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“GLOUCESTER’S DUKEDOM IS TOO OMINOUS”  
PART TWO

This article is continued from the Fall issue of the Register.

When Bedford arrived in England on December 20, 1425, ill-will between Londoners and the chancellor remained strong. Many were dismayed to see Beaufort enter their city with Bedford and his wife on January 10, 1426. At the welcoming ceremonies, Bedford made his support for the chancellor clear: “the handsome presents offered by the city to Bedford did little to assuage the duke’s temper, and he responded with but little thanks.”

Bedford’s arrival automatically demoted Gloucester: as long as Bedford was in England; he—as Henry VI’s elder uncle and heir—replaced Gloucester as protector and defender of realm and church. Gloucester lost not only the title and its limited authority, he lost the annual salary. As long as Bedford remained in England, Gloucester was reduced to the rank of first councilor to the king. This loss of rank and salary put Gloucester at a further disadvantage against Beaufort, whose wealth had raised him to the un titled position of king’s chief creditor.

Bedford’s decision to give the Anglo-Burgundian alliance priority may have contributed to the defeat of the troops Gloucester sent to aid Jacqueline of Hainault. Commanded by Lord Fitzwalter, 1,500 troops sailed for Holland in late December 1425. Surviving documents show that Bedford warned Philip the Good on December 30, 1425. On January 5, 1426, Lord Fitzwalter’s forces arrived in Zeeland. Philip the Good’s troops were prepared for them. On January 6, 1426, Burgundian troops defeated the English and Zeelanders. Many English soldiers died, and Lord Fitzwalter’s body was never recovered. By March 1426, Burgundian troops controlled most of Holland and Zeeland, but Jacqueline of Hainault and her supporters continued to resist.

In England, Gloucester was resisting Bedford and Beaufort’s efforts to resolve the London Bridge confrontation on their terms. Despite the council’s earlier agreement to prevent the chancellor from taking Henry VI into “protective custody,” Gloucester’s support had once again evaporated. Outspoken about his disbelief in a fair resolution, Gloucester boycotted two council meetings on the grounds that he could not receive an impartial judgment from the chancellor’s allies, among which he included Bedford. Appearances validated Gloucester’s claim. In Henry VI’s council Bedford and Beaufort’s combined influence overrode Gloucester’s, and their agenda for parliament prevailed. Henry VI’s council summoned the 1426 parliament to Leicester, where popular discontent with the chancellor was less vociferous. In Leicester, Bedford and Beaufort lodged in adjacent quarters, and they laid the cornerstone of a Brigitine convent together. Bedford’s contribution to Philip the Good’s victory over Jacqueline of Hainault cost Gloucester some parliamentary support; Lord Fitzwalter’s disappearance weakened enthusiasm for further campaigning. Negotiations on retinue size reflected the chancellor’s advantage over Gloucester. Under these circumstances, Gloucester threatened to boycott parliament as well. Henry VI’s council commanded him to attend.

The potential for violence was serious enough for Henry VI’s council to command all members and their supporters to attend meetings un armed. Attendees obeyed the letter, not the spirit, of the command: since “swords, bucklers, bows, and arrows” were banned, they carried staves and “battes,” which hadn’t been classed as weapons. As a result, the 1426 parliament is remembered as The Parliament of Battes.

The need for peace-making was so great that resolution of the Gloucester-Beaufort conflict took priority over all other parliamentary business; even the election of the Speaker was delayed. The Commons petitioned the Lords to resolve the conflict on February 28, 1426, and the Lords stated their intention to restore peace through an impartial arbitration process. On March 7, 1426, Gloucester and Beaufort agreed to arbitration. “A carefully balanced” arbitration panel included the archbishop of Canterbury; the dukes of Exeter and Norfolk; the bishops of Durham, Worcester, and Bath; the earl of Stafford; Lord Cromwell; and the keeper of the privy seal. Despite the chancellor’s advantages over Gloucester, the arbitrators’ decision acknowledged the validity of Gloucester’s case. Since the chancellor and his custodian of the Tower had been insubordinate to Gloucester, the arbitrators ordered the chancellor to acknowledge Gloucester’s lordship before resigning the chancellorship. This was “a bitter blow to Beaufort’s pride. It could not but recall the humiliation inflicted on him by Henry V for his presumption in accepting promotion as a cardinal legate.”

Yet Bedford had protected Beaufort from harsher
punishment: Beaufort’s wealth, lending capabilities, and titles were undiminished, and he soon received a promotion. On March 26, 1426, Martin V made Beaufort cardinal priest of St. Eusebius with Bedford’s approval. “Evidently [Bedford] took a different view from Henry V of the functions and advantages of an English cardinal.” (155)

Bedford considered Beaufort’s political and financial skills more valuable than domestic peace or law enforcement, because evidence that Beaufort’s armed retainers had caused the violence on London Bridge didn’t end Bedford’s alliance with Beaufort. Evidently Beaufort possessed the qualities of teflon and stainless steel, because he evaded the most substantial punishments for the violence he’d provoked, and he advanced himself in the church hierarchy. On May 14, 1426, the new cardinal received permission for another pilgrimage. (156) The Parliament of Battes ended on June 1, 1426, and a period of relative peace followed.

In Gouda, Jacqueline of Hainault continued to lead Dutch resistance to Philip the Good’s invasion. On Feb. 26, 1426, a papal commission had ruled that Jacqueline of Hainault’s separation from Brabant was illegal. Although Amadeus of Savoy was supposed to take custody of Jacqueline of Hainault until Martin V made a final decision, she remained free in Gouda. On April 30, 1426, her supporters defeated Philip the Good’s troops at the second battle of Alphen. Burgundian reinforcements recaptured part of her lands. By October 1426, she controlled only four towns, but her supporters endured. In mid-winter, Philip the Good besieged Zevenbergen. After Fitzwalter’s defeat, Bedford had prevented Gloucester from sending more aid to the countess. In March 1427, she made an effective military alliance with Rudolf von Diepholz, who opposed Philip the Good’s candidate for the see of Utrecht. (157) Together they withstood Philip the Good’s attacks throughout 1427.

In January 1427, Bedford prepared his return to France. Henry VI’s council asked Bedford for a clear definition of limits on the protector’s authority, in hope of preventing new dissensions after his departure. A serious illness prevented Gloucester from taking part in this definition process; during his convalescence, under pressure from the council, he agreed to the limits. Bedford also took an oath to respect them. Bedford, Duchess Anne, and Cardinal Beaufort left England together. On March 7, 1427, in the Church of Our Lady at Calais, Bedford and his wife attended the ceremony in which Martin V confirmed Beaufort’s promotion. On St. Mark’s Day, Gloucester presented a gift at the high altar of St. Albans in thanks for his recovery. (158)

In April 1427, Jacqueline of Hainault’s ambassadors delivered a letter to Henry VI’s council. Written three days before Zevenbergen surrendered, it appealed for relief from “the monstrous outrages, oppressions and injuries, which my cousin of Burgundy has perpetuated against me in the last two years in pursuing me from one of my countries to another in order to disinherit me, and in cruelly spilling the blood of my poor but loyal subjects .... I cannot endure much longer without your help and my husband’s.” (159)

Six days after Zevenbergen’s surrender, on April 17, 1427, Brabant died. Indisputably free from her contentious second marriage, Jacqueline of Hainault should have been recognized as the ruler of Hainault, Holland, and Zeeland. But Philip the Good attended the Estates of Hainault’s meeting and pressured the members into acknowledging him as their governor until their countess renounced her English alliance and husband. On June 24, 1427, the first Burgundian bailiff of Hainault was sworn in. (160)

Despite this defeat, Jacqueline of Hainault’s ally, von Diepholz, remained firm; her ships continued to sail freely in the Zuiderzee, and she continued to send ambassadors to Henry VI’s council. In the parliament of 1427, Gloucester requested 20,000 marks for military aid to his wife. Parliament granted 20,000 marks; but Henry VI’s council authorized only 9,000 marks, of which 4,000 came from Gloucester’s protectorship salary. Besides limiting financial aid, Henry VI’s council restricted military aid: English troops were only allowed to defend the towns still controlled by Jacqueline of Hainault and escort her to safety in England. The limits were intended to prevent Gloucester from ruling in Hainault; there was no intention of upholding Jacqueline of Hainault’s inheritance rights. (161) Henry VI’s council was hoping to satisfy popular opinion and Gloucester by rescuing the countess from Philip the Good without breaking the Anglo-Burgundian alliance.

Popular opinion strongly supported military aid to Jacqueline of Hainault. Some of these supporters were recruited by the earl of Salisbury, who had taken an oath to avenge Philip the Good’s attempt to seduce his wife. Leading the troops for Jacqueline of Hainault’s rescue was a welcome opportunity to keep his oath; but Bedford’s representatives pressured Henry VI’s council into withdrawing Salisbury’s authorization. From Paris, Bedford negotiated a truce with Philip the Good. Jacqueline of Hainault’s continuing appeals were futile; she received no aid from England. (162) If Bedford had not interfered, Philip the Good might “have been forced to sue for peace and to make significant territorial concessions to Jacqueline of Hainault.” (163)
Gloucester’s Dukedom

On January 9, 1428, Martin V declared Jacqueline of Hainault’s marriage to Gloucester invalid. Henry VI’s council cancelled the loans raised for her aid, and Salisbury led his recruits against the French instead of the Burgundians. Philip the Good besieged Gouda, and Jacqueline of Hainault surrendered. After the treaty of Delft was signed on July 3, 1428, Burgundy relentlessly absorbed Jacqueline of Hainault’s inheritance. By 1433, Hainault, Holland and Zeeland were all under Burgundian control. (164)

Gloucester yielded to Martin V’s decision without further protest. Yet the mayor and aldermen of London petitioned parliament to continue support for Jacqueline of Hainault. Despite the pope’s decision, the Londoners’ petition referred to her as “duchess of Gloucester and countess of Holland and Zeeland.” (165) Gloucester failed to support their petition. Bedford and Cardinal Beaufort had sacrificed Jacqueline of Hainault’s inheritance rights and marriage to the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. Martin V had sacrificed his own credibility as well as Jacqueline of Hainault’s rights for increased influence over England and France. (166) Although dispossessed by the interaction of two predatory uncles, a predatory cousin, a colluding brother-in-law, and a vacillating pope, Jacqueline of Hainault didn’t qualify for archetypal victim status. She was too capable, too resilient, too old; and she didn’t disappear.

Later in 1428, Gloucester married Jacqueline of Hainault’s former lady-in-waiting, Eleanor Cobham. This financially and politically unprofitable marriage raises questions: Was Gloucester planning to replace Jacqueline of Hainault with Eleanor Cobham as early as 1425? How many English ladies-in-waiting accompanied Jacqueline of Hainault in October 1424, and how many left her in April 1425? Was Eleanor Cobham the only one? When did Gloucester and Eleanor Cobham become involved with each other? Was Gloucester planning to replace Jacqueline of Hainault when he contributed 4,000 marks of his 1427 protectorship salary to the 9,000 marks authorized for her rescue? Was such deceitfulness characteristic of his other political actions? Could disgust with the political and financial influences behind Martin V’s rulings have driven Gloucester into a hasty remarriage which gave personal considerations priority over political and financial self-interest?

After serious fire damage was repaired, Gloucester and his new wife reoccupied his London residence, Baynard’s Castle. Its location on the Thames embankment made it convenient for barge travel from Westminster to the Tower. (167)

Bedford and Beaufort’s departure had not freed Gloucester from the limits imposed on him, although he had declared he would account for his actions to no one but Henry VI. Gloucester continued to question the authority of Henry VI’s council, and it continued to assert conciliar representation of Henry VI’s authority. Despite this dissention, Gloucester earned a reputation for competent and impartial performance of his judicial and law enforcement duties. Travelling from Norwich to London to Chester for trials of murderers, robbers, and heretics, he was able to restore order in some areas. None of this won him support from Henry VI’s councilors. At the parliament of October 13, 1427, opened by five-year-old Henry VI, Gloucester’s subordination was emphasized so strongly that he made a formal protest, which received no response. (168)

On March 3, 1428, Gloucester made a formal request for increased authority, and he refused to attend parliament until his request was considered. Henry VI’s council and the Lords upheld the limits on Gloucester: they “marveled with all their hearts” that Gloucester was questioning the agreement Bedford and the council had imposed on him during his illness in 1427. (169) Two archbishops, nine bishops, four abbots, one duke, three earls, and eight other lords signed the document reasserting the limits on Gloucester’s authority.

