The following was sent to Helen Maurer, Society Research Librarian:

Dear Helen:
I’m an RIII Society member, and, in the process of obtaining some of Geoffrey Richardson’s books, I’ve had a delightful experience with Amazon.com.uk., from which the Society will benefit.

I ordered three books from Amazon, and in the process of finding and shipping them to me, they duplicated one title (The Deceivers), and omitted another of the three. When I contacted them about the error, they were suitably apologetic, and suggested that,
given the relative low cost of the book, and the high cost of sending it back, perhaps I would care to just donate it to a library or school. Wow!

I e-mailed back that, of course, I would donate it to the Society’s library, in their name, and that seemed to please them very much. So - I will, this afternoon, send the book to you (with a copy of this e-mail enclosed), priority mail, and request that you add it to our library as a donation from Amazon.com.uk!

Perhaps, if not too much trouble, a note to them would be in order — their address is just: www.amazon.com.uk. The orders department was responsible for the donation, so you might put it to their attention. I will, of course, also send them a note.

I’m pretty impressed with these people. They have been more than responsive, and beyond caring. I’m hereby urging members of the Society to use them and their services as much as possible! And I’ll send a copy of this message to Carole Rike, in case she wants to put a note in the Register.

I’ll also enclose in the package the packing slip that came with the book, in case you need to verify value.

By the way — I’m impressed to note that the missing third volume is on its way to me at no charge, and via express mail! Now THAT’S service!!

LML -
Lorilee McDowell

And a gracious response from Geoffrey, as follows:

Dear Lorilee,

Our mutual friend, Carole Rike, kindly copied me your approbatory email on the excellent service you had from Amazon. It’s certainly nice when this kind of thing happens — all too often these days one hears of the opposite form of service so, clearly, Amazon really did try harder in your case.

I hope you enjoy the books — please let me know, or, if you have any queries on any point, I will try to help on that too. As I’ve said before on List, I’m the only history writer I know who gives after-sales service. Now it’s back to Opus 5, which is going to take much longer than the first four, if only because I’ve learned how to pace myself better over the past six years.

Have a good one when you rise,

Best regards,
Geoffrey.

Dear Carole:

I’m disposing of my personal library, which includes a slew of books of medieval and Ricardian interest, by internet auction, over the next several months. I’d appreciate your listing the Yahoo auction site in the next Register — and letting present officers and others know of the site. I will inform Myrna Smith and Laura Blanchard. Any suggestions on others I can let know before publication date?

To see the books: page.auctions.yahoo.com/booth/w_hogarth.

Many thanks for your help. The Register looks more and more splendid every issue.

Cheers,
Bill Hogarth

Dear Carole:

A few days ago I sent you a fax from Mr. Hild in Alaska, an unexpected defense of Richard III. here’s one I find on my own from The Silent Pool by Patricia Wentworth, published originally in 1953, reprinted in 1976 by Aeonian Press, Mattituck, NY. One of the characters speaks as follows:

... so why on earth Geoffrey married her just has to take its place as one of those insoluble mysteries along with The Man In The Iron Mask and Who Killed The Princes In The Tower. It’s pretty certain Richard didn’t, because if he had, Henry VII would have tumbled over himself to accuse him after the battle of Bosworth. I hope you admire the versatility of my conversation . . .

which proves that Ms. Wentworth had read her Josephine Tey!

Myrna Smith

Dear Carole:

As a fellow Ricardian, I would like to introduce you to White Rose International, a company dedicated to the preservation and perpetuation of Yorkist tradition. We help foster goodwill for both the county of Yorkshire and the magnificent House of York.

I have included herewith a small brochure on some of the company’s products. Should you or any of your group wish to avail yourself of any of these or simply wish to know a bit more of the company, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sean Emmett
Unit 2 The Mews
Newall Hall Park
Otley, Yhorkshire LS21 2RD, U.K.
Telephone: 01943 851277; fax: 01943 851288

Editor’s Note: The merchandise in his brochure is quite attractive and will thrill most Ricardians. It includes items such as baseball caps, ski hats, notepads, bookmarks, fridge magnets, luggage labels, etc. but I was especially taken with the Flag of the White Rose — if it lives up to its pictures, it
Guess which Ellen!

Our Sun-Sentinel newspaper had a review by Sean Piccoli, the “music writer,” who reviewed “The Filth and the Fury,” a documentary on the Sex Pistols. He gave the film four stars! And says . . . “The raw footage is cut with, of all things, a scene from Richard III (1954) starring Lawrence [sic] Olivier as William Shakespeare’s portrait of the murderous English monarch. The band careers, while Olivier as pitiable Richard brands himself ‘deformed, unfinish’d.’ . . . Everybody here — Richard, Shakespeare, Olivier, Johnny Rotten — is a product of ‘England’s dreaming,’ to quote the Sex Pistols. Glory takes many forms, beautiful and grotesque, as it is pursued, realized and lost . . .”

And from the new book, Shakespeare’s Kings: The Great Plays and the History of England in the Middle Ages: 1337-1485 by John Julius Norwich, the chapters on King Edward V and King Richard III, are pretty ugly, attributing everything that Thomas More wrote relative to them as pure unadulterated truth, despite Josephine Tey.

All best,
Ellen

A member who joined last year and recently moved house was thoughtful enough to e-mail us notification of her change of address along with the following note:

When I moved I found some Richard III books I’d forgotten about, some very old which I bought in England. I went there some years ago to walk Bosworth Field, and to follow his route from Leicester as best I could. . . . I had begun a novel about Richard quite a few years ago, I have loads of ‘peripheral’ books about Edward IV, for example, the Plantagenets, and the battles, Wars of the Roses, etc. I do want to get back into it again.

Diana Bristow

When Jean Kelliher joined and gave her e-mail address as ndworker2@aol.com, I [Peggy Allen, Membership Chair] couldn’t resist offering to put her in touch with another member who’s interested in needle arts. Jean wrote:

I can’t believe I still have this. [Ed: “This” is a copy of a receipt for Society dues, dated September 7, 1966.] I moved from a big old Victorian house to a tiny apartment; Kearny’s Queen of Clutter reigns no more. The kids are grown and the menagerie is down to 2 cats. Now that I have time to kick up my heels, my feet give me trouble …

The Society was so small when I joined, everyone was like family. The English Secretary’s (Phyllis Hester) daughter came over for a visit; she was my house guest [and] met and married a friend of mine. We had Ricardians all over the house for the wedding. Breakfast for 17 was no problem for me in that big house. Linda McLatchie [former long-time Society Sales Officer] met her husband at the wedding. The Hesters, the Haynes, the Snyders, the Hogarths. What great fun we all had together. I can’t tell you how much the Society changed my life, so many wonderful people I would have never met if I hadn’t plunked down my 3 bucks that August after seeing the New York Times “In Memoriam” to King Richard!

