

Research Notes and Queries

ANNE F. SUTTON

Richard III's visits to Canterbury

Mr. R. C. Hairsine has sent the following contribution:—

The recent note on Richard III's first visit to Canterbury (*Ricardian* Vol. V, No. 71, December 1980 pp.283–4), contains a statement that the visit occurred at some date between 18 and 23 November 1483 when the King was at Salisbury and Farnham respectively. Further examination has cast doubt on this dating. Richard's itinerary may be established with some confidence from the record of outgoing signet letters, now British Library Harleian Manuscript 433 (Vol. 2 of the new edition). Additional evidence for this particular period is provided by the *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1476–85*, HMSO 1901 (subsequently referred to as *CPR*). In this publication are printed summaries of the enrolled copies of the royal letters patent for grants, commissions and so forth authenticated by the Great Seal. From 19 October to 26 November, 1483, the King assumed personal control of the Great Seal during the crisis caused by Buckingham's rebellion. Thus temporarily, the places other than Westminster at which letters patent were dated represent the location of the King rather than the Chancellor.

From the following table it will be clear that the evidence suggests that Richard travelled the twenty-six miles from Winchester to Farnham on 22 November and there is no opportunity before this for a visit to Canterbury.

Date	Place	Source
14 November	Exeter	Harley 433, f.122b (Vol. 2, p.34)
15 November	Bridgewater	<i>CPR</i> , p.367
18 November	Salisbury	<i>CPR</i> , p.367
21 November	Winchester	Harley 433, f.123b (Vol. 2, p.37)
		Harley 433, f.127b (Vol. 2, p.46)
22 November	Winchester	Harley 433, f.123b (Vol. 2, p.36)
	Farnham	<i>CPR</i> , pp.367, 370
23 November	Farnham	Harley 433, f.124 (Vol. 2, p.38)
		<i>CPR</i> , p.367
25 November	London (entered from direction of Kennington)	Drapers' Company of London: Wardens Account 1475–1509, f.30 (reference supplied by Anne F. Sutton). And see Kendall, p.483 n.18.
26 November	London (Great Seal returned to Chancellor).	T. Rymer, <i>Foedera etc.</i> Vol. 12, p.203

The question of when the visit to Canterbury actually did occur is more problematical. The two independent sources cited above agree that business was transacted at Farnham on 23 November whilst the City records indicate that the King entered London on the 25th. An intervening visit to Canterbury, as suggested by Kendall (*Richard III*, p.275) would have entailed a journey of about eighty-five miles from Farnham to Canterbury and sixty miles return to London, all in less than two days (see map below). Such a journey would



have been possible but seems most unlikely and unnecessary. (For examples of medieval rates of travel, refer to H. S. Bennett, *The Pastons and their England*, C.U.P. 1922, pp.154-159 and 202, 203, where thirty-five to forty-five miles is considered good progress for a business journey.) It is also unlikely that the citizens of London would ride to meet the King at Kennington if he were approaching from Canterbury. Finally, the presence of the bishops and the ceremonial and hospitality inferred by the Canterbury account point to a more leisurely progress with sufficient notice for the city authorities to make preparations. The above considerations all tend to rule out a visit to Canterbury before Richard's return to London on 25 November.

Harley 433 indicates no further excursions outside London and Westminster until January when the following itinerary may be deduced:

Date	Place	Source
8 January	Westminster	Harley 433, f.141 (Vol. 2, p.75)
10 January	Canterbury	Harley 433, f.141b (Vol. 2, p.75)
12 January	Canterbury	Harley 433, f.140 (Vol. 2, p.75)
14 January	Sandwich	Harley 433, f.141 (Vol. 2, p.75)
16 January	Sandwich	Harley 433, f.141b (Vol. 2, p.76)
23 January	Westminster	Harley 433, f.144 (Vol. 2, pp.80-1)

The editor adds: Mr. Hairsine is most probably right in his suggestion that this visit took place in January 1484 and was not part of any lightning tour of the south coast and Canterbury as described by Kendall (*Richard III*, p.275) and as followed by myself in my note referred to above. Kendall's assumption that this

visit took place in November 1483 was based on J. B. Sheppard's calendar of a paper among the Canterbury archives (reference: Woodruff's List No. 58. Historical Manuscripts' Commission *Ninth Report*, Part I, Appendix, London 1883, p.177). Recent examination of this document shows that the first side consists of a list of 'the names of those who rode with Lord Cobham to the Lord King in the month of November' 1483 and their expenses. This excursion is also noted more briefly in the Chamberlain's Accounts (f.10) as taking place towards the end of November before the King returned to London. On the reverse is a shorter list of expenses (in a different hand) for a journey to Sandwich. There is nothing to indicate that the two journeys are in any way connected. It must be concluded, when reference is made to the itinerary deduced by Mr. Hairsine, that Lord Cobham and his fellows, including the Canterbury men, met Richard III at some other place further west than Canterbury. To clinch this argument another place can be added to Richard's itinerary at this date:

24 November Guildford

PRO: C.81/887, Nos. 53, 54 (cited by Rhoda Edwards, *Itinerary of Richard III*, to be published shortly.)