The spiritual and temporal lords insisted on corporate authority in hopes of preventing conflicts and individual abuses until Henry VI was capable of exercising royal authority. Constant references to the ideal of unity were intended to prevent destructive quarrels. (170) Unfortunately, these idealistic statements didn’t control local conflicts as effectively as the councilors controlled Gloucester. Their limits on Gloucester may even have contributed to local conflicts, because Gloucester lacked the authority to perform the protectorship’s responsibilities fully. Although public opinion respected Gloucester’s peace-keeping efforts, some lords refused to cooperate, and Gloucester couldn’t enforce compliance. Despite membership on Henry VI’s council, both the duke of Norfolk and the earl of Huntingdon failed to keep the peace in their own localities. Others followed Norfolk and Huntingdon’s example, and local violence increased in some areas between 1423-1429. (171)

In September 1428, Cardinal Beaufort returned to England. The councilors reacted coolly. They “may have harboured resentment against Bedford and Beaufort,
who, having cultivated Martin V’s favour for their own ends, left England at the point where papal pressure for the repeal of the Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire was intensified.” (172) As Martin V’s agent, Cardinal Beaufort was supposed to negotiate the surrender of the English church’s right to fill its own vacancies. All English spiritual and temporal lords opposed this surrender. Henry VI’s council expressed its opposition by denying Cardinal Beaufort permission to lead the St. George’s Day ceremony at Windsor. (173) This denial was more than symbolic. It demonstrated Englishmen’s refusal to give up traditional rights and independence in return for Martin V’s support for Henry VI’s double monarchy. Parliament had passed the fourteenth century statutes because Englishmen believed that foreign clergymen had neglected their duties and taken English money overseas; fifteenth century Englishmen were determined to prevent a repetition of these abuses. (174)

Cardinal Beaufort had spent little time in Winchester during his tenure as its bishop. As the pope’s representative, retaining the see and its revenues, Beaufort spent even less time in Winchester and more of its revenues advancing his own interests. Although his subordinates may have governed Winchester competently, Cardinal Beaufort’s conflicts of interest exemplified the abuses that the three fourteenth century laws were intended to prevent. Henry VI’s council failed to resolve the cardinal’s conflicts of interest, but it did refuse the pope’s demands to repeal the English laws. (175)

One factor in Henry VI’s council’s failure to curb Cardinal Beaufort was the English government’s need for his loans. Since 1417, Beaufort had been the government’s biggest lender. His financial and political skills enabled him to claim repayment while less gifted lenders waited years for repayment. Defeats in France during 1429 increased the government’s need for the cardinal’s loans. After the siege of Orleans failed, Bedford requested reinforcements from England. Eventually he decided that military action needed reinforcement by Henry VI’s coronation in France, which required Henry VI’s coronation in England first. The expensive double coronation put England’s government even deeper into Cardinal Beaufort’s debt. (176) Not only did the cardinal lend money, he organized Henry VI’s coronation in France.

Gloucester’s appointment as steward of England made him responsible for Henry VI’s English coronation ceremonies. On St. Leonard’s Day, November 6, 1429, the archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by Cardinal Beaufort, crowned seven-year-old Henry VI at Westminster. As he had done at Queen Katherine’s coronation, Gloucester supervised the banquet. Cardinal Beaufort sat at Henry VI’s right hand. (177)

On November 15, 1429, Gloucester resigned the protectorship. (178) In theory, Henry VI was now exercising royal authority for himself. But Bedford continued to exercise regency authority in France; and Henry VI’s council invited Cardinal Beaufort to rejoin, despite his continuing conflicts of interest. These conflicts were acknowledged, but not resolved, by excluding the cardinal from official discussions of Anglo-Papal affairs. The cardinal’s diplomatic skills extended the Anglo-Burgundian alliance, which was threatened by French victories over Burgundy and a pro-French faction developing within Philip the Good’s council. Despite a serious drop in trade revenues, the cardinal negotiated himself a 4,000 pound salary for organizing Henry VI’s French coronation. (179)

Gloucester’s salary as Henry VI’s lieutenant in England was less generous than Cardinal Beaufort’s: he received only 4,000 marks per year during Henry VI’s journey to France, and an untrustworthy promise of reimbursement for unanticipated expenses. As warden of the Cinque Ports, Gloucester was responsible for organizing the ships that carried Henry VI and his retinue across the narrow seas. Gloucester accompanied the coronation retinue to Canterbury, where they celebrated Easter. At Canterbury, Gloucester received a commission granting him authority as constrained as his protectorship authority had been. On April 24, 1430, Henry VI and his retinue sailed for Calais. The remainder of 1430 passed quietly for Gloucester; Cardinal Beaufort’s absence was accompanied by a noteworthy decline in friction. (180)

Henry VI’s arrival in France ended Bedford’s regency just as his coronation had ended Gloucester’s protectorship. A great council, using the great seal of France, authorized payments and official appointments. Cardinal Beaufort became president of this great council, displacing Bedford as the most powerful member of Henry VI’s government in France. While the cardinal took precedence in the great council, Bedford was relegated to command of military defense. The cardinal’s financial and diplomatic skills strengthened his influence in the French council as they had in the English council: during a brief return to England, he convinced the Parliament of 1431 to grant high taxes for support of the Lancastrian government in France; after Henry VI’s household overspent its income, he lent 2,815 pounds to pay its overseas expenses. (181)

Henry VI’s government was as seriously in debt as his household. From December 1430 to April 1431, the exchequer recorded 46,000 pounds worth of loans, which considerably exceeded the total lent for Henry V’s campaigns. The cardinal’s indispensability seemed to increase along with the rise in government debt, but opposition to his growing influence was developing. Gloucester
obj ected to paying the costs of the Lancastrian govern ment in France with English revenues, and other counsel ors in England agreed. Not only did they limit the English army’s funding to six months’ salary, they as serted that Englishmen in France would have to pay their future expenses from French revenues. On May 1, 1431, the cardinal returned to France. (182)

While attending parliament, Gloucester was also quelling Lollard violence, which emerged during Henry VI’s absence. Lollards were advocating a social revolution that combined abolition of monarchy and church hierarchy with the redistribution of wealth. In March 1431, co ordinated uprisings spread from London to Coventry, Oxford, Salisbury, Northampton and Frome. Within six months, Lollard leaders were captured, tried, and exe cuted. Gloucester’s effective restoration of order en hanced his reputation, even among his critics. Again Gloucester proved himself both competent and fair in the performance of his responsibilities. (183)

In Lancastrian France, friction between Bedford and Cardinal Beaufort culminated in a bitter quarrel. Al though Bedford had agreed to limits on Gloucester’s au thority in England, he was unwilling to accept the limits imposed on him by the cardinal and great council of Lancastrian France. Like Gloucester, Bedford objected when the principle of conciliar exercise of Henry VI’s au thority was applied to him. On October 12, 1431, Bed ford received a commission to govern Lancastrian France in Henry VI’s absence; he protested that this commission dis regarded his right to be regent, and he claimed the title of governor as well. Bedford was claiming in principle the civil and military authority which he’d been exercising in practice since 1422. Forced to compromise, he seems to have recognized a new cause in common with Gloucester. The timing of Gloucester’s legal proceedings against Cardinal Beaufort may have been affected by Bedford’s quarrel with the cardinal. (184)

On November 6, 1431, the king’s sergeants and attor neys presented two questions for the English council’s consider ation:

- shouldn’t Cardinal Beaufort have given up the office and revenues of the see of Winchester, and shouldn’t he repay the money he’d taken since his 1427 ordina tion as cardinal?
- did Cardinal Beaufort break the Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire when he accepted the pope’s exemption from the archbishop of Canterbury’s jurisdiction? Beaufort had reimbursed Catterick. At the time Catterick paid for this exemption, the bishop of Worcester and Catterick were both working at the papal court. (185) Most councilors reacted to this testimony by recommending more legal research. De spite their resentment of Cardinal Beaufort’s actions, the bishops on the council were reluctant to renew conflict with Martin V and his special agent. Although the coun cil ordered preparation of writs against Cardinal Beaufort on November 20, 1431, they delayed execution of the writs until the cardinal returned from France. (186)

Gloucester’s legal proceedings didn’t interfere with the cardinal’s plans for Henry VI’s Paris coronation. Em phasizing “the legitimacy and authority of the double mon archy,” the ceremonies cast Cardinal Beaufort in a leading role. (187) “To the great displeasure of the bishop of Paris,” Cardinal Beaufort performed mass and crowned Henry VI at Notre Dame on December 16, 1431. (188) The legitimate and authoritative Lancastrian government showed little concern for its French subjects. A dis appointed Parisian reported that their new king failed to pardon prisoners or relieve tax burdens. Merchants and craftsmen made little money from the coronation cere monies, and Henry VI’s French government failed to alle viate inflation or food and fuel shortages. (189)

Despite nine years of concessions to its Burgundian ally, the Lancastrian government in France had to crown Henry VI without the duke of Burgundy. After making two truces with Charles VII, Philip the Good avoided doing homage to Henry VI by staying away from his cor onation. Cardinal Beaufort used a similar ploy to evade the writs awaiting him in England. He stayed in Calais and sent for his portable wealth. Claiming that the new pope, Eugenius IV, had summoned him, Cardinal Beaufort obtained permission to go to Rome. But he didn’t obtain a license to ship four chests containing 20,000 pounds worth of coin, golden ewers, cups, chalices, candlesticks, cruets, and salvers from Sandwich to himself in Calais. On his way to meet Henry VI at Dover, Gloucester was informed that an illegal shipment had been intercepted at Sandwich. On February 6, 1432, he confiscated Cardinal Beaufort’s portable wealth. Soon after Henry VI landed at Dover, on February 9, 1432, the writs against Cardinal Beaufort were issued. Despite Philip the Good’s absence from Henry VI’s coronation, Cardinal Beaufort served as godfather to his second child. From mid-February to mid-May, he was Philip the Good’s guest in Ghent. (190)

After London welcomed Henry VI on February 21, 1432, Gloucester and Henry VI’s council replaced some of Cardinal Beaufort’s supporters with more neutral offi cials. Bedford’s observations during Henry VI’s
coronation visit may have aroused misgivings about Henry VI’s pliability; members of Henry VI’s household were also replaced. Neither the personnel replacements nor the discovery of his smuggling attempt defeated Cardinal Beaufort when he returned to face charges in May 1432. By July 3, 1432, he had negotiated a pardon for violating the Statutes of Provisors and Praemuniere, plus the return of all but 6,000 marks worth of his smuggled gold. (191)

If the cardinal had been held accountable for the laws he’d broken, Henry VI’s government could have redirected over 45,000 pounds into debt repayment and support for Bedford’s military campaigns. But this teflon and stainless steel cardinal somehow convinced Henry VI’s most influential decision-makers that he and his loans were indispensable. Despite his resentment and misgivings, Bedford withdrew his support for Gloucester’s valid charges against Beaufort. Parliament and Henry VI’s council also gave the cardinal’s potential loans and diplomatic services priority over law enforcement. As a result, Henry Beaufort became the first to retain the offices and revenues of an English see after becoming cardinal. This unprecedented position and wealth enabled him to maintain a stranglehold on government finances and policy for another eleven years. (192)

The expense of Henry VI’s Paris coronation combined with declining revenues to produce a financial crisis. Bedford’s 1433 request for troops could not be funded. At Easter 1433, England’s treasurer, Lord Scrope, informed Henry VI’s council that the exchequer’s credit was exhausted. (193) Gloucester and Bedford disagreed over defense priorities: Bedford gave Normandy priority over Calais; Gloucester, influenced by concern for merchants throughout England, gave Calais priority. English troops in Gascony also required payment, but the government’s bankruptcy made it impossible to defend all three areas. Tensions among council members increased. (194)

The conflict over funding priorities was adversely influenced by Bedford’s remarriage. In November 1432, the duchess of Bedford, Philip the Good’s sister, had died. Her death alone would have weakened the Anglo-Burgundian alliance; but Bedford’s hasty remarriage to Jacquetta of Luxembourg—whose family was at odds with Philip the Good—caused extra strain. On April 20, 1433, Bedford married Jacquetta of Luxembourg at the bishop’s palace in Therouanne, Picardy. (195)

From Therouanne, Bedford went to Calais, where he had recently imprisoned soldiers for protesting unpaid wages. Gloucester and a group of Lancastrian officials arrived to negotiate a distribution of limited resources among Normandy, Calais, and Gascony. These meetings continued into May. Gloucester returned to England on May 23, 1433. Cardinal Beaufort, who remained on good terms with Philip the Good, tried to reconcile him with Bedford. But a proposed meeting at St. Omer didn’t take place. (196) Bedford was so angry about his failure to obtain as much as he wanted for Normandy that he overreacted against the Calais protesters. He had four of them executed and banished 230, which didn’t improve his ability to defend Normandy. The resulting resentment toward Bedford exacerbated Calais’ problems. The 1433 Parliament was concerned enough to restore wages, lands, and rents which Bedford had taken from soldiers who weren’t banished. (197)

On June 23, 1433, Bedford and Jacquetta of Luxembourg arrived in England. Bedford had returned to extract more funding for Normandy. His revived alliance with the cardinal displaced Gloucester again, and many officials appointed in 1432 were replaced. Bedford obtained more than a funding increase for Normandy. After accepting parliament’s request to govern England in addition to Lancastrian France, Bedford requested authority to approve the appointments of secular and church officials and summon parliaments. (198) Parliament then granted Bedford authority which had always been denied Gloucester, violating the often-stated principle that royal authority must be exercised by a unified council when the king wasn’t able to exercise it. (199) Between December 1433 and June 1434, Bedford’s authority took precedence over conciliar authority. Behind the scenes, Cardinal Beaufort’s financial and political influence permeated government actions.