Jean Kelliher

New member George Martinez, a free-lance writer, wrote:

Thanks for processing my membership. I know I will enjoy it very much. I have been wondering about something related to the Society, however. Does membership in the Society imply that all Society members believe that Richard III has been vilified and is innocent of killing the princes, among his many other alleged crimes? I’m not all convinced yet that Richard III is innocent, yet am fascinated by him and the dynastic impasse he faced.

[Ed: Printed on the inside front cover of every issue of The Ricardian (the journal published by the Parent Society, in England) is, “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 this period, and of the role in English history of this monarch.”]

Jadzia Tracey of Kearny, NJ, wrote this response to “When Did You Join the Society?” in the Spring Register:

I am also into knitting, needlepoint and counted cross stitch. I have little doll clothes for sale on www.auntie.com/dollmall/JeansKnits. Am excited about the Summer issue. Hope that Wendy Zollo’s article is in it. [Ed: Wendy Zollo’s article was in the Spring issue.]

I am also writing a biographical novel on Louisa May Alcott. And studying later Medieval Britain. I love this period of time. It is Sharon Kay Penman’s Sunne in Splendour [that] really excited me about Richard.

By all means, you may send my name to the other Needleworker. I want to do some research on Medieval Needlework. Going to start with the Bayeux Tapestry.

Jean Kelliher

Ricardian Post

should be a great acquisition! You can also purchase the flag wall brackets from them.

New member George Martinez, a free-lance writer, wrote:

Thanks for processing my membership. I know I will enjoy it very much. I have been wondering about something related to the Society, however. Does membership in the Society imply that all Society members believe that Richard III has been vilified and is innocent of killing the princes, among his many other alleged crimes? I’m not all convinced yet that Richard III is innocent, yet am fascinated by him and the dynastic impasse he faced.

[Ed: Printed on the inside front cover of every issue of The Ricardian (the journal published by the Parent Society, in England) is, “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 this period, and of the role in English history of this monarch.”]

Jadzia Tracey of Kearny, NJ, wrote this response to “When Did You Join the Society?” in the Spring Register:

I can’t believe I still have this. [Ed: “This” is a copy of a receipt for Society dues, dated September 7, 1966.] I moved from a big old Victorian house to a tiny apartment; Kearny’s Queen of Clutter reigns no more. The kids are grown and the menagerie is down to 2 cats. Now that I have time to kick up my heels, my feet give me trouble …

The Society was so small when I joined, everyone was like family. The English Secretary’s (Phyllis Hester) daughter came over for a visit; she was my house guest [and] met and married a friend of mine. We had Ricardians all over the house for the wedding. Breakfast for 17 was no problem for me in that big house. Linda McLatchie [former long-time Society Sales Officer] met her husband at the wedding. The Hesters, the Haynes, the Snyders, the Hogarths. What great fun we all had together. I can’t tell you how much the Society changed my life, so many wonderful people I would have never met if I hadn’t plunked down my 3 bucks that August after seeing the New York Times “In Memoriam” to King Richard!

Denise Martinez of Kearny, NJ, wrote the following in the Spring Register:

The Society was so small when I joined, everyone was like family. The English Secretary’s (Phyllis Hester) daughter came over for a visit; she was my house guest [and] met and married a friend of mine. We had Ricardians all over the house for the wedding. Breakfast for 17 was no problem for me in that big house. Linda McLatchie [former long-time Society Sales Officer] met her husband at the wedding. The Hesters, the Haynes, the Snyders, the Hogarths. What great fun we all had together. I can’t tell you how much the Society changed my life, so many wonderful people I would have never met if I hadn’t plunked down my 3 bucks that August after seeing the New York Times “In Memoriam” to King Richard!

Jean Kelliher

New member George Martinez, a free-lance writer, wrote:

Thanks for processing my membership. I know I will enjoy it very much. I have been wondering about something related to the Society, however. Does membership in the Society imply that all Society members believe that Richard III has been vilified and is innocent of killing the princes, among his many other alleged crimes? I’m not all convinced yet that Richard III is innocent, yet am fascinated by him and the dynastic impasse he faced.

[Ed: Printed on the inside front cover of every issue of The Ricardian (the journal published by the Parent Society, in England) is, “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 this period, and of the role in English history of this monarch.”]

Jadzia Tracey of Kearny, NJ, wrote this response to “When Did You Join the Society?” in the Spring Register:

I can’t believe I still have this. [Ed: “This” is a copy of a receipt for Society dues, dated September 7, 1966.] I moved from a big old Victorian house to a tiny apartment; Kearny’s Queen of Clutter reigns no more. The kids are grown and the menagerie is down to 2 cats. Now that I have time to kick up my heels, my feet give me trouble …

The Society was so small when I joined, everyone was like family. The English Secretary’s (Phyllis Hester) daughter came over for a visit; she was my house guest [and] met and married a friend of mine. We had Ricardians all over the house for the wedding. Breakfast for 17 was no problem for me in that big house. Linda McLatchie [former long-time Society Sales Officer] met her husband at the wedding. The Hesters, the Haynes, the Snyders, the Hogarths. What great fun we all had together. I can’t tell you how much the Society changed my life, so many wonderful people I would have never met if I hadn’t plunked down my 3 bucks that August after seeing the New York Times “In Memoriam” to King Richard!
Another tribute to Janet Harris from an Arizona Chapter members:

It's been so nice actually having an Arizona chapter thanks to the efforts of Joan Marshall and her sister Janet Harris. ... [We] all miss Janet, but the chapter here is a memorial to her.

Ginny Chanda

Lucille Warner was kind enough to send in a cutting of The New York Times travel section article about Bosworth Field when she sent in her renewal. Later she e-mailed this:

Thanks very much for your acknowledgement of my renewal . . . I've enjoyed the Society's publications very much — even though my historical period is southwest India, turn of the 16th Century when Vasco Da Gama arrived there and introduced European colonization. But those mid and late medieval years are wonderful globally. Best wishes.

Lucille Warner

[Ed: This article started on the front page of section 5 of the May 21, 2000, edition of The New York Times. While many members saw excerpts from the text on the American Branch's listserv, seeing the whole article, with the lovely colored pictures and maps, is a much richer experience. The author, Beverly S. Narkiewicz, mentioned the Society's address, and we received many requests for information therefrom.]

A new member wrote in about her current and future projects:

Dear Society Members:

... I think ... members may be interested in the book I have just published. It is called The Red Queen — Margaret of Anjou and the Wars of the Roses. It is 284 pages and in softback. I have published it myself through 1st Books. It is on The International Online Library at www.1stbooks.com. I think it is $3.95 on the Web if you want to download it. It is one of the new, print on demand books.

