"Twixt the black of night
And the white of day
There's an area prescribed.
It is the realm of conscience
Where justice is derived,
In markings bold and lasting
With a mirror brightness gleam,
On the soul it is inscribed!

From coronation to widowhood
He has shared his master's lot,
And served him well with good
Intent, and counseled him not
to make a marriage against
The law in courts and canons, and blot
The existence of his good name
And the precepts he was taught.

Vaughan and Grey have met their fate
Along with Rivers, too.
Their sacrifice has cleansed the line
For the good of all, and true
Companions know that he has
Shunned that which is gray.
He has placed the onus on himself,
From truth he will not stray.

Twilight the black of night
And the white of day
There's an area prescribed.
It is the realm of conscience
Where justice is derived,
In markings bold and lasting
With a mirror brightness gleam,
On the soul it is inscribed!

From coronation to widowhood
He has shared his master's lot,
And served him well with good
Intent, and counseled him not
to make a marriage against
The law in courts and canons, and blot
The existence of his good name
And the precepts he was taught.

Vaughan and Grey have met their fate
Along with Rivers, too.
Their sacrifice has cleansed the line
For the good of all, and true
Companions know that he has
Shunned that which is gray.
He has placed the onus on himself,
From truth he will not stray.
Scattered Standards

MIdi Library and Theater. Scheduling Folger tour. Instead, 27 members problems hindered our plans for a Chapter of the Folger Shakespeare familiar (lemon chicken) to the plans for an April tour by the both fiction and non-fiction. Mem-
colorful Chinatown section of Wash-
at the China Inn Restaurant in the
and their guests met on April 16th
meeting, the group discussed the
be used at local Renaissance
exotic (Pelican's Nest). Following
that had originally kindled their
favorites, and the specific books
of dishes that ranged from the fa-
be out why they
explained how people, through a series of .stages, could be taken back to another existence before their present one. She also explained how people with problems in this life would go back to a former life to find out why they have these problems.

After a break for coffee, tea and delicious cookies, we returned to the meeting and were treated to a demonstration of Past Life Regression. Stuart Sender volunteer-
ed to try it and, for the next hour and a half, went back in time and, at one point, described himself as being a sheriff in Yuma, Arizona. He was then brought back to the point of his past death, and back to the present.

It was a thrilling afternoon, and I was happy to have been part of it. Thank you, Jane, for allowing us the use of your home, and for making our meeting a great one.

The next meeting will be announced. Looking forward to seeing you all there, and if you know anyone who would be interested, bring them along.

John Buffen

Northern California Chapter

We are trying to reactivate. Andrew Knight has taken over our newsletter. We are working on getting some speakers through Cal Berkeley, and when we get something set up, we will blitz the area with advertising. The Battaaglias are looking into forming a separate or sub-Chapter up in Northern Cal-
fand are an integral part of our group.

We had a meeting on January 2, at which we agreed to make real ef-
for to get going, and we do have hopes and plans.

Noami levine

Ohio Chapter

The Chapter's Planning Commit-
tee for the '89 ACM met in March at the home of Sue Butz, in Cleveland. She and Elaine Munsch will serve as Co-Chairman for ACM '89. Hotel proposals have been submitted to National for approval, and plans are coming along well.

The Spring meeting was held April 9th at the Northups' home in Columbus. Business discussed included participation in the OBU Renaissance Festival, the '69 ACM, and plans for our Medieval Banquet. Pat O'elles gave an interesting pre-
sentation on the history of 1461 and 15th century costume, which included illustrations and helpful hints on costume making.

On Saturday, May 7, we partici-
cipated in the OSU Ren/Feast for the second time. This year, the spot-
light really fell on both the Chap-
ter and the Society with our having been chosen to conduct the Corona-
tion Ceremony; which opens the Fes-
tival. All in costume, we made an impressive array of nobles, arch-
bishop, Benedictine monks, and even Blasemangier Pursuivant, in addi-
tion to the royal couple, who were also Chapter members. As part of their regal duties, King Gary and Queen Laura wandered the Festival site throughout the day, visiting with as many people as possible.

Back at the Chapter's feifdom, we "lesser lights" were busy "spread-
ing the word" to amusingly recep-
tive people, who stopped by the booth. Ren/Feast is one of the largest, free festivals of its kind in the country, so we were able to get word of the Society and the Chapter, and their respective activities and goals, to a vast audience. The day was a wonderful "trip back in time," which was rounded off by dinner in a local, marvellously medieval restaurant.

On July 9th, we will hold a Medieval Banquet in conjunction with our regular Summer meeting. Pertinent information has been mailed to all dues-paying members, and more will be forthcoming in the next edition of the Crown & Hel.

New Ricardians in the Chapter area are, of course, cordially invited to join us for the Banquet, which will commemorate the Coronation of Richard III and Anne Neville. Costumes are optional, and reserva-
tions can be made through Pat & Tom O'elles, 617 Madison Ave., Lancaster, OH 43130.

Hope we see you there! New faces are always welcome!

Jude gallery
The meeting of the Southwest Chapter on April 9 was both a preview and a review. Anne Vineyard (Dallas) reviewed the popular workshop “If, I Say Can You See?” that she presented at the ’87 ACM in Ft. Worth. Anne also previewed how she plans to adapt the workshop material when she gives the main address at the ’88 ACM in Washington, D.C.

Anne, a social studies teacher, uses material about Richard III in an Advanced Social Science Problems class designed to teach juniors and seniors how to do research papers. She uses material about her “king” as an introduction to the course because she found that the material available is either black or white. In the class, Anne has her students read Josephine Tey’s Daughter of Time and shows them a video of Richard III, starring Laurence Olivier. At the end of 6 weeks, the students use 3 class periods to write research papers about Richard III, supporting or condemning him. The 9 members who heard Anne speak decided that they would like to do one of two things—go back to school and take Anne’s class, or go to the ’88 ACM and hear her speak. They were especially intrigued by how Anne teaches the students how to “color code” a chart of the Plantagenets, then use these colors in following “who’s who” in a brief history she has written about the Wars of the Roses.