Bedford and Beaufort’s government faced unprecedented debts. Trade conflicts and sheep disease had caused a devastating reduction in the government’s wool revenues. This shortfall combined with the government’s past debts to bankrupt the exchequer again. Conditions were serious enough for Bedford and the cardinal to arrange for Henry VI and his household to live at the expense of Bury St. Edmund’s monastery between Christmas 1433 and St. George’s Day 1434. (200) A second money-saving measure cut the Calais garrison’s funding from 8,000 pounds to 540 pounds for the next year; this cutback was consistent with Bedford’s priorities, which subordinated Calais’ and Gascony’s needs to Normandy’s. (201)

Cutbacks in Calais’ funding troubled English merchants, as well as Gloucester. Their loans to the government were repaid less promptly than Cardinal Beaufort’s, and they saw fewer benefits from Bedford’s campaign in Normandy than from a well-paid Calais garrison. Merchants’ discontent with Bedford’s emphasis on Normandy may have encouraged Gloucester to volunteer to lead 7,000 troops against the French in 1434. Cardinal
Gloucester’s Dukedom

Beaufort’s new license to divert 20,000 pounds for another pilgrimage may have increased Gloucester’s determination to support Calais. Defending Calais—rather than paying for stalemated sieges in Normandy and the cardinal’s continental ambitions—probably seemed like a more valid expenditure of limited government resources to Gloucester. He proposed to pay his 7,000 troops by enforcing the fine that the teflon and stainless steel cardinal hadn’t paid for smuggling in 1432. But Henry VI’s council declined Gloucester’s proposal. Although a decisive victory led by Gloucester had the potential to reduce threats to Calais and increase revenues, Henry VI’s council chose to continue the downward spiral of borrowing from Cardinal Beaufort. (202)

Gloucester’s response was a memorandum criticizing Bedford’s war management so harshly that Bedford submitted a rebuttal questioning Gloucester’s honor. At this point, twelve-year-old Henry VI was brought in to suppress the conflict. In a formal ceremony, Henry VI declared both uncles’ memorandums null and void; Gloucester and Bedford signed a statement officially ending their conflict. Although this ceremony suppressed the uncles’ quarrel, it solved none of the problems underlying the quarrel. England’s military and financial situation continued to deteriorate. (203)

In June 1434, Bedford returned to France. Between June 1434-May 1435, Gloucester attended only two council meetings, despite Bedford’s absence. During this interval Gloucester may have tried to replace conciliar exercise of Henry VI’s authority with Henry VI’s personal exercise of authority. While Henry VI was avoiding the plague in London, Gloucester may have advised him to end his minority. (204) Both English and French protectors had officially ended with Henry VI’s coronations. Theoretically, Henry VI’s royal authority now expressed itself through his personal decisions, made with his council’s advice. (205) In practice, twelve-year-old Henry VI was overly influenced by his household officials and anyone else who could gain an audience. Gloucester may have tried to substitute his own influence for the household officials’. In November 1434, writs under the privy seal, began to appear from Henry VI’s household in Cirencester. In response, the chancellor and twenty-one council members, including Cardinal Beaufort, made an unprecedented journey to Cirencester, where they firmly recommended that Henry VI wait until he was older to exercise his royal authority. Henry VI accepted their recommendation. (206)

The absence of Gloucester’s name from the list of council members who hurried to Cirencester suggests that Gloucester may have encouraged Henry VI to issue the writs which upset the chancellor and councilors. Encouraging the young king to make official decisions on his own would have been consistent with Gloucester’s beliefs about royal authority. (207) The councilors’ recommendation that Henry VI delay his personal exercise of royal authority was consistent with the interests of those who benefited from conciliar exercise of royal authority.

As the council continued to dominate, the government continued to sink deeper into debt. Improving trade and wool income couldn’t counterbalance the cardinal’s influence. Despite its status as the government’s second most powerful creditor, the merchant community, supported by Gloucester, failed to obtain the protection it wanted for Calais. The merchants’ resulting unwillingness to lend the government more money left Henry VI’s council even more dependent on Cardinal Beaufort’s loans. (208)

Defeat at St. Denis in June 1435 threatened English control of Paris. War debts escalated. Cardinal Beaufort led a delegation to the Congress of Arras in August 1435, but his goal was at odds with the conference’s purpose, which was to resolve conflict between England and France. Instead of cooperating with the peace effort, the cardinal tried to strengthen the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. He failed because French agents spent 60,000 gold saluts bribing nine of Philip the Good’s most influential councilors. (209) Despite Cardinal Beaufort’s wealth and negotiating skills, Philip the Good followed his bribed officials’ advice; he ended the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. Departing from Arras in the rain, Cardinal Beaufort asserted that he would spend his last two million nobles to uphold Henry VI’s claim to the French crown. (210) On September 21, 1435 the treaty of Arras confirmed the new Franco-Burgundian alliance.

Since April 1434, Bedford’s health had been deteriorating. On September 14, 1435, he died, leaving no legitimate heirs. Gloucester became Henry VI’s heir apparent. The treaty of Arras discredited Bedford and Beaufort’s concessions to Burgundy and validated Gloucester’s long-running criticisms. Public opinion shifted from war-weariness to outrage. Gloucester’s former opponents on the council joined him in rejecting Burgundy’s peace offer. (211)

Letters from the Lancastrian government invited Jacqueline of Hainault and the Dutch government to join forces against Philip the Good. Jacqueline of Hainault’s reaction is unknown; she died early in 1436. Emperor Sigismund; Louis, count palatine of the Rhine; and Arnold, duke of Guelders were also invited to form alliances against Philip the Good. (212) Apparently none of these invitations were accepted.

At the October 1435 parliament, speeches and grants confirmed English determination to continue fighting for Henry VI’s double monarchy. Parliament’s restoration of
funding for Calais encouraged the merchant community to make new loans to the government. Exchequer revenue increased, and soldiers’ wages were paid “so that the garrison would remain loyal and Calais could resist an attack.” (213) On November 1, 1435, Gloucester became lieutenant of Calais. He was determined to protect “the most precious jewel in Henry VI’s crown” from Burgundian control. (214) Defense measures were begun on England’s southeastern coast as well as in Calais. Gloucester authorized the Cinque Ports’ declaration of “bloody and open war” in the narrow seas. (215)

Once again, Cardinal Beaufort’s loans paid current war expenses and committed future government revenues to his repayment. In spite of the treasurer, Lord Cromwell’s effort to halt this downward spiral, Henry VI’s council continued its dependence on the cardinal. The need to unite against the immediate Burgundian threat and long-term Franco-Burgundian alliance limited anyone’s ability to modify Cardinal Beaufort’s influence. (216) Family connections gave the cardinal another advantage over Gloucester, who was remarkably isolated from his most powerful English contemporaries. In addition to priority over the government’s other creditors, the cardinal demanded and received land grants and military commissions in Maine and Anjou for his nephews.

One of the cardinal’s nephews was Edmund Beaufort, count of Mortain, who arrived at Calais before Gloucester’s commission was signed. On July 9, 1436, Burgundian troops besieged Calais, but they failed to establish an effective naval blockade. Calais continued to receive supplies by sea while English troops, led by Mortain and Lord Camoys, broke the siege on land. On July 29, 1436, a disorganized Burgundian army retreated. By the time Gloucester arrived with the main army on August 2, there was little to be done. Gloucester led a well-disciplined raid through Burgundian territory, and returned to an enthusiastic welcome in England. Although the Burgundians’ departure had deprived Gloucester’s troops of a direct victory, the English could celebrate a campaign completed on time, with few losses. (217)

The day after Gloucester and his troops sailed for Calais, Cardinal Beaufort tarnished his vow to spend two million nobles for Henry VI’s double monarchy. In private, without interference from other councilors, the cardinal persuaded Henry VI to grant him the manor of Canford and town of Poole free of charge for life. Setting an unfortunate precedent for foolish generosity, this life grant was the first of many that diverted the king’s income to petitioners. It was the first life grant officially signed by Henry VI. (218)

Gloucester’s rewards for victory at Calais were public, short-term, and less damaging to royal solvency. Popular ballads celebrating the victory were preserved in chronicles and commonplace books. Gloucester commissioned a Latin poem, Humfrodius, from the Italian humanist, Livius Frulovisi, followed by a life of Henry V. (219) Henry VI’s New Year’s gifts to the duke and duchess of Gloucester surpassed all others: he received a jeweled image of Our Lady on a golden tablet; she received a golden brooch. (220)

None of Gloucester’s rewards equaled Cardinal Beaufort’s behind-the-scenes influence. As early as autumn 1436, the cardinal interfered with reinforcements and funding for Calais. Desertions increased as a result. Gloucester was “sufficiently exasperated to pursue his and Calais’ interests publicly.” (221) On February 25, 1437, Gloucester asked Henry VI to release him from responsibility for Calais because of the government’s lack of support. Gloucester’s request wasn’t granted, although many merchants considered him their best advocate and “the mercantile lobby in particular was highly critical of the government’s neglect of naval defense and the interests of the wool trade, on which the security and prosperity of Calais depended.” (222) On March 25, 1437, parliament granted money for the Calais garrison’s wages. Two days later “…when parliament was about to disperse, Gloucester and his men were belatedly praised for having saved Calais from the duke of Burgundy the previous summer.” (223)

While Gloucester was fighting for Calais’ share of limited resources, stricter law enforcement slightly increased revenues. On February 6, 1436, the widowed duchess of Bedford had been granted her dowry, on the condition the she did not remarry without the king’s permission. Because she married Richard Wydeville, son of Bedford’s chamberlain, without permission, the 1437 parliament fined her 500 pounds. Although Gloucester lacked the support he needed to enforce smuggling laws against Cardinal Beaufort in 1432 and 1434, he received enough support to increase the duchess of Bedford’s fine to 1,000 pounds. (224)

Two widowed queens died in 1437. On January 3, Henry VI’s mother died. Like the dowager duchess of Bedford, she had married a lower status man without official permission. This remarriage had broken a law that imposed forfeiture of life and property on unauthorized husbands of widowed queens. Henry VI’s council had not enforced this law on Queen Katherine’s second husband; but after her death, Gloucester prosecuted Owen Tudor, who took sanctuary at Westminster Abbey. Gloucester had him extracted. After interrogation, Tudor was imprisoned, but not executed. (225) On July 18, Henry IV’s
widow, Queen Joan, died. Despite the witchcraft allegations used to divert her income to Henry V’s exchequer, Gloucester and both of his wives had continued to visit her. Gloucester organized her funeral. She was honorably buried next to Henry IV in Canterbury Cathedral. (226)

On January 8, 1438, Gloucester resigned as lieutenant of Calais. During 1438 he attended few council meetings, but he did speak out against diversion of military aid from the Pays de Caux and Gascony to Cardinal Beaufort’s nephew, Mortain, in Maine. With his uncle’s help, Mortain had assimilated land and titles in France. By 1438 he had added the earldom of Dorset to his French acquisitions. Although his troops had contributed to breaking Philip the Good’s siege of Calais in 1436, Dorset’s 1438 campaign did England “but little good.” (227) Remaining far south of military action, Dorset’s troops spent resources without confronting the French. Gloucester described Dorset’s campaign as yet another example of limited resources misused under Cardinal Beaufort’s influence.

