

11. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls 1476-85*, H.M.S.O., London (1901), p.431; B.L. *Harl. MS.433*, f.175b. The marriage is usually stated to have taken place between March and September 1484, see G.E.C. (Editor), *The Complete Peerage*, 2nd edition, Vol. 10, London (1945), p.402.
12. *C.P.R. 1476-85*, p.538.
13. John Leland, *De Rebus Britannici Collectanea*, Vol. 4, London (1770), pp.216-223. I am indebted to Rhoda Edwards for drawing my attention to this fact.
14. *C.P.R. 1485-94*, H.M.S.O., London (1914), p.237. For a discussion of the position of William Herbert after 1485, see Helen Maurer, Further Notes on William Herbert Earl of Huntingdon, *The Ricardian*, Vol. 4, No. 57 (1977), pp.9-11.
15. *Gentlemen's Magazine*, Vol. 37, p.408.
16. R. H. Busk, *Notes and Queries*, 6th Series, Vol. 9 (1884), p.12.
17. R. H. D'Elboux, Some Kentish Indents, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. 39 (1946), p.96.
18. Printed by Francis Peck in his *Desiderata Curiosa*, Vol. 2, London (1735), pp.249-251. The letter, dated 1733, relates a conversation between Dr Brett and the 5th Earl of Winchelsea.
19. It is hoped to be able to publish in the near future a fuller account of the legend of Richard Plantagenet, based on the work of the late Mr Vincent Rendel, to whom I am indebted for much of my knowledge of this subject.

Research Notes and Queries

ANNE F. SUTTON

Roger Kelsall

Mr Kenneth Hillier has sent the following *corrigendum* to his article Four Southampton Rebels of 1483 in the *Ricardian*, March 1979. He draws the moral that all references must be checked back to their original source particularly if they come from J. C. Wedgwood, *History of Parliament 1439-1509: Biographies* (London 1936).

Wedgwood says in his note on Henry Kelsall's will, dated 12 November 1493, 'lands in Reading to brother Thomas, lands late of Thomas Payne in Southampton to Thomas, remainder to brother Roger Kelsale...' Since Wedgwood also maintains Roger's own death occurred in 1485, this seemed strange, to say the least! I have now checked Henry's will in Kerry's *Municipal Church of St Lawrence, Reading* (1883), pp.168-173, and find all references to Roger clearly indicate his earlier death, and, contrary to Wedgwood or his informant's ('ex. info. E. N. Dormer') statement, does not leave any property to the latter. e.g. 'my two tentis with thaier apprtenaunces sette and lying in the Town of Southampton which tentis wt thaier apptenances late were of Thomas Payne of the saide Town of Southampton, and after of Roger Kelsall, Brother of me the said Henry, and now been myn the saide Henry...' 'Item, I will and charge that Charlys Kelsall son of my brother Roger Kelsall shall have xx li. of lawful money of England, which xx li. was of the bequest of the said Roger his ffather...'

William Worcester

Interest has been expressed by members in the collection of documents illustrating the regency of the Duke of Bedford compiled by William Worcester and dedicated to Richard III (*Lambeth MS. 506*). The Collection was rather unintelligently edited by Joseph Stevenson in *Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry VI*, Volume II, part ii (Rolls Series, 1864). Stevenson chose to ignore that the original dedication was to Richard III although it was clearly visible that 'Rich' had been altered to 'Edw' and that the 'thred' of the text had been changed to 'fourth' in the margin. The problem of the dedication is, however, not a simple matter of a single alteration. K. B. McFarlane went into the matter thoroughly in his *William Worcester: A Preliminary Survey in Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson*, edited by J. Conway and J. C. Davies (Oxford, 1957). He established that the Collections were without doubt originally compiled by Worcester as a codicil or appendix to his larger work, the *Boke of Noblesse*, a tract written in the early 1450s for presentation to Henry VI to encourage him to imitate Henry V's warlike policies in France. Worcester never presented the *Boke of Noblesse* to Henry VI but revised it in October 1472–June 1475 on the eve of Edward IV's invasion of France for dedication to the more martial Yorkist King; there is some evidence that it was in fact presented on this occasion. The codicil of documents was intended to back up the arguments in favour of war by showing how parts of France had been administered by the English under the Duke of Bedford through such men as Sir John Fastolf whose secretary William Worcester had been. The dedication of the Collection to Richard III was probably made after Worcester's death by his son, another William, using the text of his father's earlier (and already altered) dedication of the *Boke of Noblesse* so carelessly that he failed to make its description of the contents of the work fit the Collection. Whether the presentation was made to Richard III is not known. The final alteration from Richard III to Edward IV was by an unknown hand at a later date.