During the business meeting, the Chapter voted to buy 2 copies of Roxane Murph’s Richard III: The Making of a Legend to be given to libraries in Ft. Worth and Arlington. Information about the Southwest Chapter will be inserted in the books. Anne Vineyard heartily endorsed this purchase, saying Roxane’s book was a valuable resource book for her students in their research work.

While feasting on strawberry shortcake, many members discussed Mallory Paxton’s ACM report (Register, Winter ’87). All were glad that Mallory and her friends from the Northwest Chapter had enjoyed their stay in Ft. Worth.

Chapter members agree that hosting an ACM was a good thing, but wish more Ricardians could have gone to partake of the Texan hospitality which Mallory seemed to relish so much. Slide contributions to the Chapter have been an increase in interest in the Society. This is illustrated by the fact that the Chapter now has 18 dues-paying members, the largest number since its founding, 5 years ago.

As is their custom, the Chapter will meet in August to commemorate the Battle of Bosworth. Who knows? Maybe our man will win, this time around!

Telephone conference meeting was called to order by Chairman Roxane Murph at 1:00 p.m. (PST) with Vice-Chairman Robert Doolittle, Treasurer Alan Dixler, and Membership Chairman Carole Rike in attendance. Secretary Jacqueline Bloomquist was excused.

1. Minutes of the previous Board Meeting were approved as read.

2. Financial Report from Alan Dixler:
   - $3,000 - Endowment Fund
   - 4,000 - Scholarship Fund
   - 17,000 - General Fund

3. Carole Rike reported 644 members now in the Society.

4. Unfinished Business:
   - The Board decided to purchase copies of Richard III: The Making of a Legend, and members will be able to buy these from Linda McAtish.

5. New Business:
   - Interest in having slides in our Audio-Visual Library has prompted a request for slide donations. A piece about this will be in the Register.

Next Board Meeting set for May 1, 1988.

The Board-Chronicles

March 6, 1988

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Roxane Murph at 3:00 p.m. (CST) with Vice-Chairman Robert Doolittle, Treasurer Alan Dixler, and Membership Chairman Carole Rike in attendance. Secretary Jacqueline Bloomquist was excused.

1. Minutes of the last meeting approved as read.

2. Treasurer’s Report:
   - $3,000 - Endowment Fund
   - 4,000 - Scholarship Fund
   - 18,000 - General Fund


4. Unfinished Business:
   - Ten people have signed up for the Ricardian Tour of England.

Publications:
   - Our first publication, a monograph by Pamela Garrett, is being submitted to the Committee for consideration.

Nominating Committee:
   - Nancy Wenzendorf, OH, Chairman
   - Linda Spicer, MA
   - Margaret Nelson, WA

Heraldry Quiz

The bearer of these arms was related to both Richard III and Anne Neville.

ANSWER TO LAST QUIZ: Richard Plantagenet & Cecily Neville.
All ballots will be mailed first class to give members enough time to complete them and also make plans to attend the AGM. The AGM, hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Chapter for 1988, is flowing along smoothly. We hope to have good attendance at this AGM.

Other Chapters that have requested "hosting" an AGM are: Ohio-1989; New England-1990; and Southern California-1991.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. (PST) and the next meeting is called for July 10th.

Jacqueline Bloomquist, Secretary

Ricardian Projects
The Glorious Son of York

This presentation, which combines background lecture, dramatic portrayal of Richard III, and general discussion in which audiences are engaged in the derivation of historical and literary truth, differences in modern and Renaissance attitudes toward truth and Richard's real role in English history is jointly sponsored by Ferrum College and the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities and Public Policy. Under the directorship of Dr. Jody Brown of Ferrum College, the program has been presented at various southeastern Virginia high schools and colleges and before art organizations. It is certainly an endeavor worthy of our attention and, in a letter from Dr. Brown, has asked our help in any way possible. For further information, contact Dr. Brown at Ferrum College, Ferrum, VA 24068-9001.

Ricardian Round Robin

On a lighter note, for several months now a Ricardian Round Robin letter has been circulating among a half dozen, or so, members. It has grown from introductions to a sizable packet filled with intriguing, often humorous, and always thought-provoking information on all sorts of topics. That group has reached its numerical limit, and Marge Nelson, who initiated the project is looking for other Ricardians for additional Round Robins. If you'd be interested in using this interesting, enjoyable way of expanding your own Ricardian contacts and profiting from an otherwise impossible exchange of individual ideas and expertise, please contact Marge at 32904 Fourth St., S.W., Federal Way, WA 98023, and she can help get you started on a truly rewarding Ricardian experience.

Richard III is not guilty of the crime which many historians attribute to him: that of murdering his two, young nephews, Richard of York and Edward V. In Richard III's face alone a great subservience to conscience is seen in the Treaty of Piquigny, Richard showed unswerving loyalty to Edward and was popular among the people. Never once during his life, even when the boys disappeared did rumor run rampant that he had killed his nephews. Why? Because his successors committed the crime, then pinned it on him.

As far as personal traits are concerned, in the Treaty of Piquigny, Richard was the only noble to refuse a bribe from the King of France. Though he was loyal to his brother, he would not sacrifice his morals, beliefs, or principles: "What would you have me write under the seal of the Great SEAL of England?" he asked and the answer was "How would you like to lose it forever?"