Gloucester’s political vicissitudes had not interfered with his scholarly interests. In war or peace he had kept his copy of Plato’s Republic nearby. His favorite study was Platonic philosophy, which won him the respect of Italian humanists, although it set him apart from his English contemporaries. As the first English patron of the new learning, Gloucester enabled English students to study with respected teachers in Italy. One of these students was John Gunthorpe, who became Richard III’s keeper of the privy seal. (228)

Gloucester was a reliable and generous patron of Oxford University. He gave legal as well as financial support. Records show that Oxford officials received Gloucester’s assistance in taking possession of books donated by Henry V’s will. Gloucester had also advised university officials about controlling heretical preachers, resolving conflicts with the city of Oxford, and peace-keeping within the university. Between 1435 and 1444, Gloucester donated 279 books, worth over 1,000 pounds, plus money for lecture series. This was not only the largest book donation Oxford had ever received, it was English students’ introduction to the new learning. They responded by so overcrowding Oxford’s library that university officials considered moving it to larger quarters in the divinity school under construction. Students from abroad soon joined English students in appreciation of Gloucester’s donation, which demonstrated that Gloucester was as committed to sharing the new learning as he was to creating a magnificent book collection. (229)

As Henry VI’s exercise of royal authority increased, the balance of power shifted even further against Gloucester. Officials closest to Henry VI began to influence both domestic and foreign affairs. Although Cardinal Beaufort was aging, his loans and his flexibility enabled him to retain some of the influence he had exercised during Henry VI’s minority. By 1439, the cardinal had aligned himself with those who gave diplomacy priority over war. But Gloucester was unable and unwilling to compromise his long-held beliefs. The retirement or death of his few reliable allies isolated Gloucester even more. He became “starkly and utterly opposed in certain crucial aspects to the personal and political outlook of the young king, his intimate companions, and his principal advisors.” (230) As early as 1435, Gloucester’s opponents had questioned his ability to father a legitimate Lancastrian heir if he succeeded Henry VI; apparently no one accused these questioners of treason, although their question implied Henry VI’s death. In 1438, Henry VI’s chamberlain, the earl of Suffolk, had become influential enough to displace Gloucester as justiciar of North Wales, where patronage redistribution accelerated Suffolk’s advancement. Gloucester’s status as heir to the throne didn’t protect him from the combination of household and cardinal’s influences working against him. (231)

Nevertheless, Gloucester continued to protest diplomatic concessions to French demands. From July-September 1439, Cardinal Beaufort led negotiations with the French and Burgundians near Calais. In August 1439, one of the English negotiators brought proposals back to England for Henry VI’s consideration. Just as Gloucester had opposed Bedford and the cardinal’s past concessions to Burgundy, he opposed the cardinal’s current concessions to France. Despite his eclipse, Gloucester was able to convince Henry VI to refuse these concessions. As a result, household officials and the cardinal intensified their efforts to silence Gloucester. (232) Records show that plans to dispose of Gloucester’s property after his death were being made as early as 1440. (233)

Gloucester’s exhaustive memorandum protesting Cardinal Beaufort’s influence on Henry VI’s government may have expedited these plans. A complaynte made to Kyng Henry VI by the Duke of Gloster upon the Cardinal of Winchester charged Henry Beaufort with action “into derogation of your noble estate and hurt of both your royaumes . . . .” (234) Charges included weakening England’s church by retaining the see and revenues of Winchester and evading the archbishop of Canterbury’s jurisdiction; breaking England’s Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire; arranging a 1424 default which allowed him to keep the crown jewels given him as security; buying crown lands on self-serving terms; advancing his relatives at government expense; and selling offices in Normandy to the highest bidder. Apparently Gloucester hoped to prevent concessions to France and future advancement of
the cardinal’s relatives by destroying the cardinal’s reputation. (235)

Unfortunately, Gloucester failed to recognize threats to his own reputation. Since 1422, he had spoken out for the truth as he understood it; repeated defeats had not discouraged him from presenting well-researched, valid cases against government actions that seemed harmful to public as well as personal interests. Perhaps a belief that he was representing those who could not safely speak the truth encouraged Gloucester’s persistence. He claimed that ending Cardinal Beaufort’s malign influence would allow Englishmen to “sey what hem thenketh of trouth; for thogh I dare speke of my trouthe, the poure ne dar not so.” (236) Apparently Gloucester felt equal to any retaliation his opponents might plan.

Despite earlier defeats, Gloucester may still have hoped to redirect the cardinal’s great wealth “for the wele and sauvacion of your royaums” and relief from the “poverte, necessitee, bareness and indigence of your liege people.” (237) Gloucester had suggested in 1432 and 1434 that the gold confiscated during the cardinal’s smuggling attempt could pay government debts and war expenses. Although Bedford and the cardinal had overridden Gloucester’s suggestion, it was still valid in 1440. Henry VI’s government was still deeply in debt, while Cardinal Beaufort controlled extraordinary wealth derived from questionable sources. Gloucester’s memorandum pointed out that: “... it is wele known that it nod been possible unto the saide cardinal to have comen to so grete riches but by such moyens; of his chirche it might not ryse, enheritance hath he noone.” (238) Neither Gloucester’s contemporaries nor twentieth century historians could identify the sources of Cardinal Beaufort’s wealth. No one has yet explained how the cardinal amassed the 50,000–60,000 pounds that enabled him to control English government for over twenty years. Only the results of his control are visible for debate. But no debate occurred in the parliament of 1440. Gloucester’s memorandum was suppressed. (239)

For the past eighteen years, Gloucester’s uncle had successfully cast “Gloucester in the role of the disruptor. [Cardinal Beaufort] was adept at wrong-footing and traducing his enemies: perhaps Clarence to Prince Henry; certainly Chichele to popes Martin and Eugenius, and Gloucester to Bedford. Gloucester’s indictment in 1440 gave expression to his cumulative frustration at being repeatedly outmaneuvered and isolated over the preceding two decades.” (240) Gloucester’s indictment may have expressed impersonal frustrations as well. His actions during the past eighteen years demonstrated genuine concern for the welfare of English soldiers, merchants, and scholars. His record as protector and lieutenant reflected a disinterested concern for justice. Although he was seldom close to Henry VI, Gloucester had done his best to protect his nephew’s interests as he understood them. Gloucester’s 1440 memorandum spotlighted the cardinal’s ability to obstruct valid, disinterested government action and evade the consequences of law-breaking as well as provoke personal frustrations.

Gloucester’s objections to the duke of Orleans’ release were not as easily suppressed as his indictment of Cardinal Beaufort. After learning that Henry VI had decided to release Orleans, Gloucester submitted yet another memorandum. He predicted that Orleans’ release would strengthen the French, demoralize Englishmen in Normandy and Gascony, and discourage potential allies from joining forces with England. He asked Henry VI for a formal reply, validated by the great seal, absolving him of all responsibility for Orleans’ release and its consequences. Evidently Henry VI and his advisors couldn’t relegate this protest to the archives. However outnumbered Gloucester had been in government circles, he had not been the only Englishman to disagree with concessions to the French. As Henry V’s companion-in-arms and heir to the throne he could still attract support from those who could not concede Henry V’s legacy or trust officials who would. On June 2, 1440, Henry VI’s formal, sealed reply to Gloucester absolved him from responsibility for Orleans’ release. On October 28, 1440, Gloucester emphasized his opposition by walking out of Orleans’ release ceremony at Westminster Abbey. (241) After informing John Paston that Gloucester “proved he had never agreed to Orleans’ release by going to his barge when mass began,” Robert Repps expressed the hope that “the seide lord of Orlyaunce be trewe ….” (242) Repps’ hope was unfulfilled. Orleans was not true. Gloucester’s predictions proved accurate, and England received no benefits from releasing Orleans.

Gloucester had received few benefits as Henry VI’s heir apparent. Cardinal Beaufort and Henry VI’s household officials had neutralized potential advantages in Gloucester’s status. Yet Henry VI’s decision-makers took advantage of Gloucester’s proven ability to restore order. In February 1440, they made him justiciar of South Wales, a demanding post that was less desirable than the one he’d lost to Suffolk. (243) Although Gloucester’s eighteen years of publicizing valid, dissenting opinions had not defeated powerful, behind-the-scenes influences, the rising generation of behind-the-scenes influences decided that Henry VI’s outspoken heir apparent should be eliminated from the succession. In 1441 anonymous officials converted Gloucester’s status as heir apparent from a dubious asset into a clear liability. Just as Henry V’s officials had used a witchcraft accusation to divert Queen Joan’s income into
Henry VI's exchequer, Henry VI's officials used accusations of witchcraft and treason to discredit Gloucester. On June 28, 1441, the duchess of Gloucester learned that three of her chaplains and Marjery Jurdane, "an ancient pythoness" had been accused of conspiring to kill Henry VI. On July 10, Thomas Southwell was imprisoned at the Tower. On July 23, Roger Bolingbroke, Oxford priest and member of both the duke and duchess of Gloucester's households, endured a highly publicized recantation spectacle at St. Paul's Cross, with most of Henry VI's council, London's mayor and aldermen, foreign visitors, and London citizens in the audience. Although the duchess of Gloucester took sanctuary, the witchcraft accusation made her ineligible. On July 25, church officials interrogated her in Bolingbroke's presence; she denied all but five of the twenty-eight charges made against her. Her case was transferred to a secular court, which convicted her of sorcery, felony, and treason as an accessory to her chaplains. From August-October 1441, the duchess was imprisoned at Leeds Castle, where Queen Joan had been held. Returned to London, confronted with Southwell, Bolingbroke, Jurdane, and their paraphanalia, the duchess continued to deny most of the charges. She insisted that her desire for children rather than ambition to be queen had involved her in fortune-telling and folk medicine. All four were convicted. Southwell died before his execution date; Bolingbroke and Jurdane were executed.

The duchess spent the rest of her life in custody. On November 6, 1441 a commission of bishops divorced her from Gloucester. This divorce stripped her of status and property. After three highly publicized days of penance, Eleanor Cobham was moved from remote castle to remote castle, where she received none of the consideration given to Queen Joan. On January 25, 1442 parliament acknowledged irregularities in the procedures that convicted her, without lightening her sentence. In order to resolve the doubts and ambiguities involved in her case, parliament passed a law that entitled peeresses accused of felony and treason to the same legal status as peers.

Gloucester's opponents had effectively used his wife's activities against him. Ten years after his campaign against Lollards had restored order, Gloucester was discredited by his wife's unfortunate involvement in fortune-telling and folk medicine. Although no accusations were made against Gloucester, his effort to help Queen Joan's chaplain in 1425 now hurt his reputation. Although barred from council meetings that concerned Eleanor Cobham's case, Gloucester continued to perform his duties as justiciar of South Wales. Evidently the sorcerers, felons, and traitors corrupting Gloucester's household did not disqualify him as a judge. Again Gloucester saw his marriage sacrificed to political motivations. Just as the pope had imposed a divorce on Gloucester and Jacqueline of Hainault, a panel of English bishops imposed a divorce on Gloucester and Eleanor Cobham. However distorted or exaggerated the accusations against his wife had been, they had effectively undermined Gloucester's credibility and popularity. The best that contemporaries could say for him was that he endured his downfall patiently.

Despite his downfall, Gloucester continued to speak out against actions he considered harmful to Henry V's legacy. In 1443, he criticized the duke of Somerset's mismanagement—which cost Henry VI's government an honest, competent treasurer, thousands of pounds, and the Bretons' good will while failing to protect either Normandy or Gascony. Under these adverse conditions, Gloucester agreed to the necessity of peace negotiations in late 1443.