Barnes and Noble will have it for $18.95. Later, I will be able to supply it for that price, postpaid.

Richard is in it only briefly.

The facts are true but the motivations are my own creations. The book covers 1444 to 1471 and then Margaret's death in 1482. There is slight love interest and no sex but plenty of violence.

I am thinking of writing a book about Cecily Neville but can find very little about her. I started The Red Queen — or the research for it — in 1962. At age 77, I don't have another 38 years so I need to get working.

Incidentally, I have made Margaret an “unvillainous” character.

Very truly,

Ruth S. Perot

Ruth notes that her book's ISBN number is 1-58721-2331.

Phone number correction for St. Louis Chapter

Dear Carole:

Thanks for making sure my letter regarding possible formation of a Chapter in the St. Louis area made the spring issue of the Register, however, there was a type-o in the phone number. I was wondering if it would be possible to print a correction in the next edition of the Register? It should be: (314) 741-5751

Actually, I didn't catch it myself, but I received a phone call from a person who was interested, but she had to call Peggy Allen for the correct number, since she lives in Mid-Missouri, and didn't have a phone book for the area handy.

The Chapter formation is already successful, but in case anyone else just tries to call (even though the rest of the information was correct) it would be great if a correction was printed. Thanks a lot.

Loyauté Me Lie

Rita Blake

And finally from the White Rose Theatre Company:

Please find enclosed details of “An Audience with King Richard III,” York actor Michael S. Bennett's acclaimed one-man show.

"An Audience with..." offers a welcome alternative to Shakespeare's play, presenting a rather different view of the “hunchbacked monster” of legend. In the performance King Richard, with flamboyance, energy and not a little humor, presents his case. At the end, audience members have the opportunity to ask questions.

In addition to a repeat at Middleham on July 6th, the show will be at The Richard III Museum in York, Friday 28th, Saturday 29th of July; Friday 4th, Saturday 5th of August; Friday 11th, Saturday 12th of August; Friday 18th; Saturday 19th of August; Friday 25 and Saturday 26 of August. For more information, www.richardiii museum.co.uk or call 01904 634191.
Web Site Update

Laura Blanchard

After five years of rapid growth, the American Branch web site is adding pages more slowly, as we refine and update some sections created earlier.

Barley Hall
Since my last report, we have added, as promised, a virtual tour of Barley Hall, the fifteenth-century alderman’s townhouse in the city of York. We’ve also updated our Bosworth site, including a virtual tour and a provocative article by Paul Trevor Bale, a member of our parent society, challenging the Battlefield Centre’s traditional siting of the battle. Bale’s arguments are very close to those of Peter Foss, and for those who’ve been to the battlefield (and those who haven’t, as well), it’s fascinating reading. There’s also a page where you can add an online in-memoriam. The two sections can be seen at

http://www.r3.org/barley_hall/
http://www.r3.org/bosworth/

Ricardian Travel
Another section that has been updated is the Ricardian Travel section. Tina Cooper is serving as webmistress of this section, and has scoured the web looking for other sites with images of buildings and places with Ricardian connections. You can view her handiwork at

http://www.r3.org/travel/

and if you have a favorite “Ricardian Travel” link, please e-mail her at tcooper@netdoor.com

The travel section also includes information on the Ricardian tour and an update on all the exciting activities planned at Middleham for the month of July.

Online Library
Although the only addition to our online library since my last report is Isolde Wigram’s article on the fate of the Princes in the Tower (http://www.r3.org/bookcase/misc/wigram01.html ), we have a significant source in process — member Ellen Mertz is working her way through the second half of the relevant chapters of Holinshed’s chronicles even as I write.

For those who wonder why Judie Gall isn’t mentioned in this report, when she almost single-handedly built our online library, I should mention that she’s working on version 2.0 (or is it 3.0?) of her glossary of medieval terms. She’s earned a break from all that picky keyboarding, although the glossary is plenty picky as well.

We have added an online edition of Helen Maurer’s famous review of all the suspects, no matter how far-fetched, in the Murder of the Princes, “Whodunit?”, at http://www.r3.org/bookcase/whodunit.html.

Online Facsimiles
On a related note, for those with a fast connection to the Internet, I commend the University of Pennsylvania Library’s Schoenberg Center for Electronic Text and Image (http://www.library.upenn.edu/etext/). The Furness Shakespeare Collection there now includes online facsimiles of the first folio of Shakespeare’s Richard III, Hall’s and Holinshed’s Chronicles, More’s History, several lesser-known sixteenth- and seventeenth-century plays about Richard III (and one about Jane Shore as well as one called The English Princess), the Colley Cibber adaptation and a prompt book for the Cibber adaptation, and a sixteenth-century history of the Wars of the Roses. There are many other English Renaissance texts at the site as well — other Shakespeare plays, Erasmus, and so on.

Online Giving
Finally, although we are still not set up to process routine credit card transactions for memberships, AGM registrations or sales on the web, we can now accept contributions online through the good offices of Helping.org, a nonprofit organization designed to help small nonprofits such as us to accept donations via credit card. I made a test donation of $50 last month, and within two weeks they sent a check for $49, keeping only the 2% fee they have to pay the credit card companies.

If you’d like to show some Ricardian generosity for a favorite project such as the libraries, the scholarship funds, the new McGee fund, and so on, the URL for the page that explains this process is http://www.r3.org/donate/two_ways.html
GREENWOOD PRESS PUBLISHES NEW BOOK BY ROXANE MURPH


Greenwood Press’ announcement says:

A period of tumultuous political and religious strife, the English Civil War has inspired writers for the past four centuries. Their works vary widely in quality from the hurriedly written political verse of the 17th century and the superficial or sentimental novels of the 19th and 20th centuries to the brilliantly conceived novels of Daniel Defoe, Nigel Tranter, and Iain Pears. All provide a perspective on a turbulent era. A useful tool for historians and researchers, this bibliography provides access to verse, novels, short stories, and plays about the Civil War era written between 1625 and 1999.

The book opens with an introductory survey of the political and religious conflicts that led to the war and the execution of Charles I and that continued through the Interregnum, Cromwell’s Protectorate, and the Restoration of Charles II. It then provides a discussion of some of the fiction written about the events and personalities of the period. With over 900 annotated entries, the bibliography itself includes virtually all of the fiction written about the period.

CONTENTS: Preface; Introduction; Verse; Novels and Short Stories, Plays; Index.


PUBLICATION DATE: 02/28/00

Greenwood Press may be reached toll-free at 1-800-225-5800.

MOVING OR TEMPORARILY AWAY?

Your quarterly Ricardian publications are mailed with the request to the U.S. Post Office to notify the Society of changes of address and forwarding addresses. This service costs the Society extra money, but we think it’s worth it to ensure that as many members as possible receive the publications to which they are entitled.

