

mous article inspired by the Arundel MS in the College of Arms. This article showed that no fewer than two English and two Latin versions of More's "Historie of Kyng Richarde the Thirde" exist, and there is reason to think that there were at least two other versions which are now lost.

According to the author of the anonymous article, the *Historie* seems to be unique in literature as it appears to have been written almost simultaneously in both languages, thus incidentally following the precepts More gave to his own children to write in English and Latin, with careful revision. Whatever More's intentions about publication therefore, his constant re-working of the theme of the "Historie" does seem to preclude any argument about 'second thoughts.' He may indeed have come to have doubts about its veracity, but as Mr. Mowat doubtless knows, there are many authorities who consider that it was written as a sort of morality to which historical truth was irrelevant.

The different versions vary considerably in the narrative order, and neither of the Latin versions contains any account of the murder of the Princes. One curious discrepancy is that the earlier English version (published in a very corrupt form by Grafton in 1548 and 1550) was correct in stating that Edward IV married Elizabeth Grey "very privily," whereas the later "standard" English version published in 1557 by More's nephew Rastell on the basis of More's own manuscript, states that Edward married her "with great feast and honorable solemnity."

This version would certainly have been more satisfactory in the eyes of Henry VIII, as the Edward IV/Eleanor Butler pre-contract was apparently known to (I think) the Emperor Charles V, who was once heard to have expressed doubts of Henry's title to the throne on this basis. I fear however that Sir Thomas More's motives in the composition of the "Historie" are likely to remain a mystery.

Readers who wish to follow up the interesting questions raised in this article will find much pertinent and useful information in *The History of King Richard III*, edited by R. S. Sylvester, 1967, in the Society Library.

RESEARCH NOTES AND QUERIES

An Early Account of the Reign of Richard III

P. HAMMOND

In the collection of Ashmolean manuscripts in the Bodleian Library is a most interesting fifteenth century manuscript (MS. Ashmole 1448). It consists of a very mixed collection of items, only one of which is of interest to us. This is an anonymous genealogical history of the Kings of England from William the

Conqueror to Richard III (pp. 269-277, 284-287). It seems to have been written in the reign of Edward IV, except of course for the last entry, written sometime in the reign of Henry VII, probably by the same person. Up to and including Edward IV there is nothing to distinguish this genealogical history from the many others in existence, but the entry on Richard (p. 287) is very different from the rest, which are brief and to the point. The account of Richard's reign is much longer, occupying one complete page, and is given below, translated from the Latin, apparently for the first time.

"Because of a devilish envy and an unsociable appetite, Richard of Gloucester succeeded to the whole body of the Kingdom after his brother Edward IV. Edward Prince of Wales and Richard Duke of York, sons of the unconquered Edward IV were treacherously delivered up into his custody. The Duke at length deceitfully imposed himself on the Kingdom and was crowned with the royal power at the instigation and by the advice and help of Henry Duke of Buckingham. A short time later Lord Antony, Earl of Rivières, Richard his brother and Lord Thomas Vaghan were beheaded with the sword at the same time at Pontefract without any lawful process. At the same time in the Tower of London an evil council was held, and there Lord William Hastings, who was not prepared to agree to the crowning, was hastily beheaded with a sword over a tree trunk. The Duke was then crowned at Westminster on the Sunday after the Passion of St. Peter the Apostle (i.e. 6th July). Terrified of his nephews, lest they should prevent his reigning with the assent of the Kingdom, with the advice of the Duke of Buckingham he wretchedly murdered them, depriving them of the light of life in some way. Alas, what sorrow, that these noble princes, the fruit and heirs of the Kingdom, should finish their lives in such a manner, who deserved no such reward for any fault or transgression."

Then follows a brief account of Richard's reign.

"King Richard III, brother of Edward IV. First year of his reign his son died: the second year his queen, who was buried at Westminster; the next year, the third the unhappy wretch was destroyed near Leicester by the providence of God by Henry Earl of Richmond and other exiles. What do you say?"

The entry is completed by a genealogical table showing Richard, his wife and son; and the words "King Edward V governed the Kingdom from the 7th day of April to the feast of the Passion of St. Peter the Apostle" (i.e. 29th June).

In substance this account is similar to Vergil or More. It contains nothing new, but two details are of interest. Firstly it gives the date of the end of the reign of Edward V as the 29th June (cf Ricardian No. 43, pp. 15-16: Reign and Death of Edward V), and secondly it describes Hastings as being executed over a log of wood. More has hitherto been the only source for this statement. It does not appear to have been copied from More or anything else though, since there are various deletions and insertions which look characteristic of someone changing his mind in mid composition. The date of composition was obviously after 1485, and the writing is sufficiently similar to the entry on Edward IV to make it seem likely that it was not written long after that entry, probably by the same person, as mentioned above. It is thus of great interest as another early example of anti-Ricardian sentiments, possibly earlier even than Rous and the Croyland Chronicle (both c. 1490). These works now seem not to be

isolated instances but expressive of beliefs and thoughts which were fairly widespread after Richard's death.