Somerset's expensive debacle diluted his uncle's influence, but it did not prevent Cardinal Beaufort from collecting loan repayments while other creditors went unpaid. Escalating military and financial losses intensified England's need for disinterested, competent use of resources. Instead, Henry VI's household officials and councilors continued to take advantage of Henry VI's foolish generosity while encouraging concessions to France.

Despite his preference for a marriage alliance between Henry VI and the Armagnac opponents of Charles VII, Gloucester made no demonstration against Henry VI's marriage to Charles VII's niece, Margaret of Anjou. In late May 1445, he and his retinue of 500 led the lords who greeted their new queen at London. But participation in wedding pageantry did not prevent Gloucester from protesting Henry VI's decision to cede Maine in return for a life-long alliance with Margaret of Anjou's father and a twenty year truce. This decision may or may not have concealed a previous secret agreement. Whenever the agreements were made, their revelation in December 1445 caused strong resistance and Gloucester emerged as its leader.

By 1446, Suffolk had replaced the aging Cardinal Beaufort as the most influential member of Henry VI's government. Suffolk and his supporters apparently decided to eliminate opposition to the cession of Maine. The parliament summoned to meet in Cambridge was postponed and relocated to Bury St. Edmunds, at the center of Suffolk's power base, far from Gloucester's London supporters. Noblemen were ordered to limit the size of their retinues. Gloucester obeyed. Only eighty horsemen accompanied him to Bury, minimal protection against travel hazards in 1447. But extraordinary
numbers of armed men were summoned to guard Henry VI at Bury St. Edmunds. (252)

Parliament opened on February 10, 1447. When Gloucester and his retinue arrived on February 18, a group of Henry VI’s household officials ordered them to go to their lodgings at St. Savior’s Hospital. Later that day, the duke of Buckingham, accompanied by Dorset and four other lords, arrested Gloucester on charges of treason. Between February 18 and February 20, many of Gloucester’s retainers and his illegitimate son, Arthur, were imprisoned in castles from Winchester to Nottingham. Hoping to convince the public that Gloucester had died a natural death, Henry VI’s decision-makers displayed his body in the abbey church on February 24. The official version of events claimed that Gloucester had died of a stroke. Members of his household buried Gloucester at St. Albans. His funeral did not reflect either his rank or his contributions to public well-being. (253) Distorted versions of events overshadowed Gloucester’s achievements and contributions as effectively as the nobles’ consensus had disinherited him in 1422. Until the 1978 publication of Henry V’s codicils validated Gloucester’s claims, detractors maintained that “Good Duke Humphrey” was actually a self-serving trouble-maker.

Many of Gloucester’s contemporaries doubted the official version of his death. When it became safe to say Duke Humphrey had been murdered, rumors held Henry VI’s household officials responsible. The distribution of Gloucester’s property within days of his death suggests that it had been planned. The treatment of his son and retainers suggests that the treason charges were known to be unjustified. Once their trials had served the instigators’ purpose, Arthur and Gloucester’s retainers were pardoned, and their property was restored to them. (254)

Duke Humphrey’s beneficiaries did not receive the property he bequeathed them. Records of legal proceedings demoer left a will, although it was not honored. The cause of its disappearance is unknown. If Gloucester left anything to ease the conditions of Eleanor Cobham’s imprisonment, she never received it. On its last day, the Bury St. Edmunds parliament passed a law reinforcing the disinheritance imposed by her divorce in 1441. This would have been unnecessary if Gloucester had died without making a will. (255) Eleanor Cobham died in custody at Beaumaris Castle, North Wales on July 7, 1452. Only 100 marks per year had been allowed for her living expenses; yet one hundred fifty pounds was paid to move her from the Isle of Man to Beaumaris Castle, and another one hundred marks were paid for her burial. (256) Her living conditions between 1442 and 1452 were probably bleak.

Oxford University officials were expecting another book donation when Gloucester died. Official letters written during the attempt to obtain this donation referred to Gloucester’s will as if its existence were a well known fact. One of these letters requested a copy of Gloucester’s will; another suggested that Gloucester’s property was being diverted for private profit. A 1453 catalog of King’s College books lists several translations of Plato and Latin authors which were unlikely to have belonged to anyone but Gloucester. This suggests that when Gloucester’s property was being distributed among Henry VI’s officials, some of his books may have been sent to King’s College. These books may have been part of the donation that Oxford officials tried to recover. (257)

Very few of Gloucester’s books can be still be identified. One of them is an English translation of a late eleventh century Arabic medical book, which includes astrological lore. Gloucester may have given it to Eleanor Cobham. Although Gloucester’s inscription was erased, his motto remains visible. It is: “Loyale et Belle.” (258)
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The Non-Fiction Library is looking for December 1990, December 1996, and December 1997 Ricardians. If anyone has these, Susan Higginbotham would be happy just to have a copy.

If you have old publications you no longer wish to keep, please contact me or Susan. There is probably someone in the Society who would be glad to have them.
Unconversable (adj) Not suitable for social converse. - The more time I spend reading the dictionary, the more unconversable I become.

After a long day trying to wrestle obscure polysyllabic words into my brain I have difficulty of engaging in any conversation beyond “make it a double.” Ammon Shea

Reading The OED: One Man, One Year, 21,730 pages – Ammon Shea, Penguin Group, N.Y.

Ammon Shea set himself the daunting task of reading the entire Oxford English Dictionary, and making it pay off by writing a book about it. “To simply describe the OED as ‘large’ is akin to saying that the bubonic plague was ‘unpleasant’...fifty-nine million words, give or take a few thousand. The most recent print edition, published in 1989, runs to twenty volumes and weighs 137.72 pounds.” And he choose to read the real McCoy, not the edition with a magnifying glass, and certainly not a computer. He hasn’t anything against computers:

“The electronic OED has an impressive arsenal of features, enabling its user to do things that are impossible...by looking through the pages of a book. You can instantly find all the quotations by any cited author...all the instances in which a specific word appears...There is case-sensitive searching and exact character searching...more options than I know what to do with. These are all wonderful functions.”

On the other hand:

“You cannot drop the computer on the floor in a fit of pique, or slam it shut...You cannot get any sort of tactile pleasure from rubbing the pages of a computer. (Maybe some people do get a tactile pleasure from rubbing their computers, but they are not people I have any interest in knowing)...I’ve never sat down at a new computer and, prior to using it, felt a deep and abiding need to open it up and sniff it as deeply as I can, the way I have with many a book.”

Early on, he began to suffer from headaches, only partially alleviated by getting glasses. By the time he reached the letter N, he is complaining: “Some days I feel as if I do not actually speak the English language, or understand it with any degree of real comprehension.” Nevertheless, he soldiered on, giving us such medieval words as Frauen Dienst (look it up), and such up-do-date words as Upchuck (used by people who have never heard of the OED). Some may come in handy, such as Need-sweat (sweat from nervousness or anxiety), some are dubiously useful: Cellarhood (the state of being a cellar).

Now that he has finished his magnum opus, what is Mr. Shea going to do? Why, go back and read it again, of course!

Latibulate (v) To hide oneself in a corner – This word may not have much resonance with many people, but given that I spend all day hiding myself in a corner there was no way that I could pass it by.


With the exception of abduction by space aliens, it would probably be almost impossible to find a “solution” to the mystery of what happened to the sons of Edward IV, which has not already been brought forward and beaten to death. The identification of Richard of Eastwell with the younger son of Edward IV is not new, but David Baldwin does a very good job of pulling it all together and adding new (new to me, at least) bits of evidence. At the end of the day, I do not find it convincing but he assembles his arguments cogently and writes it very well to boot. I can recommend this to all Ricardians.

He starts with a time line covering the period of Yorkist and Tudor rule up to the death of Edward VI - which is something I wish authors would do more often. It’s a great help in sorting out what was happening at any point. You and I might not need it for the Yorkist period, but I’m kind of weak on the Pilgrimage of Grace and the general period when the monasteries were being nationalized (pace Flanders & Swann!). Mr. Baldwin then goes over all the contemporary literature to summarize what we know from the records, drawing on hints that in many cases the writer was not telling all he knew. While this also may be familiar to Ricardians, it is useful to have a refresher before starting the meat of his theory.
There are really two items of evidence, one good and one maybe not so good. The good one is an entry in the parish register of Eastwell for 1550 (parish clergy were required to keep records of all baptisms, weddings and burials after 1538) that a man "Richard Plantagenet" had been buried on December 24th of that year.

The not-so-good one is a letter written in 1733 by Dr. Thomas Brett recalling how thirteen years earlier he had been told of a tradition that when Sir Thomas Moyle had had his house built in Eastwell in the 1540s, he had observed one of the bricklayers reading a book in Latin during his leisure time. On questioning, the man stated he was the natural son of Richard III who had had a gentle upbringing prior to Bosworth. After the battle, he had had to shift for himself, keeping his identity secret for fear of death. David Baldwin surmises that he was really the younger of the Princes but pretended to be a natural son of Richard III as he still felt threatened.

This is not a new argument. However, after the dissolution of the monasteries, there must have been any number of educated men tossed out to fend for themselves, and many of them must have turned to manual occupations. Dr. Brett was writing about something he heard thirteen years earlier of a tradition 200 years old. Not very creditable. Also there were others of Richard’s natural children who were well known; why hide this one? Sounds as though Richard of Eastwell was trying to make himself out to be someone higher than he actually was.

David Baldwin considers Richard III’s history and the events leading up to and subsequent to Richard’s assuming the crown. He concludes that the Princes were sent to a country estate where they would be more secure. He surmises Prince Richard (who should properly be Richard of Shrewsbury since that’s where he was born) was then taken to the Abbey of St. John in Colchester (the elder Prince is assumed to have died of natural causes) and remained there until the dissolution of that abbey in Henry VIII’s reign. This is really where his argument is strongest; he enumerates a number of strong connections that Henry VII had with Colchester. Why Colchester? These do need explaining and David Baldwin’s theory does provide an explanation.

As any reader of the Paston Letters knows, country estates in this period were very far from secure and I cannot see Richard sending his nephews to one unless it was well watched. Although the removal to Colchester has plausibility, David Baldwin then assumes young Richard would be trained as a bricklayer and after the dissolution wandered down to Kent. There is more than a bit of post hoc ergo propter hoc reasoning in this. The son of a king put as apprentice to a bricklayer? David Baldwin admits with full academic honesty that this is conjecture, however he has to connect the dots. IF Richard of Eastwell was actually the younger Prince, the question of how did he get to be a bricklayer and how did he wind up in Kent needs to be answered and he has tried to do so.

David Baldwin damages his argument by listing all the people “who must have known” about the hiding of Richard of Shrewsbury in Colchester. It looked like a sizable chunk of the royal administration over the reigns of both Henry VII and Henry VIII. To assume such a secret could be kept when there were so many – in England and on the Continent – who would love to know it goes beyond belief. It also strains credibility that Henry VII would permit so great a threat to continue to exist. David Baldwin says it was due to his “family feeling” toward his wife’s family. As he never showed much of that on any other occasion, I find that tough to accept.

Still, very well worth reading. My local library got this for me on interlibrary loan.

— Jonathan Hayes

Aerumnous (adj) Full of trouble – More descriptive than troublesome, and with far more gravitas than irksome, aerumnous is practically begging to be reintroduced to our vocabulary. It describes everything from your squalling children to the used car that your wife’s brother managed to sell you last year.


This book should be judged by its cover. The restored Society of Antiquaries portrait is a good match for Annette Carson’s text, which restores Richard III’s reputation. Her interpretation of the events that turned a respected duke into a maligned king is well worth reading. By categorizing Thomas More’s mistitled History of King Richard the Third as fiction, Carson removes layers of wordy varnish which have clouded Richard III’s reputation. She consistently refrains from filling gaps in the historical record with More’s stories. Instead, she asks reasonable questions and acknowledges the difficulty or impossibility of answering them. Instead of illusory certainty, Carson offers her readers ambiguities and alternatives to tiresome variations on More’s tall tale.