A recent issue of the Ricardian Register “rewarded” us with an unusual number of postal returns marked “Temporarily Away” or “Moved – Left No Forwarding Address”, greatly adding to the consternation and perplexity of those of us who must deal with these cases.

So, please, please, if you are moving, let us know your new address as soon as possible. If you will be away temporarily, please ask your Post Office to hold your mail for you.

Your change of address notices should go directly to the Membership Chair: Peggy Allen, 1421 Wisteria Dr., Metairie LA 70005-1061, or e-mail membership@r3.org. Please don’t forget to include other changes that help us contact you, such as new telephone number, new e-mail address, or name changes.

Changing Your e-Mail Address?
Don’t Forget the Society

More and more of the Society’s business is being done by e-mail, when possible. As postage costs rise, this makes good economic sense. For many of us, our e-mail address changes much more frequently than our mailing address. If yours changes, please notify the Society by e-mailing the details to: membership@r3.org.

We were very sad to learn of the death of longtime Branch and Southwest Chapter member Dr. Dorothy Finley, of Dallas, Texas.

We extend our heartfelt sympathy to her family and friends.
American Branch Members Who Joined 01-MAR-00 Through 31-MAY-00

Justin M. Armstrong  
Joanne Barrera  
Marjorie L. Beck  
Lolene Blake  
Eric H. Carter  
Lynn M. Carter  
Gary Conelly  
Barry Cotton  
R. Jill DeMarco  
Michael J. Depew  
Margaret Derascavage  
Mary Devlin  
Guy M. L. & Barbara McG. Fein  
Nancy J. Fletcher  
Rhonda Kathryn Harer  
Alex Hoffer  
Clyde Kelley & Lisa Kelley  
Jean P. Keliher  
Lynne Kiesling  
Paul M. Lewis  
Leslie C. Livingston  
George A. Martinez  
Tamara Mazzei  
Brenda J. Mitchell McDonald  
Amy McGee  
John F. Melville  
Rachel A. Mittler  
Sarah J. Moore  
Paul C. Pinkosh  
Robert I. Rath  
Michael Reid  
Joy Rothke  
Rosemary M. Schreader  
Schuyler G. Steele  
Daniel Thiery  
Stephen G. Umstead  
Lori A. Van Daele  
Donna Vinson  
Catriona Watt  
Joseph Wawrzyniak  
Matt Weaver  
Debbie Zollo

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

All Executive Board positions will be open for election in October. The nominating committee has nominated the following people for these positions:

Chair: Sharon Michalove (incumbent, eligible for second consecutive term)

Vice-Chair: Dawn Benedetto (incumbent, eligible for second consecutive term)

Secretary: Dianne Batch (incumbent, eligible for second consecutive term)

Treasurer: Wayne Ingalls

Membership Chair: Eileen Prinsen

Ballots will be mailed on or before August 15.

The Nominating Committee members are: Roxane Murph, Mary Miller, and Compton Reeves.

WHEN DID YOU JOIN THE SOCIETY? WITH AN UPDATE

A long-time member recently wrote to ask when he joined the Society. The short answer was: we don’t know. An explanation of our database may help other long-time members understand the situation.

Our database keeps a record, for each member of “Date of Membership”. The year in which a member joined is printed on the annual renewal card label, on the first line.

For members who joined during 1978 or later, this date should be correct. However, I surmise that this date was not kept for members who joined before 1978. The reason for this conjecture is that all members (except one) who joined before 1978 have their “Date of Membership” recorded as 10/2/77.

Any member who knows the exact date he joined and thinks our records are incorrect may contact me to have the records corrected. E-mail or write to Peggy Allen, Membership Chair, 1421 Wisteria Dr., Metairie, LA 70005.

UPDATE: Mrs. Roger M. Crosby II has written in that she joined in March, 1966. At press time, she now holds the record for the longest membership, with Jadzia Tracey a close second (see Ricardian Post). Keep those changes coming in!
Play it again, Sam . . .

This time, our column features some books which have been reviewed before, a few years back. Or books which are a few years old, even though they may not have been reviewed here. Or new books which are part of old, ongoing series. Or, perhaps, new books with old, time-honored plots.

We naturally like what we have been accustomed to. - Maimonides


Under the Hog, (as that title may hint to you) is a zestfully deranged piece of work. Whatever its flaws, it is unquestionably one of the most vivid and original — not to mention frequently hilarious — historical novels I have ever encountered. It reads a bit like something P. G. Wodehouse would write, assuming he had first gone slightly mad from reading too much H.P. Lovecraft and Sir George Buck.

And, yes, I do mean that as a compliment.

As familiar as the history covered in the novel (which ranges from 1470 to 1485) may be to Ricardians, it is given a fresh spin by the novel’s greatest asset, namely Carleton’s talent for creating colorful and multi-dimensional characterizations. (I found his depiction of Anne Neville — who is usually portrayed as an insufferably saintly twit — particularly intriguing.) This alone makes the novel worth reading, even if those characterizations do, admittedly, occasionally lapse into caricature. (Poor Charles of Burgundy! After reading this novel, I will never be able to think of the Bold one without picturing him covered in pimples and with flecks of foam around his lips.)

Under the Hog’s cardinal sin, as far as Ricardians are concerned, is, of course, the author’s view that Richard did, in fact, murder his nephews. (Although, in Carleton’s view, the act was something of a public service.) I agree that this is the novel’s weakest aspect, not only from a purely historical, but from an artistic standpoint. When the reader reaches the page where the murders are revealed, one is shocked, not by the atrocity of the deed (one is more than happy to see the last of the depraved little brat who is Carleton’s Edward V), but by how out-of-place it is. Simply by following the novel’s own internal logic, such an action on Richard’s part does not “fit.” Carleton’s Richard is a man too humane, too coldly logical, too practical, and — most importantly — too intelligent to do something so blitheringly stupid.

In truth, one could argue that Carleton indirectly does Richard a favor, simply by illustrating just how glaringly nonsensical is the idea that he murdered his nephews. I grant you, that is unlikely to have been his intention, but there it is. In any case, this one disappointing flaw in an otherwise witty and perceptive work should not prevent fans of both Richard and historical fiction from investigating this fascinating novel.

— Lisa Lideks, CA


Intertwining the tales of a fictitious monk, Robert Fletcher, and his fall from the faith after the Dissolution of the monasteries, and the story, first told through letters, of Reginald de la Pole, last of the Yorkists, who died as Archbishop of Canterbury under Mary Tudor, this ambitious, thought-provoking novel tells of the tumultuous upheavals that marked the break from Rome, the attempts to restore England to Catholicism and the personal struggles of Fletcher and de la Pole who became friends shortly before the Cardinal’s death.