All of these qualities are well demonstrated in the historical Richard III and serve to make him much more human than his sister, Queen Elizabeth. Other Chapters that have requested "hosting" an AGM are: Ohio-1989; New England-1990; and Southern California-1991.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. (PST) and the next meeting is called for July 10th.
Sir James Tyrell of Gipping Hall. Here is an important figure who played on Woodville, and proclaimed their children "bastards." George found out about the illegal marriage. The not-so-bright George took a firm stand against his brother, Edward, and the Woodvilles as well, and argued against the execution of George. The document proclaimed Richard might have been placed for a time. Once Henry gained the crown—first, by Henry not only reinstated these later but also established the Star Chamber Benevolences and Livery and Maintenance. These were, basically, the foundation of the feudal system. By outlawing them, Richard gave the tenant farmers more freedom and a chance for social mobility. It is too bad that the treacherous Morton could not have been read. Henry wanted to marry Elizabeth of York, who had been proclaimed illegitimate in Titulus Regius, but in making her legitimate, Henry also made Edward V and Richard, Duke of York legitimate. This alone was quite enough for Henry to murder the boys, but there are other factors to consider as well.

Once King, Richard allowed his relatives and the "supposed" claimants to live freely in England. His first Parliament was a liberal and progressive one. However, the first Parliament followed the standards of the Woodvilles, and Richard was trying to make himself the new Edward as well. Instead, they instigated a plot to get Edward V crowned before Richard could get to London. The plot failed, however, and Elizabeth fled to sanctuary.

It was a year later when she and her daughters came out of sanctuary—after the girls had been declared illegitimate by the Titulus Regius. When Elizabeth came out, she "made her peace" with Richard, lived at his Court in London, and received a handsome pension from him. It was at this time that the boys disappeared. Another important factor to consider is that if you were a strong-willed woman, obsessed with family, as Elizabeth Woodville clearly was, would you make peace with the supposed murderer of your two sons? Definitely not. This is because she knew where the boys were—Gipping Hall. It is therefore a point frequently omitted by the history books attributes the crime to Richard, but with some careful investigation and character analysis, the puzzle fits together and exposes Henry Tudor as the true murderer.

Olivia Saxon-Glasgow

FOOTNOTES

There are a great many mysteries still unsolved today. These mysteries are becoming harder and harder to solve, as the evidence is disappearing into the sands of time. There is one such mystery that, to an extent, may be solvable. This is the mystery of the disappearance and possible murder of the sons of Edward IV: Edward V and Richard. Over the years, this supposed murder has remained cloudy and unclear. Conclusions were seemingly impossible. Circumstantial evidence is all there is to the finding. Surprisingly, even after five hundred years, this may be enough. Richard III has been charged many times with the murder, but he has been charged unjustly. Even in the midst of some inconclusive evidence, the innocence of Richard remains an inevitable conclusion.

In regard to the evidence surrounding the murder, there exists two distinct groups: evidence through historians and evidence through rumor and hearsay. This latter group does not contribute to the solving of the mystery; rather, it clouds the issue as a result of its contradictory and inconclusive information.

Dominic Mancini, who wrote The Discourse of Richard the Third, wrote an account of the mystery largely based on gossip. What is stated in his text is that a suspicion had arisen that Richard had murdered the princes. No evidence is given. It merely says that suspicion existed. Historians have pounced on this as if it were fact. Too little questioning has come forth to challenge this suspicion, and his reports are one unsubstantiated source.

The second source material based on hearsay is the Croyland Chronicle. Compiled in the spring of 1486, three years after the suspected murder, its validity is questioned. To add to this is the fact that it was compiled under the Tudor regime, so a large amount of bias would be expected. What is most interesting, however, is the fact that the Croyland Chronicle is remarkably similar to Mancini's account, a manuscript based on another manuscript, based on hearsay. In the translation, already untrue stories were turned into more stories. One interesting point is that the Chronicle states "rumor was spread that the son of King Edward had died a violent death, but it was the certain how."

Nowhere else does it mention the princes, nor does it state that the rumor is true. Either the Chronicler did not believe that Richard was guilty, or did not wish to accuse him and, for the type of work it is, this seems unlikely.

Polydore Vergil and Thomas More were historians under Henry VII and VIII, and their accounts of the murder are vague and incomplete. Kendall makes this comment on More's work: "The sparse and uncommunicative desert where grew only scattered shots of suspicion that Richard was guilty suddenly blossoms into luxuriant certainty." Vergil does say that George was an interesting, however, is the fact that the Croyland Chronicle is remarkably similar to Mancini's account, a manuscript based on another manuscript, based on hearsay. In the translation, already untrue stories were turned into more stories. One interesting point is that the Chronicle states "rumor was spread that the son of King Edward had died a violent death, but it was the certain how."

Nowhere else does it mention the princes, nor does it state that the rumor is true. Either the Chronicler did not believe that Richard was guilty, or did not wish to accuse him and, for the type of work it is, this seems unlikely.

Polydore Vergil and Thomas More were historians under Henry VII and VIII, and their accounts of the murder are vague and incomplete. Kendall makes this comment on More's work: "The sparse and uncommunicative desert where grew only scattered shots of suspicion that Richard was guilty suddenly blossoms into luxuriant certainty." Vergil does say that George was an interesting, however, is the fact that the Croyland Chronicle is remarkably similar to Mancini's account, a manuscript based on another manuscript, based on hearsay. In the translation, already untrue stories were turned into more stories. One interesting point is that the Chronicle states "rumor was spread that the son of King Edward had died a violent death, but it was the certain how."

Nowhere else does it mention the princes, nor does it state that the rumor is true. Either the Chronicler did not believe that Richard was guilty, or did not wish to accuse him and, for the type of work it is, this seems unlikely.
There is, however, a man who had every reason to kill the princes. This man is King Henry VII. He was not a direct descendant to the throne. He took the throne by force and, secondly, he claimed it through bloodline. To secure his line, he had to repeal Titulus Regius, that marriage was declared illegal and the children bastard. Henry had to repeal Titulus Regius to secure his line. Once this was repealed, the sons of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville, whose murder is in question, were made legitimate. They held a higher claim to the throne than Henry. Henry must be rid of them to have a secure crown.