Carson’s interpretations of surviving chronicles and official records encourage readers to learn more about them. Her annotated list of principle sources offers a convenient, reader-friendly way for readers to become better acquainted with the fifteenth-through-seventeenth century English and Latin originals. The sources under her Post-Tudor investigations heading are especially interesting. John Stow, author of The Annales or General
Chronicle of England, was a member of the College of Antiquaries who pointed out contradictions between chronicles and public records. Stow described “Richard’s accession as an election, not a usurpation.” The Encomium of Richard III, by Sir William Cornwallis the Younger responded to John Morton’s lost manuscript, which apparently vilified Richard III. References to Morton’s lost manuscript also appear in Sir George Buck’s History of King Richard III. By bringing A.N. Kincaid’s 1979 edition of Buck’s History to her readers’ attention, Carson contributes to the rehabilitation of Buck’s reputation as well as Richard III’s. Kincaid has demonstrated that Buck’s great-nephew badly disfigured Buck’s work when he edited and published it. Ricardian readers may be inspired to refresh their memories of Kincaid’s article, George Buck senior and George Buck junior: a literary historical mystery story, published in the March 1978 issue. This article demonstrates how one of Richard III’s earliest defenders was also misjudged.

Buck’s credibility needs emphasizing because many of his opinions contradict long-accepted versions of events. One of many controversial statements is that “Dr. Morton and a certain countess, conspiring the deaths of the sons of King Edward and some other, resolved that these treacheries should be executed by poison and by sorcery.” Carson suggests that the phrase “some other” refers to Edward IV. In her first two chapters she considers the possibility that an unsuccessful attempt to poison Edward IV preceded a lethal dose.

Some readers might find poisoning theories unconvincing. [Your Reading Editor, for one.] Yet those who are familiar with the outcomes of English protectorships are likely to agree that Carson’s poisoned chalice metaphor is appropriate to the protectorship established for Edward V. Carson writes: “In 1483, the appointment of a protector certainly represented a significant stumbling-block to those who planned to be the power behind the boy-king; but it simultaneously delivered a poisoned chalice to the protector himself. If the lad, as seemed likely, remained a creature of the Woodvilles, then once he assumed full power the career of Richard of Gloucester would be ended—and probably also his life.”

In the last twenty-seven months of his life, Richard endured the precontract crisis, the October 1483 rebellion, the sudden death of his son and heir, his wife’s death, and rumors accusing him of murdering his nephews and wife. Defeat at Bosworth was followed by centuries of vilification and controversy. By comparing contemporary reports, chronicles, and official records to Tudor versions of events, Carson validates her subtitle, “malignant king.”

A generous selection of full-color illustrations reinforces the message on the dust jacket. Several images contribute new perspectives on Richard III and the controversies associated with him. Stained glass portraits of Richard and Anne at Cardiff Castle present a respectful, undistorted image of Richard where Tudor prejudices might be expected to prevail. Most evocative is the portrait of Joanna of Portugal, who would have legitimately united the houses of Lancaster and York if Richard had lived to marry her. How do the elaborate, jeweled headdress, the flaming red hair, the multiple golden necklaces, and the sitter’s expression fit in with Joanna’s reputation for rigorous piety? Was this portrait intended to promote a political marriage that would prevent Joanna from fulfilling her religious aspirations? Who chose her clothes and accessories? The portrait of Elizabeth of York on the facing page raises even more questions. Why would Richard III repeat Edward IV’s mistake by cutting off negotiations for a politically beneficial marriage in order to marry an Englishwoman who could bring him no political or financial advantage? Was the story about Richard III’s thwarted desire for his niece just a variation on the tales about Edward IV’s misalliance with Elizabeth Woodville? How would the flaming-haired Joanna have reconciled her aspirations for a religious life with the realities of life at Richard III’s court? Did Richard III ever see this portrait? If so, how did he react to it? Could Richard and Joanna have produced the heir necessary to stabilize a united Lancastrian/Yorkist government? Could they have produced other sons and daughters with which to make domestic and foreign marriage alliances?


—Marion Davis

Foiblesse (n) A distinctive weakness or a weakness for something. – Foible has such an inelegant ring to it; it positively reeks of bad habits and decisions of dubious merit; in contrast, foiblesse makes the notion of having a weakness for something seem acceptable, even downright commendable.

Ellen Perlman has a few comments to make about matters Ricardian, plus a review. Excerpts from her letter:

“Our first overseas post when Al was in the U.S. Foreign Service was India...I never tire of finding books written by Indian authors whose works remind me of those early times. In Jhumpa Lahiri’s Unaccustomed
Earth, several novelettes deal with cultural differences. The stories were prefaced by a quote from Nathaniel Hawthorne:

‘Human nature will not flourish, any more than a potato, if it be planted and re-planted, for too long a series of generations, in the same worn-out soil. My children have bad other birthplaces, and, so far as their fortunes may be within my control, shall strike their roots into unaccustomed earth.’

In ‘Nobody’s Business,” a young woman named Sangeeta…moves into a house with Paul and Heather. Paul is in the process of trying to get his PhD in an area that covers three centuries of English and European literature. At his first session with his professors, which he failed, he had not been able to reply to the first question, about comic villainy in Richard III. He had read the play so many times he could picture each scene, not as it might be performed on a stage, but rather as the pale printed columns in his Pelican Shakespeare…”

Comic villainy? Is this an oxymoronic area the Society should explore?

And, in The Teaching Company catalogue, in a DVD/CD lecture series by Professor Peter Saccio called “Shakespeare: The Word and the Action,” Richard is described as follows:

‘Richard III is a classic villain, but somewhat disturbingly, also a Renaissance figure. Schooled in Machiavellian tactics of self-promotion, deception and betrayal, he is a cautionary example of what it means to be a “self-made” man. Yet he says he is “determinate” to be a villain. Is this a Calvinist nod to the limits of free will and responsibility.’

Wow! Is that comic villainy or just plain classic villainy?

Now for the review, of a book written some 30–odd years ago, which Marion thinks she may have read before but forgotten. (I do that all the time!)

The Murders Of Richard III – Elizabeth Peters

The story begins as bachelor Thomas Carter muses about the portrait Ricardians know and love. Thomas, an American lecturing at a British university, is “involved” with librarian Jacqueline Kirby, also an American visiting England for the summer. He hopes to persuade her to his belief. In this vein, he invites her to the home of Sir Richard Weldon, who claims to be a descendant of one of Richard’s illegitimate children. The weekend in Weldon’s mansion is to be a sort of mini-AGM at which a recently discovered love letter from Elizabeth of York to her Uncle Dickon will be read.

Sir Richard, of course, portrays Richard III, and the guests are to take the robes and roles of important figures in Richard’s life: a cousin is Queen Anne, and another cousin Elizabeth of York; a well-known novelist is Elizabeth Woodville; a Major-General plays Buckingham; the local pastor, Edward IV; a doctor is Henry VI; an actor takes the role of Hastings; and a visiting American Ricardian becomes Edward of Lancaster. A very fat young man (“Queen Anne’s” son in real life) will be Edward V. Thomas is Clarence, and since there is nothing much left, Jacqueline opts to be a mistress of Richard’s.

As the weed-end weaves along, the “murders” occur. But each murder is reasonable facsimile only – Henry VI becomes violently ill, but doesn’t die; Clarence is found upside down in an empty vat, but doesn’t die; Edward V is enclosed by a feather mattress, but doesn’t die; Hastings is “beheaded” although the head is a department store dummy’s; etc.

The mystery of who was actually stage-managing these “murders” is eventually cleared up, and the relationship between Thomas and Jacqueline begins to look promising. The novel, itself, is not very promising. Its saving grace is that, intertwined with the story, is a history lesson based on the life of Richard III, and a novice who borrows the book from a local library might become interested in the truth beyond Shakespeare.

Comic villainy? Classic villainy? Or just zany villainy? - Ellen Perlman

Agathokakological (adj) Made up of both good and evil. - Agathokakological is an imposing and meaty word. Don’t be scared of it; you don’t have to use it in casual conversation. Sometimes it’s enough to merely know that a word exists in order to enjoy it.

Royal Panoply: Brief Lives of the English Monarchs – Carolly Erickson, St Martin’s Press, N.Y., 2003

I’ll cut to the chase, reasoning that if the authors of this type of potted biographies can be fair to our period and our monarchs of choice, they will be well-balanced on others also. Ms. Erickson, best known, to me, for her studies of some of the Tudors, has in her other books covered everything from the medieval period to the current monarch. The chapters in this compendium are allotted one to a monarch, but, surprisingly, none to Edward V, going directly from Edward IV to Richard III. Of the latter, the author says: “His nephews…disappeared; most likely he ordered them killed, though no firm conclusion about their fate is possible. (Two bodies discovered in
the Tower in the seventeenth century were not those of Edward IV’s sons.)” Aside from this, however, her mini-bio of Richard borders on the eulogistic in places. While she by no means trashes Henry VII, she is hardly fulsome in praise either. She says of Henry’s style of rule...

“He modeled himself on the Italian despots, wealthy rulers of small states who governed through financial control, treachery and intimidation, and who overawed others by their personal magnificence. The old style of chivalrous monarchy, of kings who led and inspired through personal strength and military might, was abandoned.”

Williamson’s book is the real surprise. It is more of a coffee-table book than Ms. Erickson’s, the pages being interspersed with colorful illustrations—that’s not surprising—and handy gemological charts. The biographies are much shorter. The one on Edward V recounts the traditional story, but calls it “Tudor propaganda,” adding that “There is some evidence that the princes were removed to Middleham Castle in Yorkshire and that they were still alive at the time of the Battle of Bosworth…A strange factor in the whole story is the attitude of the princes’ mother…, who appears to have been completely unconcerned as to their fate.” The article on Richard III contains not one word about the murder of anyone!

Homodoxian (n) A person who is of the same opinion as you – A very fancy word for “friend,” “assistant,” or “someone who’s got their head on straight.”

Brief Mention Department

_The Man Who Forgot How To Read_ – Howard Engel, St. Martin’s Press, N.Y., 2007

This is Mr. Engel’s autobiographical account of his CVA (stroke, to a layman) and his gradual recovery from it. I can hardly think of a fate I would less care to have visited on me, but in his case it was made worse by the fact that he is a recognized and applauded novelist. As he began to get some of his memory and ability back during his hospital stay, he writes:

“I remembered Josephine Tey’s wonderful mystery novel _A Daughter of Time_. Tey’s detective-hero is recovering in hospital from a serious accident in the line of duty and bored out of his mind…. He becomes fascinated by a picture of the infamous English king and child murderer Richard III. The policeman sets out, metaphorically speaking, to find out the truth about history’s most notorious uncle. It’s a wonderful book and I cannot recommend it highly enough.”

So he determined to put his detective, Benny Cooperman, literally in the same position as Alan Grant, and have him solve a mystery from his hospital bed. Well, when life gives you lemons...

Other interesting works from Mr. Engel: _Mr. Doyle and Doctor Bell, Crimes of Passion: An Unblinking Look at Murderous Love_, and _Lord High Executioner: An Unashamed Look at Hangmen, Headsmen, and Their Kind_, in addition to the Benny Cooperman novels, which I can recommend on the basis of the ones I have read.

Although it’s not in the least Ricardian, anyone who is interested in the working of the brain should read _The Woman Who Can’t Forget: A Memoir_, by Jill Price. Her problem is the opposite of Engel’s and while it is certainly an advantage to always know where your keys and cell phone are, I would rather have my spotty memory than literally total recall like hers. As long as I don’t forget deadlines!

Finifugal (adj) Shunning the end of anything – Many things in life deserve being finifugal about: the last twenty pages of a good book, a special meal that someone has just spent hours preparing for you, a slow walk in a light rain.

Could this be grave of King Richard?

Mystery surrounding one of the county’s medieval legends has been reignited after an ancient stone coffin linked to Richard III was unearthed on a building site.

The solid stone sarcophagus was discovered in the grounds of a property in Earl Shilton, by the home’s former gardener Reg Colver, where it had formed part of a water garden built in the early 1900s.

Archaeologists believe it dates from the time Richard died and could have been buried in the same church, Greyfriars, which once existed near Leicester Cathedral. Richard Knox, of the county council’s archaeological services, said: “It is an important medieval artefact in its own right, it also shows the strength of the Bosworth myth which makes all local medieval finds somehow relevant to Richard and the Battle of Bosworth.”

Legend has it that after Richard’s death at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485, he was buried in Greyfriars Church, but some 50 years later his grave was ransacked and his bones thrown into the River Soar.
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King, Betty. *The Beaufort Secretary.* Robert Hale, London, 1970. 222 pp. This novel tells of the romance between William Elmer, a clerk of Margaret Beaufort's, and Perrot, one of Margaret's ladies in waiting.