I had difficulty liking Fletcher, but I enjoyed the letters and de la Pole, who had to suffer through the execution of his family due to his refusal to approve of Henry VIII’s divorce. He also had to suffer the guilt from the blame he placed upon himself for their deaths. I also enjoyed his discussions with Fletcher as the former monk struggles to understand faith and truth.

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


This children's novel is the true story of Red Hugh O'Donnell who lived in Ireland in the later 16th century and who at 15 was captured by the English and imprisoned in Dublin castle. The book is mainly concerned with that time and his two escape attempts. There is also the story of Hugh and Kathleen, the daughter of the Chieftain of the MacSweeney clan where Hugh had been fostered as a child.

I liked the way things were described. The suspense was kept up. I am not entirely sure I really liked Hugh since he had an anger management problem, but at other times he was brave, resourceful, loyal, and most human of all, flustered in the presence of his beloved Kathleen, and loving to his parents. His mother, the Dark Lady, Ineen Duive, intrigued me.

I read this story to my oldest nephew, age 8, over a period of 3 days, and he really enjoyed it. His comments follow: "Battle was pretty interesting and exciting. Never knew who was going to win. I recommend the book. He's really neat."

And from my oldest niece, age 6 1/2, who heard some of it: "I think the story was neat and exciting. He was captured once and another time too. He went to a Fair. Hugh loved Kathleen. She was his childhood sweetheart. When he was captured, he was there for three years. Hugh wanted Kathleen to be queen, then bad guys took him away on a ship to the city of Dublin."

— Anne Marie Gazzolo, IL

And thrice he routed all his foes, And thrice he slew the slain. - John Dryden

ADDIE’S KNIGHT- Ginny Reyes, Jove Books, NY, 1999

Adelaide Shaw, a Victorian spinster schoolteacher with a fey younger sister, falls through an oak tree and lands in a wood in 1485, during a battle between Robert Swynton, a knight loyal to King Richard, and his enemies, the Morlands, whose allegiance is Lancastrian. The plot is as melodramatic as is much of the dialogue. “Unhand me, you cad!”

Addie and Robert fall in love and marry. The sexuality is tender rather than titillating. Two days before Bosworth, Addie, having the knowledge of the future, takes an unwilling Robert back to 1885, thus robbing Richard of several loyal fighting men. There they resolve their problems and supposedly live happily ever after.

No bird has ever uttered note That was not in some first bird’s throat; Since Eden’s freshness and man’s fall No rose has been original. - Thomas Bailey Aldrich

THE WIZARD’S SHADOW - Susan Dexter, Ballentine Books, NY, 1995

Croken, the peddler, is captured by the shadow of a dead wizard. Definitely not the sort of stuff that usually appeals to me. But I was told that the book was about Richard. By the time I decided it was not about Richard, I was so involved with Croken’s predicament that I continued to read. Croken dreams of a small store with living quarters above, and bargains with the shadow for more gold than offered. Croken is a good sort really, with his own brand of honor. His solution is very insecure. He is unsure of the shadow’s power and its mode is ominous. The blame for whatever evil the shadow does must fall on him since he is the only one to be seen. The shadow attaches itself to him and forces him to take it to Armyn to meet Rhisiart, who betrayed the wizard.

Rhisiart (or Richard) of the house of the Falcon, the Steward-Protector of Armyn, finally appears in Chapter 12. He is more self-controlled than I imagine Richard was, not being given to outbursts of Plantagenet temper. He toils ceaselessly protecting the country for his nephew, a spoiled, cruel, venomous young man, educated by his maternal uncle, Lord Stiles, and bearing a stronger resemblance to his vain, greedy, icily beautiful mother than to his dead father, Rhisiart’s elder brother. Croken meets Mistress Ivy, who possesses strange powers and dreams in prophecy. She seems kind but . . . She is handmaiden to the exquisite but enigmatic Princess Mirrell of Calandra, the betrothed of the young prince, who has vowed not to speak until she finishes an intricately embroidered shirt, speaking instead through Ivy.

The story is basically Richard’s, transformed by magic. Croken is a worthy hero. The style is enchanting (Sorry about that.) The descriptions are clear and very vivid. The reader feels all Croken’s fears and pain. The atmosphere is clearly medieval and if there are anachronisms — well, magic abounds. Part fairy tale, part morality play, the book leaves the promise of a happy ending for all the survivors, and a smile on the reader’s face.

— Dale Summers, TX
Freud would explain the whole book as the fantasy of a sexually repressed young woman with too many responsibilities. She creates a knight, a perfect knight, to rescue her.

Richard III does not appear. The only clue to his character is that the good guys are for him and the bad guys are against him.

This is a romantic bit of fluffy fantasy, good for light entertainment.

— Dale Summers, TX

For it is precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little, there a little. - Isaiah 28:10


This is a book Ricardians can love to hate. A widely respected historian who specializes in 15th century northern England, A. J. Pollard has the influence to lead us down almost any garden path. His knowledge of the field is awesome, and certainly he has done his homework. He has read widely in the standard Richard III sources and scholarly articles, including many published in the Ricardian. Yet Richard III and the Princes in the Tower is not trustworthy, and the reason goes beyond Pollard’s general lack of sympathy for the king.

The book’s central problem, for Ricardians and non-Ricardians alike, lies in what Pollard does—and fails to do—with what he knows. While other scholars, such as Charles Ross, Michael Hicks, and Alison Hanham (all of whom could be called anti-Ricardians) explain the bases of their conclusions, Pollard tends to lecture in a lofty moralizing tone. This is irritating, but far worse, he blithely dismisses conditions and situations in which even other anti-Ricardians allow Richard III some benefit of a doubt.

In other words, Pollard discounts crucial elements in the king’s story. He disregards the Woodville threat out of hand, remarking that had they been a real danger, they would never have collapsed so quickly before Richard’s presumptive action at Stony Stratford. Nor does Pollard consider the power they would have wielded had the prince been crowned under their tutelage, much less the danger they would ever afterwards have posed to Richard personally, and to his son.

Once having dismissed the Woodvilles, Pollard has no qualms about discounting Richard’s claim of a Woodville-Hastings plot. He argues that since Elizabeth Woodville was in sanctuary, she could never have conspired with Lord Hastings against the protector. A few pages later, though, Pollard relates how the queen plotted, still from sanctuary, with Margaret Beaufort regarding the marriage of Elizabeth of York to Henry Tudor. Similarly, Pollard makes hash of Bishop Stillington’s report of the precontract for a flimsy reason: Mancini wrote two different versions about the illegitimacy charge. Are we to believe that because a foreign historian (who did not speak English) was confused, Bishop Stillington was lying? Without the precontract, of course, the illegitimacy issue collapses.