Also interesting is the disappearance of other descendants, who had lived happily during Richard's reign. Henry could not afford to let them live, so he killed them. And what of Tyrell, mentioned earlier? Where did he fit in? Tyrell, who happened to know the location of the princes, saw the fall of Richard and the rise of Henry. He saw the repeal of Titulus Regius and, thus, the importance of the boys. He made a deal with Henry. He stated that he would dispose of the boys if Henry would let him live in peace. Henry agreed, took Tyrell on as his constant of Calais, and gave Tyrell the customary pardon. Tyrell happened to be the only surviving aide who served under Richard. Tyrell then disposed of the boys, received a mysterious second pardon, and continued with his life. Tyrell is later taken into custody by Henry and killed. Henry then spread the story of a confession of killing the boys for Richard made by Tyrell, and the tale ends.

This account is logical. It fits the facts, and it makes sense. There is no doubt that Richard had nothing to do with the murder of the boys, and there is not a single fact to do with it. This is one line in this investigation, as in most investigations, is motive. The result is that Henry had motive. Richard did not. The situation surrounding Henry is far too suspicious and, on closer inspection, is found to be almost silly. The basic facts were not included in this paper, but they are not necessary. The basic situation, the basic facts are all that is necessary. With the basic facts, the inescapable conclusion remains that, in the killing of the sons of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville, Henry VII is guilty.

Tod Kelman

FOOTNOTES

2. Williamson, p. 17.
5. Kendall, p. 469.
8. Williamson, p. 17.
10. Kendall, p. 150.

Edward IV’s two sons were not murdered by Richard III, nor were they murdered by Henry VII. Richard III had neither the motive nor the personality capable of such a crime. Henry VII certainly had reason to murder the princes, and probably would have, had he been given the opportunity. Richard III has been portrayed as a neurotic hunchback with a withered arm by many historians. However, the truth is that he was a handsome man capable of love and affection, especially for his family. Richard and Edward IV had a very close relationship. For example, Edward trusted his brother enough to place him in charge of the entire Northern region of England, perhaps the most volatile in the land. Richard reciprocated his trust by complete support for his brother throughout Edward IV’s reign (indeed, Richard’s motto was loyauté me lie). Historians only mention one incident where Richard openly disagreed with his brother. That involved a Breton from France in which Richard refused to take part, because he felt it was his duty to England to refuse. That was the extent of the disagreement, honor to country.

It is impossible that a man charged with the Protection of his brother and king’s children, who cared and loved them as his own, just as he cared for and loved his brother, would heartlessly and brutally kill those same children. Furthermore, there is evidence that Richard made every attempt to protect the children. When Edward died, Lord Rivers, immediately enlisted young Edward V and set off for London with 2,000 soldiers. Richard, however, intercepted him and had Rivers executed, along with three of his accomplices. Richard then escorted the princes to coronation and began preparation for the coronation by taking control of matters at hand—putting down the Hastings’ rebellion and having Hastings executed to ensure the safety of the Princes.

One might then ask why Richard accepted Titulus Regius, the document which annulled Edward IV’s marriage and thus made Richard the rightful heir. Richard was exceptionally intelligent (proof of this lay in his ingenious letters concerning political affairs) and probably thought this was an opportunity to unify the country and simultaneously place the princes in safety. One might argue that this is just a fancy explanation of Richard’s innocence and, does not deny that he was getting power over the country and the princes. He was getting the throne. However, if Richard really desired the throne, why not kill the princes himself? After all, he had plenty of opportunity. He knew that by
assuming the throne, he put himself in jeopardy, not the princes. Therefore, he
did what was best for England, and followed his brother's wishes, at the same
time. Besides, if Richard had murdered the princes simply to stabilize his
case to the throne, by that theory he would have to murder all other possible
heirs to the throne, which never happened. 
A point has been made concerning Richard's love for his family, but what of
his love for others? After all, he did have several conspirators beheaded
during the Hastings Rebellion. However, the statistics show Richard was
lenient, even by today's standards (where murderers go free and treason, nearly
legal): so lenient as to grant luxurious favors to Morton and Stanley and to
treat Elizabeth Woodville, a known enemy of the crown, with "startling
acquiescence." The fact that she came out of sanctuary with her daughters in
the first place, proves that she trusted Richard with her own and her daughter's
lives. Therefore, it is quite obvious that Richard was just and fair and 'lack
the murdering personality.
On the other hand, there is Henry VII, who seems to have had every reason
to kill the princes, but did not. Why?
First, if Henry had killed the nephews of Richard, why did he not force the
blame on Richard by means of a public announcement? If Henry had done this,
then he would have gained support for the battle of Bosworth, which he
desperately needed after being repulsed in October, 1483. The battle of
Bosworth was barely won and only because Stanley betrayed Richard at the last
moment. If Henry had killed the princes after he won the crown, he still had
nothing to lose by blaming Richard, and everything to gain by eliminating any
possible claims by impostors.
Then, there is the problem of Tyrell. If Tyrell had actually done the
killing, or knew where the princes were and told Henry, Henry would have killed
Tyrell then and there. By letting Tyrell off, he let loose potential threats to
his power: Tyrell would always have that ace in the hole. He was not the
personality of a man who would stand for blackmail; rather, he was the type who
would blackmail.
By this hypothesis, Henry should have blamed the deaths of the princes on
Richard, no matter who had done the actual killing. Therefore, the princes were
still alive after Henry became king. In fact, they were alive until 1502.