---

**The Lord Jasper.** Herbert Jenkins, London, 1967. 256 pp. Unable to marry Margaret Beaufort, his brother's widow, Jasper Tudor devotes himself to the care of her son, Henry. He helps Henry overthrow Richard III.

---

**Margaret of Anjou.** Robert Hale, London, 1974. 255 pp. The life of Margaret of Anjou from her marriage to Henry VI to right after Battle of Tewkesbury is told here.

---

**The Rose Both Red and White.** London: Robert Hale, 1970. The story of the turbulent life of Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII.

---


---


---


---


---


---


---

*The Maudie Reed Tale.* Thomas Nelson, 1971. 174 pp. Adapted and lengthened from a section of Lofts' 1959 book, *The Town House*, this novel tells the story of young Maudie Reed, who is sent to a castle to learn to become a lady. The depiction of fifteenth century life is very well done and Maudie is an appealing heroine. Suitable for 12+.

---


---


---

Long, Freda M. *Requiem for Richard.* Robert Hale, London, 1975. 190 pp. Starting at Richard’s coronation, the novel is told as a series of flashbacks, detailing events up to the coronation. Richard is seen as a decent, but ruthless, man who becomes corrupted by a desire for power.

---

McChesney, Dora Greenwell. *The Confession of Richard Plantagenet.* London: Smith, Elder Co., 1913. 319 pp. (This is a photocopy of the original book.)

---


---

Magee, Knox. *With Ring of Shield.* Publisher unknown, 1901. 363 pp. A romantic adventure novel with language so amusingly quaint that it is entertaining from a linguistic perspective alone. From Berwick to Bosworth, we follow the exploits of the gallant Sir Walter Bradley (ardent admirer of Hazel Woodville,kinswoman to Queen Elizabeth Woodville) as he champions the cause of oríghtó and ójusticé against the villainous Richard III and William Catesby (who has sordid designs on our hero’s lady-love).

---


---

Malvern, Gladys. *The Queen’s Lady.* Philadelphia: Macrae Smith Co., 1963. 189 pp. Lancastrian sympathizer, Johanna, serendipitously befriends Anne Neville while she is inognito as a serving girl, hiding in terror from Crouchback. Richard and grieving the loss of her beloved husband Edward. This is a very harsh depiction of the Yorkists in general, but particularly of Richard, who is so madly in love with Anne that he tortures her physically and psychologically in order to induce her to marry him. Ugh! Intended for young adult readers ages 12+.

---

Makepeace, Joanna. *Battlefield of Hearts.* Masquerade Historical (Mills & Boon). 253 pp. Aley escapes from her stepmother who would force her into marriage, and is caught up in the campaign of 1471 as she is wed, for her protection, to a follower of Richard of Gloucester.

---


---


---

*King's Pawn.* Mills & Boone Large Print Edition, 1998. 1484-5 Historical Romance. Martyn, Earl of Wroxeter, a faithful supporter of Richard III, is asked to take as his wife the daughter of a Welsh knight whose loyalty Richard needs. Their service to King and Queen embroil them in the fates of both monarchs.
Parsons of Power. Hurst and Blackett, London, 1972. 185pp. Marian Hurst, daughter of a Lancastrian nobleman, becomes a friend to Anne Neville. Both share many adventures until they both wed the men they love.

Reluctant Rebel. UK: Mills & Boon Ltd. 1993. In the aftermath of Bosworth, Isabel Hatfield is caught up with Frances Lovell and her friend Adam Westlake in their rebellion against Henry VII.

Stolen Heiress. London: Mills & Boon, 1996, 284 pp. Young heiress, forced to marry against her will, helps to escort the young George and Richard to Bruges in 1461 when their mother sends them abroad for safety.


Maiden and the Unicorn. New York: Bantam Books, 1998. Deals with events from 1470-1472. Margery, ward of Warwick the Kingmaker, is sent by Edward IV on a dangerous mission to George, Duke of Clarence in exile in France. She and Richard Huddleston, whom she suspects of having abandoned King Edward, fall in love, and she must risk losing his love, or revealing her secret mission. Based on historical characters.

Moonlight & Shadow. New York: Berkley Books, 2002. 457pp. Somewhat of a sequel to Maiden and the Unicorn. Here the focus shifts to Heloise Ballaster, a fey-touched maiden, who is forced to marry the shadowy Miles Rushden (friend and advisor to Harry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham) in the medieval equivalent of a shotgun wedding. Intrigue and suppressed passion collide with history at Northampton as the pair proceeds to be instrumental in the unfolding of events that lead to R3’s ascension and Buckingham’s demise.

Then And Now. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1946 A novel of the Renaissance, set in the violent days of Machiavelli and the Borgias. A young heirress, forced to marry against her will, helps to escort the young George and Richard to Bruges in 1461 when their mother sends them abroad for safety.


John of Gloucester. London: Robert Hale, 1972. 189pp. Romance dealing with Richard III’s illegitimate son, John. It tells of his love affair with a cousin, his [historically inaccurate] marriage, and his escorting Richard’s nephews Edward and Richard to safety. He is portrayed as much older than he actually was.


In the Fragile Condition. Stories from English history from the time of William the Conqueror to Tudor period are presented here, heavy on romance and verbiage. Small print—hard to read.


The Romance of History: England and New York: Neele, Henry. Frederick Warne, 1891. 598 pp. Fragile condition. Stories from English history from the time of William the Conqueror to Tudor period are presented here, heavy on romance and verbiage. Small print—hard to read.


On the Trail of King Richard III. Taheke Press, New Zealand, 1996. 367 pp. The central character in this work of fiction is determined to do her own investigation into the truth behind Richard III. Using a combination of common sense, instinct and more than touch of ESP, she gets more than she bargains for when she reaches for the ultimate prize: the truth about what happened to the ‘Princes in the Tower.’

Crouchback. London and New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929, Tom Stacey Reprints. London, 1973. 359pp. Anne Neville’s life from childhood until her death is given a negative treatment with respect to her relationship with Richard. Despite the title, Richard is not the main character, and the mystery whether he was really a crouchback is left unanswered.


Poor Man’s Tapestry. London: Michael Joseph, 1973 (1946), 303 pp. Concerned with the lives of ordinary people during the Wars of the Roses: a young goldsmith, a mercer’s daughter, a clan of miners with their traveling forge, a priest or two of sorts, a nobleman’s household and retinue of men-at-arms.
Paget, Guy. *The Rose of London*. Plymouth: Mayflower Press, 1934. 279pp. The rose is Jane Shore, and this novel tells her story from her adolescence until her death. Jane is very intelligent and witty and manages to give Edward much advice on political matters, as well as rescuing Anne Neville. Richard makes frequent appearances. Well-written, similar in style to Under the Hog, with good historical detail.


——— *The Queen's Man*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1996. 291 pp. Medieval mystery featuring Justin de Quincy who is asked by Eleanor of Acquitaine to find the murderer of a goldsmith, an event tied into the disappearance of Richard the Lion Hearted on his way back from the Crusade.

——— *When Christ and his Saints Slept*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1995. 746 pp. Maude, the daughter of King Henry I of England, is in contention for the English throne with her cousin Stephen, the son of William I. This is a detailed account of that 12th-century struggle between them; both held valid claims and had shifting supporters. This 20-year controversy was much like a civil war, with such loss and pain that the period was characterized by a contemporary chronicle as a time of great wretchedness “when Christ and His Saints slept.”

Perot, Ruth. *The Red Queen: Margaret of Anjou and the War of the Roses*. Bloomington, IN: 1st Books Library, 2000. 281pp. A well-intentioned (if a bit naive) Margaret of Anjou becomes Queen of England. She is a faithful, loving wife, doting mother and loyal friend to her supporters, but is eventually driven, by adversity and maternal instinct, into harsh actions and subsequent despair. There is a brief encounter between Margaret and Richard of Gloucester after Tewkesbury during which she asks him to look after Anne Neville for her son’s sake.


Peters, Maureen. *Beggarmaid, Queen*. London: Robert Hale, 1980. 190pp. The life of Anne Neville from age 5 to shortly before her death. The relationship between her and Richard is seen as one of understanding and partnership but not affection. Neither character is portrayed particularly attractively.

——— *Elizabeth the Beloved*. London: Robert Hale, 1965. 222pp. Elizabeth of York's life from childhood until her death is the focus of this novel with strong emphasis on the mutual unrealized love affair (according to the author) between her and Richard III.

——— *The Queen Who Never Was* (also titled The Woodville Wench). Los Angeles: Pinnacle Books, 1972. 187pp. The life of Elizabeth Woodville is written here as a modern romance. She is scheming and greedy as a result of her humble past, and only realizes her mistakes at the end. A number of historical inaccuracies.


Plaidy, Jean. *The Goldsmith's Wife*. London: Putnam, 1950. 316 pp. The life of Jane Shore from the age of 18 to her death is the subject of this novel. Though the author accepts all the Tudor tales about Richard, he is still portrayed somewhat sympathetically. (Also published as “The King's Mistress”)

——— *The King's Mistress*. (See “The Goldsmith's Wife.”)


——— *The Reluctant Queen*. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1991. 295pp. Eighth in the English Queens series, this novel tells, in almost childish first person prose, the story of Anne Neville to close before her death. At the end, she is unsure whether the rumors of Richard's desire to be rid of her are truth or not.
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Ragosta, Millie J. Winter Rose. New York: Doubleday, 1982. 179 pp. Anne de Syon, the hidden daughter of Eleanor Butler & Edward IV, is discovered by the villainous Duke of Buckingham who seeks to use her to put himself on the throne. Richard III, identified as the murderer of the Princes, is an off-stage character.


Rubino, Diana. Crown of Destiny. New York: Domhan Books, 1999. 197pp. In this sequel to The Jewels of Warwick, Topaz’s rebellion against Henry VIII gets under way, throwing England into civil war and chaos. Her sister Amethyst is forced to choose between remaining loyal to her sister, or losing the only two men she has ever loved: the king, and her sister’s husband Matthew.

Rubin, Dara. Destiny Lies Waiting. New York: Domhan Books, 1999. 190pp. Denys, an orphan, was brought up in the Woodville family, but unwilling to become a pawn in the Elizabeth’s bid for power, she decides to seek the truth about her family and real identity. Valentine Starbury, a follower of Richard of Gloucester, woos Denys to prevent the Queen’s planned marriage for Gloucester and Denys, and both Starbury and Denys discover dangerous secrets.


Sabatini, Rafael. One Too Many Times. New York: Domhan Books, 2000. 370pp. [Large print] In this time travel novel, Edward, George and Richard travel to the 21st century in order to try to re-write history by making a film portraying Richard as he really was. In the course of their adventures, they each fall in love with very different women who re-shape all their destinies.


Scott, Amanda. *The Rose at Twilight.* New York: Dell, 1993. 390pp. After Richard III’s defeat at Bosworth Field, Yorkist Lady Alys Wolveston is given in marriage to Sir Nicholas Merion. In spite of her growing love for him, she plots with Francis Lovell to overthrow Henry VII.


Sedley, Kate. *Death and the Chapman.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991. 190pp. Roger the Chapman, a young peddler who travels England’s by-ways, is asked by a Bristol alderman to look into the disappearance of his son while on a trip to London. When Roger arrives in London, he unravels several mysteries tied to a mysterious inn and earns the gratitude of Richard, Duke of Gloucester. Sedley’s other nom de plume is Brenda Homan.

———*The Plymouth Cloak.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992. 192 pp. Second mystery in the Roger the Chapman series, whose path crosses that of Richard, Duke of Gloucester. In this story, Roger is asked to guard a Yorkist agent on his way to Brittany, but more than one person is interested in stopping Philip Underdown.

———*The Weaver’s Tale.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993. 248 pp. (Also available in Large print edition, under the title: The Hanged Man) The third of Roger the Chapman’s adventures, this one is set in 1474 in Bristol where Roger investigates the mysterious case of disappearance and murder. No real Ricardian connection in this book.


———*The Holy Innocents.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993. 280 pp. In April 1475 Roger the Chapman arrives at the village of Totnes where a band of marauders has been terrorizing the countryside for weeks and two children have disappeared. Roger uses his detective skills to find out what truly happened to the Holy innocents.