As regards the Canterbury Chamberlain's Accounts, Michaelmas 1483 to Michaelmas 1484, these give no date to what they call Richard III's 'first' visit to Canterbury. The word 'first' implies a second visit and indeed the entry describing the 'first' visit is immediately followed on the same page by another entry headed: 'Expenses at Le Hale at the arrival of the Lord King in the month of January.' Upon consideration of the above itinerary it seems likely that both entries should be dated January. A note in the Chamberlain's Account (f.11b) records that the King's secretary was given three gallons of red wine and two gallons white by order of the mayor on the occasion when 'the Lord King returned from Sandwich to Canterbury.' This shows that there were in fact two visits in January, both en route between London and Sandwich.

To supplement the January 1484 itinerary further it can be noted that on 17 January Richard was still at Sandwich (PRO: C.81/887, No. 96, cited in Edwards *op. cit.*) and he also appears to have fitted in a visit to Dover where the citizens bought an ox and capons to feed him and his entourage at the castle. (Dover Corporation Accounts 1462-85, BL: Add. 'Ms. 29616, f.251). Unfortunately there is no date for this entry but it occurs between others for Christmas 1483 and April 1484.

Mr. Hairsine adds: I am grateful to Miss Sutton for the opportunity of examining copies of the Canterbury documents first hand. The identification of 'Le Hale' is of some interest and readers with local knowledge may be able to locate this building. At first sight it might be assumed that the Guildhall was referred to, but the wording of one item in the account clearly refers to the carriage of items 'from Canterbury to Le Hale' thus pointing to a house well outside the walls. Whether there is any connection with the prominent local family of Hales remains to be established. The Le Hale costs include payments for carpentry work, repairing the road, for the carriage of furniture, cushions and hangings of cloth of gold and silver loaned by various citizens, and for the provision of wine and food. It seems likely that Richard's entourage were accommodated outside the city and this would allow the explanation of his 'first

coming' or 'first arrival' to be the occasion of the ceremony of the purse with presumably one or more other 'arrivals' in the city from Le Hale either during the period of the first visit or after the return from Sandwich.

Regarding the November activities recorded on folio 10 of the Chamberlain's Accounts, there are two entries particularly relevant to the present discussion. The first records expenses 'for 40 men riding with Lord Cobham throughout the County of Kent in the month of November in the first year of the reign of King Richard III thus assembled for 6 days for the benefit and defence of the Lord King and the Realm . . .' This must represent Cobham's activities in carrying out the Kings commission of array against the rebels (*CPR*, p.370). The second and clearly separate item mentioned earlier relates to '36 men riding with the Lord Cobham to the Lord King before his arrival in London in the month of November near to the end of the same month . . .' Nowhere in the Chamberlain's accounts is there any suggestion that the King came to Canterbury during November although it is easy to see how J. B. Sheppard could have deduced as much by muddling up his notes on the several complex entries relating to royal business.

Ralph Rudyard

Mr. Philip Brough and Mrs. Audrey Cartwright have both, independently, drawn attention to a statement in John Sleigh's *History of the Ancient Parish of Leek in Staffordshire, including Horton, Cheddleton and Ipstones* (London 1883, p.159) that Ralph lord of Rudyard, joined Lord Stanley with a large body of men at Bosworth and, according to a family tradition, was the one who killed Richard III. To commemorate this Henry VII allowed him to augment his family coat of arms 'on a canton a rose or in a field gules'. However unreliable family traditions may be, there is nothing inherently impossible in the story that a follower of the Stanleys actually killed Richard III. There is some evidence that Ralph was a leader of a body of archers in 1476 given by Sleigh in the margin of the same page of the annotated copy of his *History* held by Guildhall Library, London. Ralph might have been at Bosworth in a similar capacity. Otherwise, he is an obscure personage not to be found in the calendars of central government records. It is the heraldic part of the tradition, however, which casts most doubt on the story. Mr. Peter Hammond has sent the following note:—

The Rudyerd arms seem originally to have been argent, fretty sable, but by 1583 the main branch of the family were certainly using these arms with the addition described by Sleigh, and were still doing so in 1664 (*Visitations of Staffordshire 1583 and 1664*, William Salt Society, Vol. 3, Part 2, 1883, p.126; Vol. 2, Part 2, p.52). At some point one branch of the family (possibly that headed by Sir Benjamin Rudyerd in the late sixteenth century) seems to have replaced the rose on the canton by a crescent argent (Bernard Burke, *General Armory etc.*, London 1884, p.878) and another branch or branches (given as Rudyard or Rudyer and Rudiard in Burke, *op.cit.*) to have changed the golden rose to argent. A related family the Rudiards (or perhaps yet another branch of the same family) uses a coat very similar to that quoted by Sleigh above.