George Neville, Duke of Bedford

George Neville was the eldest son of John, Marquis of Montague. He was born c.1457, and was created Duke of Bedford on 5th January 1470 by Edward IV, who intended giving him his eldest daughter Elizabeth in marriage. However the Marquis was killed at Barnet in 1471 fighting for Henry VI, and having been attainted, forfeited all his honours and estates. His son thus had no means to sustain his honours and was degraded from his Peerage by Act of Parliament in 1477. He died on 4th May 1483 and was buried at Sheriff Hutton.

Exactly where he was buried has never been stated. It has been said that the tomb now attributed to Edward of Middleham is his, and that one of the shields on this tomb showed a Neville saltire alone (Bulmer, North Riding, Vol. 2, 1891), much more likely on George Neville's tomb than Edward's. This identification is ruled out by the age of the figure, and the Neville saltire does not seem to have been noticed by anyone else. No proper systematic investigation seems ever to have been made, and Mrs. Pauline Routh and I have made a preliminary search (all of the local work and much of the literature searching was done by Mrs. Routh).

No contemporary source, so far as we are aware, gives any clue, but there is some rather confusing and contradictory later evidence. From Dodsworth (1623) to Bulmer (1891) no author mentions any possible tomb, and it is not until we get to J. E. Morris (North Riding of Yorkshire, 1904 and 1920) that any clue is obtained. Morris says "Notice also . . . (4) Fragment of a brass in the North Aisle, exhibiting the arms of Neville" (p. 345). A similar statement was made by Lawrence and Collier in their article "Ancient Heraldry in the Deanery of Bulmer" (Y.A.J., XXVII, 1923, p.159), but not curiously enough in the Victoria County History for the North Riding (written 1914). No subsequent mention is made of this brass, perhaps because it had then been completely destroyed. Certainly the only slab which could have been the tomb is now completely bare. It lies on the north side of the Witham brass, in the North Chapel, and has on it the matrices for two brass inserts, a shield and an oblong plate. The identification of this slab with that inscribed with the Neville arms is not certain since neither description makes it at all clear where the slab was placed. For various reasons it seems unlikely that it was next to the Witham brass, but could have been placed there when the Chapel was reconverted from an organ chamber and wooden flooring removed (probably in the 1930s).

Further information is being sought, we would welcome any further references to the brass, but as a tentative conclusion it may be said that the lost tomb of the Duke of Bedford has been discovered.

Progress of Richard III in 1483

After his Coronation Richard III progressed through England. Very little is known of the details of his route, except for a few meagre details, chiefly from Rous. Our knowledge is particularly poor for that part of his route from

Oxford to Warwick, and Mrs. Gwen Waters of Gloucester wonders if perhaps any information concerning his stay may be forthcoming from a search of the town archives of Worcester and Warwick. She is working on the archives of Gloucester herself, so far a singularly unrewarding task. Can any member from Worcester or Warwick help?

Book Reviews

ELIZABETH OF YORK TUDOR QUEEN

by Nancy Harvey, Arthur Barker, 1973, £3.

The life of Elizabeth of York is not well known, apart from her associations with her father, brother, uncle and husband successively, and this is the theme of this book. It is well written, and imagination is used with discretion to bring life to contemporary descriptions of various ceremonies and festivals.

The author admits that the techniques of the novelist are used in an attempt to understand the fifteenth century through the minds of Elizabeth and her contemporaries. Such a practice is not something to be commended, although in this case it is not used to excess, and is not unsuccessful. It is not in fact the chief objection to the book, which is that while a good acquaintance with the source material and secondary authorities is displayed in the Bibliography and Notes, these are not used in such a manner as to display a similar acquaintance with their conclusions. For example the investiture of Richard's son as Prince of Wales at York is described as a second coronation, a mistake corrected by Davies in his "York Records" in 1843, a fact cited by at least two of Miss Harvey's sources.

There are numbers of other similar mistakes, and Richard is described as a villain throughout, a view sometimes half-heartedly corrected in the Notes. The author prefers the dramatic versions of the Tudor Chroniclers to the more sober conclusions of their successors. This gives the book a rather old fashioned air. Nevertheless it remains a useful and very readable introduction to the life of Elizabeth of York, provided that one remembers the errors and fictional approach. It does not replace Nicolas' "Memoir" (pp. xxxi-civ) in his "Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York" (1830) but can be used to supplement it.

Both this and the new book are in the Society's Library.

P. W. HAMMOND

GENERAL ARMORY TWO: ALFRED MORANT'S ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO BURKE'S GENERAL ARMORY

Edited and augmented by C. R. Humphery-Smith. Tabard Press, 1973, £6.50

For myself and fellow heraldry addicts this book is very welcome. It is a supplement to the "General Armory" as its title proclaims and contains references to some 10,000 new and corrected names and associated coats of arms. Burke of course contains many errors, and like the present work is only as good as its