———*The Eve of St. Hyacinth.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995. 280 pp. *It’s the summer of 1475 on the eve of Edward IV’s invasion of France.* A rumor is circulating that Richard, Duke of Gloucester, is to be assassinated by the Eve of St. Hyacinth. Roger the Chapman is called upon to enter the Duke’s household and find the assassin.


———*Brothers of Glastonbury.* UK: Headline Book Pub. 1997. Roger the Chapman is asked by the Duke of Clarence to escort a young bride to her betrothed’s home. Chapman must unravel the mystery of the disappearance of the bride’s betrothed and of an ancient manuscript in a strange language.


———*Desire the Kingdom: a Story of the Last Plantagenets* (published as ÒPaula Simonds Zabkaí) San Diego: Bosworth Publishing Co., 2002. 360pp. This novel has a loyal Ricardian backbone, classical Ricardian viewpoint providing the structure for this tale, which begins with Anne Neville in flight to Calais and ends at Bosworth. Anne is depicted here with more than the usual stamina and Thomas Mallory makes an unexpected contribution to the plot.


Solmsen, Arthur R. G. *The Wife of Shore: A Search.* Philadelphia: Mill Creek Press, 2000. 284 pp. The wife of Shore, as she was called by all the writers of her time, was the mistress of Richard’s older brother, King Edward IV. This novel begins in to supply the details, but historian affirm that soon after Edward IV got a look at her, the wife of Shore was moved to Windsor—not reluctantly—while her husband transferred himself and his business to Flanders. Not long after that, she petitioned the Pope for a divorce, alleging that she wanted children but her husband was impotent. All that is background. This story begins on April 8, 1483, when Edward IV, only forty years old, suddenly collapses.


Stoker, M. Brooke. *Prince Perkin.* London: Robert Hale, 1966. 197pp. A tale of tragedy, lyrically told. We follow the story of Richard of York, who seems to be what he claims to be, a Plantagenet, royally born. As his short life sweeps to its heartbreaking and inevitable end at the hands of a truly villainous Henry ap Tudor, we learn the truth of his parentage from a formidable Margaret of Burgundy..


Tannahill, Reay. *The Seventh Son*. London: Headline Publishers Ltd., 2002. 432pp. A rather dry look at Richard's life beginning after Tewkesbury. Apparently the author was at great pains to *dèse-romanticezó* this story at all costs. The characters lack soul and depth and there is a disproportionate emphasis on Richard's land acquisitions (with a rather over-the-top depiction of the incident with the Countess of Oxford.) Still, a few fanciful twists on some famous scenes make this a worthwhile read.


Townsend, Guy M. *To Prove a Villain*. Menlo Park, CA: Perseverance Press, 1985. 190pp. In answer to Tey's novel, Townsend has Professor John Forest solve the murder of the head of the English Department of a small college. In doing so, Townsend condemns Ricardians and *ôprocèseô* that Richard III murdered his nephews.


**———. Within the Fetterlock.** Lake Charles, LA: Trivium Publishing, LLC, 2003. 527pp. Well-written account of the origins of the War of the Roses during the reign of Richard II, told primarily through the eyes of Constance of York, granddaughter of Edward III and wife of Thomas Despencer. This is a story in which the political and the personal are inextricably intertwined; the pages virtually ooze intrigue, treachery, revenge and personal tragedy. The characters are strongly drawn and the plot moves apace; an enjoyable and informative read.

Warrington, Freda. *The Court of the Midnight King*. London: Simon & Schuster, 2003. 575pp. The veils between the worlds part in this fantasy, and it is but a step from our world to that of an England following a slightly alternate path of history û one in which the ancient worship of the Goddess and the practice of magic prevail. The story moves between these two threads of history and back and forth through time, keeping the reader engaged and intrigued along the way. Recommended for Ricardians with a penchant for the metaphysical.


———. *The White Rose* (also titled *The Lion's Share*, which is a shorter version). New York: G.P. Putnam, 1969. 480 pp. Romantic treatment of Elizabeth Woodville's life from 1461 until the marriage of her daughter to Henry Tudor. Written in a stiff style, with emphasis on the nobility of the Woodvilles, especially Anthony. Author seems to have had difficulty deciding on what to make of Richard's character, though it's primarily negative.

Whittle, Tyler. *The Last Plantagenet*. London: William Heinemann, 1968. 275 pp. Richard's life from the age of 7 with his capture at Ludlow to his death is sensitively told. However, characterization of Richard's youth is better than treatment of adult character. Emphasis is on Richard's squandering of trust on the wrong people, and author skips over the events of the Protectorate entirely.


Williams, Bert. *Master of Ravnepur*. Canada: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1970. 156 pp. 12 year old Dickon seeks justice from the Duke of Gloucester when his master is killed by Lancastrians. He soon becomes the Duke's faithful follower from 1469-1471 and has many adventures. Written for young adults, especially boys, 10+


—–*The Rose of York: Crown of Destiny*. Arizona: End Table Books, 2007. 267 pp. *Crown Of Destiny* is book two in *The Rose Of York* trilogy and deals with the downward spiral of Edward IV’s reign. Richard, a strong advocate of justice and loyalty, is sucked into the turbulent and dangerous vortex of life in Edward’s court where, at a single word from the detested queen, a man's land, family, and life can be erased. Readers learn of Richard’s agony as he tries to reason with Edward, and how he miserably fails. Glowing throughout the book is Richard’s obvious love for his wife and concern for his frail son.


Wright, Patricia. *I am England*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1987. 396pp. I Am England, Wright’s biography of a palace pool on a ridge above a forest, England in micro-cosm chronicles the lives of Brac the primitive smith, Edred, Alfred’s Saxon warrior, Rico, the traveling storyteller, and Francis, ironmonger and martyr. The community, its traditions, etc., is shaped by movements—large Alfred’s wars against Viking raiders, the Norman conquest, religious vagaries and persecutions large and small, the communal repair of a pool, the naming of an ox, and quarrels from one generation that bring prosperity or death to succeeding ones. Similar to Edward Rutherfurd’s Sarum (LJ 9/15/87), another novel of England, this is more lyrical and compact. Highly recommended.

Zabka, Paula Simonds. See Paula Simonds.
A medieval stone coffin found by a local resident has been unearthed with the help of The One Show’s resident historian, Dan Snow.

Reg Colver discovered the stone coffin when working as a gardener in the grounds of a property in Earl Shilton, where it had been used for many years as a water feature. After seeing a television programme about Richard III’s coffin, which mentioned it was later used as a water feature, Reg wondered if the two could be related.

David Wilson Homes, who now own the property housing the coffin, were keen to preserve the local history and worked together with Leicestershire County Council’s archaeological service and Bosworth Battlefield to extract the artefact last Friday.

Richard Knox, Curator of Bosworth Battlefield, said: “The coffin is a fascinating piece of medieval history and could only have been afforded by the wealthy, although who it belonged to will always be a mystery.”

The coffin will be cleaned and examined before finding a new home at Bosworth Battlefield Heritage Centre in Sutton Cheney, where it will be displayed for the public to view in the spring.

Ernie White, Leicestershire County Council’s Cabinet member for Community Services, said: “It’s fantastic that such an important piece of history will be displayed at Bosworth Battlefield Heritage Centre for members of the public to enjoy.”

Philip Lacey, Sales Director for David Wilson, says, “This has been a very exciting project for us and we are delighted to have been able to share it with The Battle of Bosworth Heritage Centre, preserving this piece of history for generations to come.”

The dramatic events of the Battle of Bosworth, 1485, can be experienced in a new, interactive exhibition at the Battlefield Heritage Centre, which recently won the bronze award for Small Visitor Attraction at the East Midlands Tourism Enjoy England Awards.

Internet Sites of Interest

http://www.english-heritage.org.uk

The English Heritage website, offers information about events planned at historic locations. You can investigate by using their monthly calendar of events, or you can go to the website, scroll to the bottom right of the page to “English Heritage Newsletter”, click on it and sign up to their free newsletter.

There are a wide variety of programs listed. You may even want to plan a trip to coincide with some of them. Something I would like to attend is the annual Festival of History planned for July 25 and 26 2009 at Kelmarsh Hall, Northamptonshire. Last year, dramatic events from England’s past 2,000 years were reenacted by over 1,000 costumed participants including Roman Briton, Victorian, Wars of the Roses groups and WWI and WWII events, each doing their separate displays or battles. This site is highly recommended.

While trying to research an event in Cheshire this year, the reenactment of the return of the retinues of Wm. and Thomas Stanley to their Tatton manor, after Bosworth, I stumbled upon this website of the Wars of the Roses Federation. It has a calendar of events that relate to medieval markets and re-enactments, and a list of the levies, retinues and households that take part in the Federation. There are a number of re-enactment groups involved, and their geographic locations, loyalties and separate events are listed, so you should check each one in which you have an interest. One upcoming event is the International Living History Fayre to be held in Leamington Spa, Feb. 27-March 1. The Federation website:

http://www.et-tu.com/wotrf1/cgi-bin/index.cgi
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Requiem Mass, Cambridge - the celebrant and acolytes in the sanctuary
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Floral Tribute for Queen Anne Neville, Westminster

Blessed Margaret Pole (Lady Margaret Plantagenet, Countess of Salisbury) stained glass window

Floral Tribute for Queen Anne Neville, Westminster
### Chapter Contacts

**ARIZONA**  
Mrs. Joan Marshall  
10727 West Kelso Drive • Sun City, AZ 85351  
(623) 815-6822

**EASTERN MISSOURI**  
Bill Heuer  
111 Minturn • Oakland, MO 63122  
(314) 966-4254 • bheuer0517@sbcglobal.net

**ILLINOIS**  
Janice Wiener  
6540 N. Richmond St. • Chicago, IL 60645-4209

**MICHIGAN AREA**  
Larry Irwin  
5715 Forman Drive • Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301  
(248) 626-5339 • katvredc@yahoo.com

**MINNESOTA**  
Margaret Anderson  
3912 Minnehaha Avenue S. #29, Minneapolis, MN 55406.  
(612) 729-4503 • megander@earthlink.net

**NEW ENGLAND**  
Joan Szechman  
917 Ward Lane • Cheshire, CT 06410  
r3ne@cox.net; www.r3ne.org

**NEW MEXICO**  
Lori J. Braunnhardt  
4931 Story Rock St. NW • Albuquerque, NM 87120  
lori_richard3@hotmail.com

**NORTHWEST**  
Jean Macdonald  
bonnyj@verizon.net

**NEW YORK-METRO AREA**  
Maria Elena Torres  
3216 Fillmore Avenue • Brooklyn, NY 11234  
elena@pipeline.com

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN**  
Chapter moderator wanted  
Please contact: Eileen Prinsen  
16151 Longmeadow St - Dearborn MI. 48120  
313-271-1224 • eileenprinsen@woway.com

**SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA**  
Joseph Wawrzyniak  
3429 Chalfont Drive • Philadelphia, PA 19154  
(215) 637-8538 • jwawrzyniak@worldnet.att.net

**SOUTHWEST**  
Roxane C. Murph  
3501 Medina Avenue • Ft. Worth, TX 76133  
(817) 923-5056 • afmurph04@aol.com

If you are interested in forming a chapter, contact Eileen Prinsen, Chapter Co-ordinator, Eileen Prinsen ecp6@sbcglobal.net.

---

**Membership Application/Renewal**

- [ ] Mr.  [ ] Mrs.  [ ] Miss
- [ ] Individual Membership  $50.00
- [ ] Individual Membership Non-US  $55.00
- [ ] Family Membership  $50 + $5/member  $_____
- [ ] International Mail  $10.00

**Contributing & Sponsoring Memberships:**

- [ ] Honorary Fotheringhay Member  $ 75.00
- [ ] Honorary Middleham Member  $180.00
- [ ] Honorary Bosworth Member  $300.00
- [ ] Plantagenet Angel  $500.00
- [ ] Plantagenet Family Member  $500+  $_____

**Contributions:**

- [ ] Schallek Fellowship Awards:  $_____
- [ ] General Fund (publicity, mailings, etc)  $_____

**Total Enclosed:**  $_____

*Family Membership $50 for yourself, plus $5 for each additional family member residing at same address.*

Make all checks payable to Richard III Society, Inc.  
Mail to Amber McVey  
4681 Angeline Lane • Mason, OH 45040-2907