It would thus seem very likely that these additions to the original arms were there as difference (or cadency) marks, to distinguish between different branches

of the family, albeit in a rather unorthodox manner. Cadency marks, of which in England there are a series for use by the first, second, third and so forth son in a family (e.g. a crescent for the second son and a rose for the seventh), are usually placed directly onto the shield, but a canton variously charged was sometimes used (see *Boutell's Heraldry*, revised by C. W. Scott-Giles, London 1954, pp.111, 116-7). This use of a charged canton seems to be much more likely than its use to augment arms as a mark of distinction, certainly since the canton is charged with a rose or a crescent. The early augmentations of which we have a record (Boutell, *op. cit.*, pp.124, 125) all reflect the service for which they were given, e.g. the demi-lion of Scotland given to Thomas Howard Earl of Surrey to show the defeat and death of the King of Scots at Flodden. It will be seen that the supposed augmentation given to Ralph Rudyerd does not in any way reflect his supposed service, the rose was not even argent for York, and a demi-boar or boar's head would have been much more likely.

A suspicious circumstance in the story of this 'augmentation' is the statement by Sleigh (*op. cit.*) that James, son of Ralph, 'resumed' the original Rudyerd arms 'which continued to be borne by his successors'. Augmentations are only rarely dropped, and not without very good reason, and we know anyway that the Rudyerds were still using the charged canton later in the century (see above). An even more suspicious circumstance is found in Sleigh's note that King Richard I granted an augmentation of a crescent to an earlier Rudyerd for services in the Third Crusade. The heraldic system had hardly begun at this time (the end of the twelfth century), let alone an elaborate system of augmentations. From the above it may be concluded that the family records of the Rudyerd family, at least as interpreted by John Sleigh, may be somewhat suspect. There is a total lack of evidence supporting his story, and it would seem very likely that the 'explanations' of the various cantons are merely an attempt by an heraldic illiterate to explain charges which were on the arms purely as marks of cadency.

The Manor of Sutton Cheney

Dr. Bernard Juby has sent some information on Sutton Cheney in the fifteenth century. The manor is particularly notable for including the battlefield of Bosworth. The lords of Sutton Cheney were the Houbys from at least 1140 to 1422. In 1422 the sole heiress was Elizabeth Houby, then aged thirty. She married firstly, John Beler of Eye Kettleby, and secondly, Thomas Segrave. By John Beler she had one son, John, who died without issue in 1476, and of her two daughters who had issue, Joan married William Villiers of Brooksley, who died in 1480, and Elena married William Roskyn of Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire. It was Elena who eventually inherited the manor of Sutton Cheney and through her it passed to the Roskyn family. It is not known if William Roskyn fought at the battle of Bosworth. (John Nichols, *History and Antiquities of Leicestershire*, 1795-1815, vol. 3 pt. 1, pp.264-5, vol. 4 pt. 2, pp.543-4, and George F. Farnham, *Leicestershire Medieval Pedigrees*, Leicester 1925, p.32).

John Kendale, Secretary: the search continued

John Kendale, Turcopilier of Rhodes. He was a knight of the military Order of St. John of Jerusalem, the English headquarters of which was the Priory of St.

John Clerkenwell. John Kendale was elected Turcopilier or Commander of the coast defences of the island of Rhodes in 1476, an office usually held by an Englishman. John Kendale was not present at the great siege of Rhodes by the Turks in 1480 but was conspicuous in raising funds in Europe to continue the defence. On 16 December 1484 Richard III appointed him, John Sherwood, Bishop of Durham, and Thomas Langton, Bishop of St. David's, to offer the King's obedience to the new Pope, Innocent VIII. In 1489 he succeeded John Weston as Prior of the Order in England and was ambassador to Venice on behalf of the Grand Master of the Order. In 1495 it was alleged that he was corresponding with Perkin Warbeck and plotting to kill Henry VII by necromancy but there appears to have been no foundation for these statements. Henry VII continued to honour him until his death in 1501, including him among his councillors and using him frequently on diplomatic missions to France and the Empire.¹



Portrait medal of John Kendale, Turcopilier of Rhodes, thought to be the first contemporary portrait of an Englishman. Italian, bronze. 1480. Reproduced by kind permission of The Museum and Library, The Order of St. John, Clerkenwell.