Pollard also dismisses the Titulus Regius as propaganda intended, first, to justify Richard’s claim to the throne; and, second, to contrast the “moral and political corruption of the previous regime with his own matchless virtues.” Only a little knowledge about Edward IV’s reign, however, can make the Titulus look very different. Pollard needed to consider some well-known facts in relation to each other. In his biography of Edward, Charles Ross describes a lawless England with frequent violent—and unpunished—crimes, many committed against commoners by the king’s own aristocratic supporters. Given this information, the Titulus seems less a deliberate slur of Richard’s predecessor and enemies, and more a promise to try to improve things, particularly for the ordinary people.

With regard to the central subject of Richard and the princes, Pollard is more careful. He is willing to consider other candidates for the (assumed) crime and fingers Henry VII as the “only plausible alternative” to Richard. Moreover, he agrees that the Westminster bones need testing with forensic methods developed since 1933 and denies their value, commenting that “essentially the bones are a red herring [and] . . . cannot settle the question of whether Richard III murdered the princes.” Ricardians could hardly disagree.

Admitting that proof is lacking either way, Pollard then goes out on a frail limb and contradicts himself to boot. He bases his acceptance of Richard’s guilt on the “weight of contemporary opinion and believe,” which he calls “an impressive array of evidence.” This, even though he has admitted that hearsay, gossip, and rumor prove nothing. He needed to go one step farther; hearsay, gossip, and rumor are not evidence of anything, except what some people in some parts of England thought at the time. A contemporary comparison might be drawn with the tabloid press. How much of these “news” stories should future historians consider valid evidence about our times?

Despite his generally negative assessment of Richard, Pollard at times offers original, highly imaginative interpretations of certain issues. For example, he gives a truly convincing reason why the accusations against the king were accepted so readily: they fit a...
cultural stereotype already widespread throughout Europe, the mythical figure of the uncle who coveted his ward’s inheritance. Thus, instead of the model for wicked uncle stories, as other writers have claimed, Richard was the victim of a congruence of social myth with an actual event, the disappearance of the princes.

Like even Richard’s worst detractors, Pollard acknowledges the king’s intelligence, physical courage, and power to inspire loyalty and personal affection. But what he gives in one sentence, he takes away in the next. He acknowledges Richard’s administrative talents, such as business ability and fiscal responsibility, but refuses to credit the king with desiring justice for commoners. All those cases from Gloucester’s 12-year administration in the north were, Pollard claims, nothing more than part of a long-term scheme to build a good reputation.

Overall, Pollard’s depiction of the king avoids the old evil–Richard myth, but fails to keep the promise (on page 5) of objectivity and balance. When he warns that his view “is coloured by the common literary heritage,” Pollard is admitting that he has never managed (if he ever attempted) to free his mind from authority and tradition, specifically from Shakespeare’s Richard III. Pollard also confesses to personal prejudice: “Given the nature of the topic, it is hard to [be both objective and dispassionate] in practice.” Assuming that “the topic” is the murder of children, this statement, by its nature, assumes Richard’s guilt and alerts the reader that Pollard’s mind was made up before he investigated any of the sources. Despite awareness of his own attitudes and emotions, he appears to make little, if any, effort to compensate.

Nor is his appeal to probability acceptable as a way to assess the king’s innocence or guilt. Judging the possible actions of an individual by what nine out of ten other people might have done is weak logic and worse historical interpretation. Statistical methods can work quite well with groups, the larger the better. But any one person is as likely to be an aberration as representative of the average or norm.

Nonetheless, the book is worth owning for the number and the beauty of its photographs. The text must be read with close attention and a generous serving of salt. The pictures may be enjoyed without reservation!

— Elizabeth Enstam, TX

There is much difference between imitating a good man, and counterfeiting him. - Ben Franklin

RICHARD OF ENGLAND - Diana Kleyn, The Kensal Press, Great Britain, 1990

In considering the mystery of the “Casket Letters” of Mary Queen of Scots, it has always struck me as simply the most common sense solution to assume that the controversial missives were truly Mary’s writings. Similarly, I have always believed that the simplest and most obvious explanation for the enigmatic young man known as “Perkin Warbeck” was that he was who he claimed to be: Richard, Duke of York, the younger of the two “Princes in the Tower.”

Incredibly, this possibility has been alternatively ridiculed and ignored by historians. Diana Kleyn’s Richard of England is an important work, simply because she has the courage to take a more open-minded approach, point out that the surviving evidence, muddled and incomplete as it is, leads one to a belief in his professed identity. And, furthermore, that all the leading figures of the time, including Henry VII, also believed it.

The notion that the rightful King of England was deliberately murdered by his utterly undeserving rival is obviously a deeply disturbing one that strikes at the very core of the legitimacy of the British monarchy. This, I suspect, is why historians refuse to look at “Warbeck” as anything but a fraud. They simply do not wish to believe anything else. (I feel that this is also why the myth of Richard III’s villainy is so persistent. No one likes to think that the bad guys won.)

Kleyn’s book does a fine job of presenting what little has been revealed about “Warbeck’s” life, sorting the truth from the Tudor misinformation campaigns as clearly as possible.

One argument she forgets to make, however, comes when she refutes the claims that “Warbeck’s” undeniable lack of martial spirit and hesitancy over invading England proves that he could not be a true Plantagenet. She counters this by citing the notoriously ineffectual Plantagenet kings Edward II, Richard II, and Henry VI. To my mind, an even more telling rebuttal is to point out that if disgruntled Yorkists were to foist a fake claimant on the world, wouldn’t they obviously use an experienced fighter, a warrior, a ruthless go-getter who would stop at nothing to get the crown? If “Warbeck” were an impostor, his audacity would have to be incredible. Why did he never seem to show any of that quality?

Besides, if Henry VII’s enemies wished to produce a rival claimant, why would they have to invent one? England was packed to the rafters with potential Yorkist heirs (until, of course, the Tudors, in that charming way of theirs, succeeded in massacring them all.) Why not groom one of them to replace Henry?

Barring the discovery of now unknown evidence, we will likely never know for sure what the truth was about that poor man, but whoever he may have been, “Richard of England” makes depressing reading. Fraud or no, “Warbeck” seems to have been a
thoroughly decent and likable young man, deeply in love with his beautiful Scottish wife, who hardly deserved his dreadful fate. The only faintly satisfying note in this book comes at the end, where it is reported that after the execution of “Warbeck” and the Earl of Warwick, Henry VII seemed to age twenty years in the span of a few weeks. It is to be hoped that, with the ghosts of those two young men facing him on one side, and on the other side, the memory of seeing Richard III, battle-ax in hand, charging towards him at Bosworth, Henry never had a good night’s sleep in his life.