The key to the mystery is Tyrell. Tyrell was a close friend to Richard and
held important titles. It is highly probable, therefore, that Richard
trusted Tyrell with the princes, as many historians suggest. In fact, there is
evidence that Tyrell was in charge of the "king's interests," 13 the king being
Richard, suggesting the princes as those interests. If Tyrell did have the
princes, he probably had a significant number of guards to go with them (He held
titles enough to retain small bodies of men-at-arms, thus freeing him of any
suspicion). 14

So, Henry assumes the throne and finds out Tyrell has the princes. Tyrell
demands two general pardons for keeping the princes, and then demands to be sent
to France, so as to be as far away as possible. Tyrell did not make public the
fact, but the princes were still alive because all he wanted was a peaceful
England, as Richard had, and he was aware of Henry's political maneuvering.
Also, his friend had just been killed and the entire dynasty had fallen. He was
in no mood to have a power struggle with Henry. All he wanted now was peace for
himself and the princes.

Misfortune struck Tyrell in 1502, when Henry tricked him. Possibly, the
princes had died of natural causes, or Tyrell had decided that the princes were
safe and they had escaped to France. Whatever the reason, Henry finally got
Tyrell, and since it had been so long Henry had no need to strengthen his claim
to the throne by proving the princes dead, or by blaming the murder on Richard.
Thus, nature wins in the end, despite the follies of megalomaniacs or concerned
kings—be that as it may.

FOOTNOTES

12. Ross, Charles; Richard III; University of California, Berkeley, 1981.

Anne Vineyard, who has guided the work of these future Ricardians, will be
the keynote speaker at this year's convention in Washington, D.C., expanding on her
very successful workshop last year in Ft. Worth.
The facts of history are readily learned by anyone who takes the trouble to discover them. However, Sharon Kay Penman’s newly published novel The Shadow, goes well beyond the basic facts to give us the essence of the 13th century within the splendid story of ambition, intrigue, betrayal, obstacles, these two dynamic individuals, the English king’s church-bound architect who built Westminster Abbey, whose birth doomed him to kingship, the weak and ineffectual, Henry III. The power behind the throne, except for the period when de Montfort’s military might made him the virtual ruler of England, was the king’s firstborn. This son was to become Edward I, Longshanks, scourge of the Welsh and the Scots. Here we see a seed of Ms. Penman’s next book, The Reckoning, which is currently being written.

The extraordinary results of this author’s exhaustive research, so well utilized in her novel of Richard III, The Sunne in Spicke, are again evident in The Shadow. Moreover, her talent for description and her insight into human nature are finely tuned. She has a wonderful knack for putting the reader in the middle of a battle, or in the anguished mind of a character torn by conflicting loyalties.

Like Penman’s highly successful earlier novels, this is a book to be savored, read and reread; a literary journey that is not diminished by knowing how it all came out.

Helen Cusk, California

Coming Publication

In a previous Register, I announced the forthcoming publication of Joan and Richard by fellow Ricardian, Dr. Charles Wood of Dartmouth College. Because many members have asked how these two historical figures might be linked, I asked Dr. Wood if he would provide some background information. Here is his reply:

I've always been attracted to Joan and Richard not because I saw them as being in any way connected, but rather because both stand out as those figures in the histories of this period whose actions at the end of the Middle Ages, seem so prominent that their lives have received almost continuous attention from literary artists, as well as from historians. My sense was that there was something about each of them that seemed to sum up and symbolize a good deal about the nature difficult political communities which existed in England and France. As a result, I felt that if I could genuinely understand both of them, I would be seeing a good deal about France and England— as well as about why they developed in such different ways.

So I then began working on Joan and Richard themselves, trying to understand them within the context of their own times and countries. What I found, though, was that once I felt I knew them, it wasn’t conveying that understanding to others in the form of simple biography. The problem was that a good deal of my understanding was based on an interpretation of earlier French and English developments that differed significantly from that to be found in the standard accounts.

I then backed off and asked myself what a reader needed to know about. To do this, I turned to histories of England and France in order to see why I saw Richard and Joan as I did. Amazingly, such queries took the opening six chapters of the book, where I treat such disparate topics as royal absolutism, dynasticism, the problem posed by child kings, and the differing nature of successful kingship as it was seen in the two countries. Then in the last third of the book, I turn to Joan and Richard themselves, trying to show how the background I've sketched helps us to understand who they were, as human beings, why they so quickly developed the contrasting reputations they did, and what, in turn, those different lives and reputations can further tell us about how and why France and England developed into countries with such different political structures.

I'm beginning to believe that the main obstacle is the problem faced by both Joan and Richard: the lack of reliable historical documentation. In Joan’s case, the historian was forced to rely heavily on the chronicles of the time, and in Richard’s, the historian must rely more on the documentation of later historians. The two historical figures might be linked, I asked Dr. Wood if he would provide some background information. Here is his reply:

The extraordinary results of this author’s exhaustive research, so well utilized in her novel of Richard III, The Sunne in Spicke, are again evident in The Shadow. Moreover, her talent for description and her insight into human nature are finely tuned. She has a wonderful knack for putting the reader in the middle of a battle, or in the anguished mind of a character torn by conflicting loyalties.

Like Penman’s highly successful earlier novels, this is a book to be savored, read and reread; a Literary journey that is not diminished by knowing how it all came out.

Helen Cusk, California

Coming Publication

In a previous Register, I announced the forthcoming publication of Joan and Richard by fellow Ricardian, Dr. Charles Wood of Dartmouth College. Because many members have asked how these two historical figures might be linked, I asked Dr. Wood if he would provide some background information. Here is his reply:

I've always been attracted to Joan and Richard not because I saw them as being in any way connected, but rather because both stand out as those figures in the histories of this period whose actions at the end of the Middle Ages, seem so prominent that their lives have received almost continuous attention from literary artists, as well as from historians. My sense was that there was something about each of them that seemed to sum up and symbolize a good deal about the nature difficult political communities which existed in England and France. As a result, I felt that if I could genuinely understand both of them, I would be seeing a good deal about France and England— as well as about why they developed in such different ways.