The elder Worcester is one of the most interesting personalities of the mid fifteenth century: the first English antiquarian. He was born in Bristol in 1415, educated at Oxford and was in the household of Sir John Fastolf by 1438 as his personal attendant. From Sir John's death in 1459 he was involved in the bitter quarrels that arose over Fastolf's considerable estates. He and Justice Yelverton opposed the claims of the Paston family. The long fight ended in 1478 and left Worcester a poor man. Antiquarian research, the history of his own times, architecture, natural history and astronomy were the pursuits of his all too brief leisure and his few surviving works and notebooks remain of inestimable value to historians. Among his friends were John Free, the English humanist who achieved fame in Italy as a scholar and was briefly Bishop of Bath and Wells, and John Gunthorpe, Keeper of the Privy Seal to Richard III. Besides the authoritative article by K. B. McFarlane, details of Worcester and his career may be found in R. J. Mitchell, *John Free* (Longmans, 1955) and T. D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (Methuen, 1950) and his own research notes may be read in John H. Harvey (Ed.), *William Worcestre, Itineraries* (Oxford, 1969).

The Deformity of Shakespeare's Richard III

Dr Gordon Dale, MD, BSc, Senior Lecturer in Paediatric Biochemistry at the Newcastle General Hospital, has sent the following criticism of Dr Bernard Juby's points made in the *Ricardian*, Vol. 5, No. 64, March 1979, p.30:

While it is true that both knock-knees and scurvy may occur in the condition, neither can be said to be a *sine qua non*. Coeliacs do not readily gain weight; this is an advantage to the many jockeys with the disorder—indeed it has been called 'Jockey's disease'.¹ It need hardly be said that jockeys are not notably knock-kneed nor are they singularly lacking in physical fitness. Coeliac disease does not necessarily produce profound ill-health, indeed the patient may be quite well during early adult life. I recently had occasion to examine a lady in her mid-sixties in whom the diagnosis had not been made earlier. Until a year previously she had managed a pub unaided and had always regarded herself as reasonably healthy. She was very small, had kyphosis and X-rays revealed two 'pseudo-fractures' in one shoulder blade and another in the pelvis (a well-described phenomenon in adults with Vitamin D-deficient adult 'rickets'). She was not knock-kneed, she had curvature of the spine and a deformity of the shoulder but in earlier days had been a fit young married woman with a family.

It is true to say that coeliacs usually make normal progress for the first six months of life, but the age of onset is very dependent upon the time of introduction of wheat or rye into the diet.² Dr Juby is incorrect when he says that Shakespeare's picture of Richard contradicts my hypothesis in this respect. In *Richard III*, Richard was reported to be eating bread at a very early age:

York: "Marry, they say, my uncle grew so fast
That he could gnaw a crust at two hours old".

(II. iv. 27, 28)

A baby born with teeth presents its wet nurse with considerable discomfort. Since, under these circumstances, breast-feeding can be a painful affair it would not be surprising if the infant were to be introduced to a diet of bread (in milk) at the earliest possible moment. The features of coeliac disease would appear soon afterwards.

As to the interpretation of the word 'foul', the *Oxford English Dictionary* gives a score of meanings of which the first is: 'Grossly offensive to the senses, physically loathsome; primarily with reference to the odour or appearance indicative of putridity or corruption.' Its roots include old Norse, Sanskrit, Greek and Latin words meaning 'rotten'; 'to cause to rot'; 'to stink'; 'purulent matter'; 'to stink'; 'rotten'. Dr Juby may, if he wishes, interpret Shakespeare's use of the word as denoting moral or spiritual pollution, but he would have an impossible task if he attempted to deny the playwright's use of double meanings.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. H. M. Spiro, *Clinical Gastroenterology*, Macmillan, 1970.
2. C. M. Anderson and V. Burke, Coeliac Disease, in *Paediatric Gastroenterology*, Blackwell, 1975, pp.175-197.