— Lisa Lideks, CA

Round up the usual suspects. - Casablanca

**THE REEVE’S TALE** - Margaret Frazer,
Berkeley Publishing Group, NY, 1999

For a cloistered nun, our Dame Frevisse gets around. In this mystery, she is deputized to take the place of the convent’s reeve in a nearby village, where she sits with the manor’s own reeve, Simon Perryn, to settle various matters of local business, and to settle whether the man she is filling in for is freeborn, and thus qualified for his post, or not. A local man has been found dead close to another village, which makes him the other village’s problem. Then murder strikes closer to home . . .

Frazer is adept, not only in catching the spirit of these precursors of the New England Town Meeting, but in delineating the men and women who attended them as individuals, every bit as much as Bishop Beaufort and the other great lords and ladies Frevisse has rubbed shoulders with. And she can make the somewhat prickly sister seem at home among her village compatriots, no mean feat. An excellent addition to the series.

— m.s.

**THE MAIDEN AND THE UNICORN** -
Isolde Martyn, Bantam Books, NY 1998

Written by a member of the Australian Richard III Society, this novel has its setting in the Earl of Warwick’s court-in-exile during 1470-71, and concerns Margery, whose parentage and reputation are both a bit shady, and Robert Huddleston, King’s Receiver, whose loyalty is in question. The happy couple, naturally, jump to conclusions about each other. One of her parents is very exalted, and her scarlet reputation is actually snow-white. And on the other side, she simply mishears the name of her suitor. Nevertheless, they are married, and live happily ever after, but not directly ever after. Their situation is fraught (what is the present tense of which fraught is the past perfect? I’ve often wondered.) with danger, and many adventures are to be passed. A pleasant summertime read.

— m.s.

[Ed. Note: Isolde writes that she has a second novel out, set in the reign of King Edward II about a medieval divorce case (a real one) but Bantam US wanted too many changes so it is not out in USA. The Maiden and the Unicorn has been nominated by Romance Writers of America for Best First Novel 2000 and by Romantic Times as Best Historical Novel 2000.]

**THE DIFFICULT SAINT** -

The title does not refer to the heroine of this series of mysteries, Catherine LeVendeur, although she would make a difficult and unlikely saint indeed. Catherine, her husband Edgar, her children, her father Hubert, and her cousin Solomon are off to Germany on a mission of mercy, or rather of necessity, to help Catherine’s estranged sister Agnes, who is not the saint either. Instead, this refers to Agnes’ husband, Gerheardt, a man of infinite patience and kindness, beloved by everybody – except Agnes, who is accused of poisoning him. The mystery is as much Why as How, but never fear, Catherine will get to the bottom of it. Along the way, she will encounter a new acquaintanceship with heresy, so-called. Newman does not put 20th century attitudes of tolerance — often the tolerance of indifference — into 12th century minds, but Catherine and Edgar, at least, are progressive denizens of the 12th century, and we can even understand the thought processes and emotions of the anti-Semitic Agnes. Thoughtful, but entertaining as well.

— m.s.

A serious writer is not to be confounded with a solemn writer. A serious writer may be a hawk or a buzzard or even a popinjay, but a solemn writer is always a bloody owl.

- Earnest Hemingway

**THE POPINJAYS** - Geoffrey Richardson,

Geoffrey Richardson defines “popinjay” three ways:
1. A person given to vain displays and empty chatter.
2. A coxcomb.
3. A type of vanity or empty conceit.

According to my dictionary, it is also an obsolete word for a parrot. The bird which appears on the cover of this handsomely made trade paperback, surrounded by portraits of various Woodvilles, although it is probably a falcon, could be a parrot. Certainly, many of the Woodvilles were birds of gaudy plumage, as well as answering to the other descriptions.

Richardson gives his sources for this history of the Woodville family only in general terms. This in itself is not necessarily a bad thing, for he is writing for the general public and not scholars. But it does make it difficult for the less-informed reader to differentiate between what is generally accepted fact, minority opinion, or the author’s own speculation, however soundly based. In order to distinguish among these, one would have to consult his other 15th-century popular histories: The Hollow Crowns, The Deceivers, and The Lordly Ones.

On the other hand, writing for the general public means that he writes like a human being, and even with wit and perception. For example, he characterizes Charles Brandon — a Woodville in-law — as “cast in the same mold as one of the forgotten forebears of the royal Tudors, Richard Woodville . . . big, handsome, not very bright, and . . . raised by sheer good fortune . . .”

The Woodvilles were certainly prolific (15 brothers and sisters, though a couple of them died young), and none of them in fact lived very long. Queen Elizabeth Woodville outlived all of her siblings except her younger sister Katherine, who died in 1512. Mr. Richardson brings to our consideration some people we might not have thought of as being associated with the family, e.g. Lady Jane Grey — though she was a typical Woodville only in her star-tossed life.

At $6.99, (whatever the rate of exchange is at the moment) this is a worthy addition to any Ricardian library.

— m.s.

Editor’s Note: Jacobyte Books announces the reissue of Geoffrey Richardson’s well-known work The Hollow Crowns as an electronic book. You may buy it at www.jacobytebooks.com. The Hollow Crowns is a highly readable guide to the battles of the Wars of the Roses, and includes battle maps and diagrams. In the Appendix, Geoffrey puts forward his theory about who killed the Princes in the Tower. Jacobyte Books are keen to build a strong history list, both fiction and non-fiction, and welcome submissions and suggestions about out-of-print or self-published history books they can reissue as e-books.

Finally, a few words from two great wits of the Western world:

Oscar Wilde: I wish I’d said that!
James McNeill Whistler: You will, Oscar, you will.

Don’t just wish you’d said it — say it! Look through your own Ricardian library — or someone else’s. Reread an old favorite, or share a new experience with us. A good book can’t have too many good reviews, and a bad one should be well-posted with warnings.

Scattered Standards

Arizona Chapter

Two 2-hour sessions were used to present Richard III’s history and defense in the case of the Princes in the Tower, at Rio Salado Community College’s Institute of Senior Education (R.I.S.E.), last March 15 and 22nd. The senior students were set up as a jury, and 33 found Richard innocent, and 2 found him guilty. The instructor, Richard III Society member, Willi Waltrip was very glad of the turn out and the vote as she was concerned that she might be so slanted in Richard’s favor, that she would do a poor job of presenting the other side. Apparently not, as she was requested to present the class again in Oct. 2000, but this time she will be joined by Dr. John Heljin who will present the Lancasteran side. They decided to extend the class to three sessions rather than two, so they may present more details in their debate.

Students will also enjoy another medieval event at R.I.S.E. this fall when Willi will present a popular interpretation of “1066” which will cumulating in a discussion and vote on William the Conqueror’s motivations.