So I then began working on Joan and Richard themselves, trying to understand them within the context of their own times and countries. What I found, though, was that once I felt I knew them, it wasn’t conveying that understanding to others in the form of simple biography. The problem was that a good deal of my understanding was based on an interpretation of earlier French and English developments that differed significantly from that to be found in the standard accounts.

I then backed off and asked myself what a reader needed to know about. To do this, I turned to histories of England and France in order to see why I saw Richard and Joan as I did. Amazingly, such queries took the opening six chapters of the book, where I treat such disparate topics as royal absolutism, dynasticism, the problem posed by child kings, and the differing nature of successful kingship as it was seen in the two countries. Then in the last third of the book, I turn to Joan and Richard themselves, trying to show how the background I've sketched helps us to understand who they were, as human beings, why they so quickly developed the contrasting reputations they did, and what, in turn, those different lives and reputations can further tell us about how and why France and England developed into countries with such different political structures.

I'm beginning to believe that the main obstacle is the problem faced by both Joan and Richard: the lack of reliable historical documentation. In Joan’s case, the historian was forced to rely heavily on the chronicles of the time, and in Richard’s, the historian must rely more on the documentation of later historians. The two historical figures might be linked, I asked Dr. Wood if he would provide some background information. Here is his reply:

I've always been attracted to Joan and Richard not because I saw them as being in any way connected, but rather because both stand out as those figures in the histories of this period whose actions at the end of the Middle Ages, seem so prominent that their lives have received almost continuous attention from literary artists, as well as from historians. My sense was that there was something about each of them that seemed to sum up and symbolize a good deal about the nature difficult political communities which existed in England and France. As a result, I felt that if I could genuinely understand both of them, I would be seeing a good deal about France and England— as well as about why they developed in such different ways.

So I then began working on Joan and Richard themselves, trying to understand them within the context of their own times and countries. What I found, though, was that once I felt I knew them, it wasn’t conveying that understanding to others in the form of simple biography. The problem was that a good deal of my understanding was based on an interpretation of earlier French and English developments that differed significantly from that to be found in the standard accounts.

I then backed off and asked myself what a reader needed to know about. To do this, I turned to histories of England and France in order to see why I saw Richard and Joan as I did. Amazingly, such queries took the opening six chapters of the book, where I treat such disparate topics as royal absolutism, dynasticism, the problem posed by child kings, and the differing nature of successful kingship as it was seen in the two countries. Then in the last third of the book, I turn to Joan and Richard themselves, trying to show how the background I've sketched helps us to understand who they were, as human beings, why they so quickly developed the contrasting reputations they did, and what, in turn, those different lives and reputations can further tell us about how and why France and England developed into countries with such different political structures.

I'm beginning to believe that the main obstacle is the problem faced by both Joan and Richard: the lack of reliable historical documentation. In Joan’s case, the historian was forced to rely heavily on the chronicles of the time, and in Richard’s, the historian must rely more on the documentation of later historians. The two historical figures might be linked, I asked Dr. Wood if he would provide some background information. Here is his reply:
On Our Mi_design. nately, publication has been delay-
ed a bit, but I hope to be able to offer the book for sale to members toward the end of the year.

Thank you, Dr. Wood! Unfortunately, publication has been delayed a bit, but I hope to be able to offer the book for sale to members toward the end of the year.

Linda McTatchie, Sales Officer

On Our Research Shelves

Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages: A Tribute to Charles Ross, edited by Ralph A. Griffiths (New York: St. Martin's Press, NY, 1986). Charles Ross is well known to Ricardians, for among his publications are important biographies of the royal York brothers, Edward IV and Richard III. This volume of essays was intended to honor Ross on his retirement from the University of Bristol, but Ross untimely death transformed it into a memorial tribute. Five of the essays focus closely upon the reign of Richard III and are thus most likely to be of interest to readers of this journal.

A.J. Pollard in "St. Cuthbert and the Hog: Richard III and the County Palatine of Durham, 1471-85," traces the chronology and extent of Richard's growing influence in the county palatine of Durham. Beginning with his acquisition of Barnard Castle and its attendant borough in the early 1470s, Richard had become "the unchallenged lord of the county palatine" (p. 120) before he became king. Furthermore, Richard as king showed inclination to share his authority with others, even such a one as Ralph Neville, Earl of Westmorland, whose family history was certainly one of influence in the north; and Pollard clearly implies that Richard's condescending attitudes toward the aspirations of families accustomed to influence in the palatinate compromised support for Richard's kingship.

In his analysis of "Richard III and the Church of York," R. D. Dobson notes that the king acquired firm dominance over York Minster and its resources, and suggests that Richard intensified his influence in association with his visit to York in the autumn of 1483. Dobson also suggests this visit was the occasion of Richard's initiation of his ultimately unrealized project of a chantry of one hundred priests in York Minster (where, Dobson would like to guess, Richard proposed to be buried), which would have been the grandest chantry founded by an English monarch. Dobson tells us much about significant York ecclesiasticism, reminding us that Richard III was oriented toward the north of England religiously as well as politically, and, in passing, evaluating Richard as "a king who was less the most calculating than the most impetuous monarch ever to sit on the English throne" (p. 141).

The contribution of C.T. Wood, "Richard III, William Lord Hastings and Friday the Thirteenth," argues strenuously for the validity of a Hastings conspiracy against Richard of Gloucester in the wake of Edward IV's death, and Wood explains how such an opinion was revised in an earlier opinion and returned to Friday, 13 June 1483 as the date when Hastings was executed. In telling the story of Richard's usurpation of the throne, Wood firmly presents Richard as being driven by circumstances to usurpation, "a man who, far from being a villain, was a noble entirely typical of his age. He was not, surely, a skilled politician..." being "...more impulsive than scheming" (p. 161). Furthermore, to Wood Richard appears "to be one of those people who see trees rather than forests, a person never quite able to grasp the fact that events are interconnected and that actions taken in response to one event are likely to have consequences in others...a person who viewed the world in an incoherent, tentatively fragmented way..." (p. 162).