His family origins are uncertain. He is known, however, to have been related to the Tongs of York and the Clippesbys of Orby, Norfolk. A nephew, William Tong, became a cleric and was aged sixteen in 1487, and another nephew, Sir John Tong, was accused with him of conspiracy with Warbeck in 1495 by Bernard de Vignolles.² Sir John Tong was also a knight of St. John and the Commander of Great Ribstone and Mount St. John.³ The Clippesby connection is mentioned by John Kendale himself in a letter to his 'cousin', Sir John Paston, while he was Prior (1489–1501), in which he refers to his 'cousin' Clippesby and a contract of marriage between him and a niece of Sir John Paston. There was already a marriage connection between the Pastons and the Clippesbys, which may be why the Prior called Sir John Paston 'cousin', for in about 1480 Edmund Paston II had married Katherine, the daughter of John Spelman and widow of William Clippesby, Esquire of Orby, Norfolk, and secured the wardship of the Clippesby heir.⁴

The Kendales of York. There were several families of Kendales in York in the fifteenth century. A certain amount of information about them can be gleaned from their surviving wills or grants of administration of their estates. Dr. Rosemary Horrox most kindly offered to look at those of them most likely, by date and by the status of testator, to show any connection with Secretary. A man

in his position and of his legal background would have been very desirable as a supervisor of a will in the late 1470s and early 1480s and he would undoubtedly have been mentioned in some capacity by relatives. Dr. Horrox found no mention of him and only a single reference to a John Kendale, brother of the Thomas Kendale of York, draper, who died in November 1447. This man was probably the John Kendale of Conesthorpe in the parish of Barton who died in 1452 leaving a widow Marion.⁵ It follows that it is extremely unlikely that the Secretary was of York.

John Kendale of Ormsby, Norfolk. The son of Nicholas Kendale. He sold land at Filby, Norfolk, to John Paston the elder (d.1466) and was involved in a dispute over its title, probably with him, and certainly with his son, Sir John Paston, from about 1472. He is also to be found in 1466 being enfeoffed, with others, by Robert Clere of Ormsby with land in Ormsby for a rent payable to Clere's mother as lady of the manor. On 22 January 1483 he conveyed the manors of 'Vauxhalle' and 'Stalhamhalle' in Burgh, Norfolk, as well as the advowson of the church of St. Mary in Burgh to Sir Robert Clere and his wife.⁶ No Norfolk connection can be established for the Secretary.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Notes on portrait medal in the catalogue for *The Siege of Rhodes 1480*, a commemorative exhibition at the Museum of the Order of St. John Clerkenwell, E.C.1, 1980. P.M. Kendall, *Richard III* (London 1955), p.488 n.10. *The Dictionary of National Biography's* article on him needs to be used with care.
2. *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (HMSO 1961), XIV, p.305. J. Gairdner (ed.), *Letters and Papers, Henry VII and Richard III*, II (Rolls Series 1863), p.318.
3. T. Stapleton (ed.), *The Plumpton Correspondence* (Camden Society 1839), pp.117-120. A Thomas Plumpton was in the Order at the siege of Rhodes and Sir Robert Plumpton was godfather of Sir John Tong.
4. N. Davis (ed.), *The Paston Letters and Papers I* (Oxford 1971), pp.li, 615-616, 640, II (Oxford 1976), 480.
5. Borthwick Institute: Probate Register 2, ff.163b, 258. For a complete list of Kendale wills and administrations see *Wills in the York Registry 1389-1514*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series vol. 6, 1889.
6. Paston Letters, *op. cit.*, pp.462, 508 and II, pp.408-9, *Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds* (HMSO 1902), IV, A7539 and A7760. No will of his survives in either the Consistory or Archdeaconry Courts of Norwich.

Book Reviews

RICHARD III. Sein Leben und seine Zeit. 'Shakespeares Schurke, wie er wirklich war'. (His life and times. 'Shakespeare's villain as he really was'.) By Andreas Kalckhoff. Bergish Gladbach, Gustav Lübbe Verlag, 1980. DM 39.80. I have enjoyed reading this book, and have, I am sure, profited by it. There is much to give a reader interest and pleasure, not least an agreeably light touch at appropriate moments—the author sees 'bedroom eyes' in a portrait of Elizabeth