If anyone is interested in more class details they may e-mail Willi Waltrip: goodoldgal@aol.com
Days of Grace at Middleham

Just as many members of the Society have fought to use scholarship and research to redress the balance of history, so we are seeing comparable efforts in the arts to revise the two-dimensional and cartoon-like, villainous representation of Richard III in the public mind. Thus on a recent visit to San Francisco I had the opportunity to see a playwright and a director use the instrument of five actors to present a new and hopefully more veridical view on the life and actions of the one-time Duke of Gloucester. Located well away from the central theater district, the studio production gave a remarkably competent and energetic presentation of Toni Press-Coffman's play Two Days of Grace at Middleham. Triggered by the playwrights own experiences of Bosworth, the piece successfully weaves the contemporary actions of two modern characters into the Ricardian tale. They, a part of Richard’s future visions and he dominant in their nightmare-laden dreams, early scenes are redolent with adroit barbs at the Shakespearean poetic caricature. ‘Who ever determines themselves to be a villain?’ the King enquires and rightfully his wife answers — no one of course.

The opening scene shows one of the modern characters in a ruined Middleham Castle, racked by dreams of the Richard’s reign while at virtually the same time, Richard himself is shown reclaiming Anne Neville, his future wife from the position of a servant, in which his brother George has sought to hide her. Typical of the character we see develop, Richard seeks to justify his brother’s action even while he recognizes the motivations behind it.

Much of the historical commentary takes the form of conversation between Richard, Anne, and Francis Lovell, portrayed as friends and companions since early childhood. The text of the modern era is overlaid and promised at first to be problematic, being an unlikely meeting between the nightmare haunted young Englishman and the history-enthralled NFL Linebacker! This latter meeting might well have slipped from the dramatic through the comic to the pathetic. However, in the performance I saw the combinations worked on all levels, not the least because of the accomplishment of the actors portraying the modern characters and the way in which the hopes and aspirations of the Ricardian and the modern world were interwoven. Richard is the only one who can see these ‘future’ shades and some of the conversational cross-references that result were well timed and indeed apposite. That the dream-haunted young man is violently opposed to Richard while the Linebacker is pro-Ricardian is an effective plot device but was, in my view, not exploited sufficiently to allow what could have been significant argumentative development of controversial points of contention.

Perhaps the most enjoyable of scenes showed four brothers, in order Edward IV, Edmund, George and Richard all now dead, arguing about their lives and actions. Walking a fine line between the dramatic and the comedic, the scene worked well in helping distinguish Richard’s motivations, especially his filial affections and the commitment to duty. Clarence’s dry observation about Richard’s motto being a peculiarly poignant utterance. In largely chronological order, but with flashbacks and leaps forward between modern and medieval times, the story proceeds, absolving Richard from any role or collusion in each of his brothers death’s. Indeed, in the scene of the four brothers Richard is surprised to learn that Edward
had George poisoned and receives considerable ribbing from his brothers for his ‘butt of Malmsey wine’ theory! In a production of this size, narrative is often constrained to replace action and we are told of Edward’s death and Richard’s response in conversations between Richard, Anne and Francis Lovell. Francis always points to practical necessity and political expediency, Anne always concerned with her home, her husband and her family. Again through narrative conversation, Buckingham’s joining with Richard is seen as the action of a fair weather friend and this time Francis complains of the alliance (what is wrong with his existing friends?). In a turnaround Anne is heard to comment; what can he do, go to face Rivers and his 2000 men alone?

Events progress apace and we are invited to believe that Richard’s dispatch of Lord Hastings (arguably the pivotal event of the whole Ricardian story) is the result of Hastings suspicions that Richard intended to usurp the throne from the time of the death of his brother. I must say I found this the weakest point of the production from an historical viewpoint, although it is only one of a number of events mentioned quickly in passing from a performance perspective. It does however, provide a transition as events move from Middleham to the Tower of London in both time frames. Seen as a whining Woodville, the fear of the new boy king Edward V is palpable and following Richard’s coronation (founded upon Stillington’s evidence of Edward’s previous engagement) Francis Lovell constantly argues of the danger to the Realm, to Richard, and to his family due to the still living nephews in the Tower. Richard does not order their deaths but like Pilate is guilty of passive collusion as Lovell is told to do what must be done for the safety of the realm. The sufferings of the modern youth now become explicit as he is identified with Richard Duke of York, the younger of the two boys in the Tower.

While not pleasing some Ricardians, dramatically I was glad that Richard here was not consigned to a cardboard anti-thesis of Shakespeare’s mon(arch)manical, serial killer. Whilst not personally believing in this scenario, the playwright has Richard wracked by conscience and when his own son dies he sees this as evidence of a divine retribution. This realization comes to Anne as she quizzes Richard on the fate of his nephews and we attach her subsequent death to Richard’s direct failure to provide a satisfactory account of their fate. Again, Anne’s (and his son’s) death are now used as motivation for Richard’s roll of the dice in the form of the last charge down Ambion Hill and in the scene most reminiscent of Shakespeare we see the brave actions of the last Plantagenet King (so contrastive of the actions of Henry VII during the same battle) crying ‘treason’ and dying in the very press of his enemies.

The scene which follows shows a reconciliation between the now dead King and his dead nephew and this is employed as a dramatic vehicle to exorcise the nightmare’s of the modern character now firmly linked with the one time child Duke of York. Freed from this burden, the young man now reaches a romantic conclusion with his budding intellectually linebacker mentor. The fact that the actor who plays the Linebacker has also portrayed Edward IV throughout the play is distracting as the modern action ends with the two in a sensual embrace. The final scene harks back to Richard’s childhood where he has been chided by Francis over his shyness toward Anne. We see Richard screwing up his courage to ask for a kiss. It is a final and momentary glimpse of a good man, a good husband to be and the best of King’s which circumstance will allow.

Despite an audience of only ten people (there were after all only thirty chairs in the studio!) and minor distractions such as the use of Bodiam instead of Middleham on the poster and the constant use of Dickon for Richard, I was enthralled by both content and performance. Having seen other performances at much larger theaters I thought the present actors evidenced a higher degree of talent, especially Megan Towle who handled the maturing of Anne Neville with a confident surety. But pride of place must go to Jonathon Ingbretson as Richard, upon whom the whole tenor of the performance must either stand or fall. I found his presentation sympathetic and highly believable and must expect that as an actor he is destined for much higher things.

Overall, I found the play a welcome exploration of a reality far more probable than the Bard’s offering and in its own small way a candle in the darkest of historical fogs, which used scholarship embedded in entertainment to enlighten.

Dr. Peter Hancock is the Director of the Human Factors Research Laboratory and a Professor In the Departments of Computer Science, Mechanical Engineering, Psychology and Kinesiology at the University of Minnesota. He also holds an appointment as a Research Scientist at MIT. This year, he is the President of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society. A committed Ricardian, his primary interests concern the Battle of Bosworth and the Hastings ‘incident.’
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