A.J. Pollard in "The City: London Politics and the 'Dun Cone'" by DeLloyd J. Guth looks at events from the London perspective, and surveys the reactions of England's greatest city to the succession of kings in the 1480s. Guth demonstrates that the security, prosperity, and best events with eyes firmly fixed upon the security, prosperity, and best interests of London. Guth concludes his essay with a venture into heraldy. Noting that when Henry VII entered London after Bosworth, his regalia carried standards bearing the arms of St. George, the red dragon of Wales, and a 'dun cowe.' The banners of St. George and the Welsh dragon are clearly enough, but the 'dun cowe' has been a minor mystery. Guth argues that Londoners would have seen it as the Heraldy-Warwick-Lancastrian symbol (p. 197) which would have suggested a breadth to the Tudor's support as he began his reign.

Keith Dokray looks at the period after Bosworth in "The Political Legacy of Richard III in Northern England." Using many specific examples of men and families, Dokray shows how many firm supporters of Richard III in his power base of northern England came to be adherents of Henry Tudor after Bosworth, albeit not always quickly. Henry, for his part, was cautiously willing to come to terms with his recent foes, although northerners who had been given positions of influence in southern England by Richard III found themselves reoriented to their native north by Henry VII. A significant minority of northerners, however, were not won over by the conciliatory Tudor posture, and these resisted Tudor rule until Henry VIII's victory. Dokray's essay in 1987 gave conviction to the reality of Tudor authority. There are a further ten essays...

Along with his review of Kings and Nobles, Dr. Reeves also relayed word of the recent publication of a manuscript from the collection of the Marquesses of Bath, Longleat House, Wiltshire, "Financial Memoranda of the Reign of Edward V, Longleat Miscellaneous Manuscript Book II" in Camden Miscellany, Vol. XXIX, (London Royal Historical Society, Camden Fourth Series, Volume 34, 1987). The manuscript has been edited by Rosemary Horrocks, the co-editor of British Library Hanseatic Manuscript 453.

Additions to the Research Library


English Hunting and Hunting in "The Book of St. Albans," Rachel Hands

Books and their Makers in the Middle Ages, (2 vol.), George H. Putnam


English Weapons and Warfare 1499-1650, A.V. Norman, & Don Pattinger

Lambert Simnel and the Battle of Stoke, Michael Bennett

The Book of the Medieval Knight, Stephen Turnbull

Pretendress to the English Throne, Jeremy Potter

After abortive attempts to acquire Margaret Woods' wonderful architectural work, The English Medieval House for the Research Library, an urgent plea for help in that endeavor has come from our Research Librarian. If anyone has a copy they would like to donate, or knows where or how a copy can be acquired, please contact Helen Maurer at 24001 Salero Lane, Mission Viejo, CA 92691. We are also looking for The Medieval Archer by Jim Bradbury. Any help with this search will be greatly appreciated.

Library Angels

Even as the call goes out for yet another "Angel," the following are saluted for their contributions to the Research Library during the past quarter:

Margaret Anderson, MN
Carole R. Bell, RI
Jane Clayton, MA
M. Donnermeyer, MA.
John McMillan, FL

As always, your help and generosity are more than appreciated.

The Ricardian

Back Issues Available

The Society has back issues of The Ricardian from March 1977 to September 1986. Some issues are in very short supply, and some we do not have at all. The price is $4.00 per copy. These issues may be of interest to new members, or older members who have misplaced an issue. If you would like a complete list of issues in stock, please write. At present, I do not have an index of articles, but I plan to prepare one. Checks should be made payable to the Richard III Society. Requests for information and/or orders should be directed to Mary Miller, 8801 James Ave., NE, Albuquerque, NM 87111.

Mary P. Miller

Can You Help?

In light of great number of inquiries made about the possibility of borrowing slides, we are trying to put together an appropriate collection under the auspices of Marie Martinelli, our Fiction and Audio-Visual Librarian. If anyone has slides they would like to donate, or the knowledge or facilities for duplicating slides donated by members, please contact Marie at 3911 Faquier Ave., Richmond, VA 23227. This is a new endeavor for the Society, so any and all help will be gratefully appreciated.

Bob's Books

Bob's Books, with which many Ricardians may be familiar, has a new address: P.O. Box 1171, Des Moines, Iowa 50311. This well-stocked store and search service also reports that they do have the Jarman and Palmer novels in their current inventory, as well as Cotahi's Plantagenet series.
Meet the Publication Committee

H.A. Kelly is Vice-Chairman of the English Department at UCLA, Los Angeles, California, and a distinguished medievalist. Among his numerous publications is “Croyland Chronicle Communications: 1. The Croyland Chronicle Tragedies,” in the December, 1987 Ricardian.

James A. Moore, Committee Chairman, is Professor of English at East Central University in Ada, Oklahoma, where he has taught Shakespeare for twenty years. His book, Richard III: An Annotated Bibliography, appeared in 1985. He led an entertaining workshop on Ricardian fiction at the 1987 AGM, and his recent publications include “Historiography in Shakespeare’s Richard III” in the Winter, 1986 Ricardian.


Jon A. Suter, Director of Libraries, Houston Baptist University in Houston, Texas, is an expert on medieval history and literature, as well as modern popular literature. His research has led him several times to Yorkshire, and he is planning a student tour of northern England in the summer of 1989.

Answers to Some of Your Queries

Did the Covent Garden Market exist in the 15th century?

No. The Farmers’ Market, which until recently stood at Covent Garden, originated in 1556 as a small group of produce stands in the Garden of Bedford House, the London home of the Earl (later Duke) of Bedford. The name of the market (originally “Convent Garden”) derives from the area’s earlier ownership by the Convent of St. Peter at Westminster, which held in the 15th century, primarily as pasture, the area bounded by Long Acre, St. Martin’s Lane, Drury Lane and a line parallel to The Strand.

For those interested in other mysteries lurking behind the Temple Bar of Richard’s time, Marge Nelson (of strawberry fame) is working on a walking tour of King Richard’s London. Questions or contributions can be sent to her at 32904 Fourth Ave., S.W., Federal Way, Washington 98023.

What are the origins of the titles ‘Clarence’ and ‘March’ borne by Richard’s brothers?

The title of Clarence is derived from the honour (seigniory or lordship) of Clare in Suffolk. Lionel, second son of Edward III, married Elisabeth de Burgh, from whose paternal grandmother he derived a great inheritance, including the honour of Clare. Elisabeth predeceased her husband, who was created Duke of Clarence in 1362 and went on to marry Violante Visconti, another heiress in 1368, in a marriage as lavish as Richard’s coronation, only to die four months later.

Roger Mortimer, 8th Baron Wigmere, likewise derived his title from his wife, Joan’s grandfather, Hugue XII, Count of La Marche and Angouleme. His elevation to the title in 1328, he derived from his intimacy with Queen Isabella, which ultimately elevated him to Tyburn.

Who was Ethelfleda?

Daughter of Alfred the Great and wife of the Earl of Mercia, a medieval kingdom stretching from Watling Street to Offa’s Dyke in Wales; Ethelfleda played a prominent role in the defense of her husband’s realm against the Danes in 914. She is credited with fortifying Warwick Castle (presumably the Ricardian association), although the present castle was actually founded in the 11th century, and began as a Norman motte-and-bailey commissioned by William the Conqueror.

Why wasn’t the wall at Warwick built around the outside of Ethelfleda’s Mound, the slope of which seems to provide an easy approach to the castle?

The wall atop the Mound actually provides a vantage point from which to pick off attackers trying to reach the castle, as does the curtain wall in general. Warwick Castle was a home as well as a fortress and, when unoccupied by its owners, would have been only lightly garrisoned. The bailey surrounded by a wall was cheaper to build and easier to defend than a single, solid keep.

Richard’s own construction at Warwick seems to have had in mind the defense of a fort or keep within the wall, independent of the rest of the Castle, and proof against its mutiny (With fascinating psychological ramifications as well.) The Castle, surrounded on three sides by a ditch and on the fourth by the River Avon, is thus better defended than its parklike setting leads one to believe.

Strawberries.

Many of you wrote in response to Marge Nelson’s inquiry about the origins of strawberries, and I thank you all for your assistance. It seems they are both a New World and an Old World fruit, although the best known American
strawberry, a 17th-century hybrid of *Fragaria virginiana*, native to North America, and *Fragaria chiloensis*, native to North and South America, would obviously not have graced Richard's table. At least one variety, the woods strawberry, or *Fragaria vesca*, akin to the 'wild strawberries' still found in England, is native to both hemispheres and was cultivated during the Middle Ages. Further information may be found in *A History of the Strawberry* by Stephen Wilhelm and James Sagen (Agricultural Publications, University of California at Berkeley), *The Strawberry* by George Darrow (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, NY, 1966), and *The Englishman's Flora* by Geoffrey Grigson (1975). Future commentary on this should be addressed to Marge Nelson at the address given previously in this column.

Your Question.

Do not despair if a response to your question does not appear in this column. There was a narrow window between the mailing of the Spring *Register* in which "Gallimaufry" made its debut, and the deadline for the Summer issue. I shall reply to your questions personally and continue to publish answers in the *Register*, as space permits.

Calling All Experts!!

In addition to being curious as to what you are working on, I'd be grateful for your help in answering one another's questions, and would like to put you in touch with other Ricardians who share your interests.

Nellary Paxton
Research Officer

Ed. Note. Along with the final comments above, Nellary has prepared the member survey enclosed with this issue of the *Register*. Please fill it out and return it to her at the address listed inside the front cover.

WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Boyle, Charles K.</td>
<td>123 Main St, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Kristine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Todd D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson, Laurie S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafras, Pat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Willa Wingfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamp, Mark O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton, Ann Marie &amp; Florence N. Cafras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumby, Jacky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine, Margaret M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine, Kathleen T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egan, Erin Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gately, Jane F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitt, Wendy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenblatt, Miriam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guily, Cassandra O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har, Kevin Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedborn, Donna E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinemann, Carol M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmerichs, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, Linda R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyt, Lester M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman, Margaret A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Max, Larry</td>
<td>456 Illinois St, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>McLaughlin, Thomas</td>
<td>789 Washington Ave, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Neumann, Evelyn G.</td>
<td>123 New York St, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Partee, Morris Henry</td>
<td>456 Connecticut St, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Price, Jr., John L.</td>
<td>789 Rhode Island St, RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Quigro-Nicholas, Yvonne M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Rager, Mary Jean</td>
<td>123 Canada St, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Regetz, John D.</td>
<td>456 Illinois St, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Ribnick, Madelyn K.</td>
<td>123 Georgia St, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Riordan, Maude D. &amp; Dr. John L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Sexton, Margaret</td>
<td>456 Illinois St, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Shaw, Heidi</td>
<td>123 Alabama St, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Stewart, Clark L.</td>
<td>456 Michigan St, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Sturckel, Janet M.</td>
<td>123 Idaho St, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Sutton, Tamara J.</td>
<td>456 Indiana St, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Waechter, Jr., Joseph</td>
<td>123 Illinois St, IL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submission Deadline - July 15