

Research Notes and Queries

The Portuguese Marriage

Doreen Court has sent the following note:

I was pleased to read Barrie Williams' communication on the Portuguese marriage in the September 1983 *Ricardian* and look forward to his forthcoming article (see above).

The intention of my comments in *The Ricardian* of June 1983 was not so much that of giving sole credit for the betrothal plans to the Portuguese as to try to dissociate Richard from the discredit of them. Would not the start of new marriage negotiations so soon after Anne's death have indicated a degree of insensitivity that would have undermined his reputation with his northern supporters, which meant so much to him, and to have given credence to the 'crocodile tears' shed at her funeral?

While agreeing with Mr. Williams that courtesy should have demanded that the marriage proposal be initiated by the gentleman involved, I am not convinced that this would always have happened when political alliances were at stake. John of Portugal was a pragmatic, ruthless man who may not have bowed to convention when under pressure. According to my secondary sources of the *Memorial*, rumours of projected betrothals of Joanna to Charles VIII of France, Maximilian, and Richard III followed each other during the same period when John was desperately seeking foreign alliances. None of these came to anything and I have not, so far, found any references to them outside of Portugal. I still feel that Joanna was not so much fending off a flurry of importunate suitors as resisting being used to further her brother's urgent political ends, against her religious convictions.

I appreciate the point about the surfeit of Woodville brothers. I have followed the consensus of opinion that the adventurous one who went to the Peninsula was Edward (R. B. Merriman, *Edward Woodville, knight-errant, Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, 1903, pp.127-144). It is probably worth noting that Edward Hall refers to him as 'Sir Edward Lord Woodville'. In the *Paston Letters* (ed. J. Gairdner, 1895, vol. 3, p.316) he is named Sir Edward Woodville and (on p.344) Lord Woodville, both being indexed as the same person. In *Henry VII* by S. B. Chrimes he is indexed as Edward Woodville, Lord Scales. His brother Richard seems to have concentrated more on keeping a low profile and obtaining free pardons every time the wind changed. According to the *Complete Peerage* (vol. 11, pp.24-5 under Rivers) he was knighted in 1465 after his sister's coronation, received a free pardon during the re-adeption of Henry VI, apparently continued to mind his own business under Edward IV, was attainted as Sir Richard Woodville in Richard's parliament of 1483, pardoned in March 1485 and then obtained another general pardon from Henry VII in December 1485. In the interims he served on the commission of the peace for Bedfordshire and on various other local commissions. It is possible that he acted as an ambassador to Portugal after the March 1485 pardon, but his forte seems to have been

more of self-preservation than diplomacy. Could Brampton's companion not just have been someone who had been on previous missions to Portugal?

As Mr. Williams says, we both agree that Bosworth was a freak and that the only 'higher-ups' who regarded Richard as an abysmally 'bad lot' were those who had an axe to grind. Not, of course, that many of them were over-squeamish as to where they married their female relatives!

The Duke of Buckingham and the execution of Clarence

Joanne C. Stone has sent the following note:

Before 1483 Buckingham had only one short lived period of importance. This entry into Royal favour began around January 1478 and abruptly ended after Clarence's execution a month later (Charles Ross, *Richard III*, London 1981, p.39n.). The last expression of Edward IV's favour seems to have been a grant of the King's manor and lordship of Cantref Selyf made on 18 February 1478, the very day that Clarence died. This grant was a reward of Buckingham's good service as Steward of England for Clarence's trial (M. A. Hicks, *False, Fleeting and Perjur'd Clarence*, Gloucester 1980, p.149).

The lordship was in fact a poor reward. In 1519 its income was only £15 (Carole Rawcliffe, *The Staffords*, Cambridge 1978, p.132). This does not necessarily mean that Buckingham would not have wanted the title to Cantref Selyf. Cantref Selyf was part of Eleanor de Bohun's inheritance. Anne, daughter of Thomas of Woodstock, had had a legal struggle with Henry V over the title and it was her son who eventually recovered Cantref Selyf (Rawcliffe, p.16). The lordship of Cantref Selyf fell into Edward IV's hands when Buckingham was a minor (*CPR 1461-67*, p.91) but was not returned when Buckingham was allowed to come into his inheritance. For that reason Buckingham may have been glad to receive it. Even so, the grant of such a poor lordship (when Buckingham had already carried out his duties as Steward and Clarence was dead) may indicate Edward IV's real attitude to the Duke.

It may be that Buckingham's adoption of the royal arms of Thomas of Woodstock without them being quartered with the Stafford arms may have permanently prejudiced Edward IV against him (Rawcliffe, p.31). For most of his adult life Buckingham was excluded from power and the business of government (Rawcliffe, p.28). However, towards 1478 Edward gave more confidence to the Woodville family (Hicks, p.149) and, since Buckingham was married to Catherine Woodville, he was part of this group. He and his wife took a ceremonial part in the marriage of Anne Mowbray and the Duke of York on 15 January 1478 (Philomena Jones, Anne Mowbray, *The Ricardian* no. 61, p.18). Nineteen days afterwards Buckingham's first child was born and named Edward after its godfather the King.

More important, Buckingham had a part in the trial and execution of Clarence. Edward IV, despite his previous love for Clarence and the fact of his being Clarence's brother, which moved him not to follow his ideas of justice and spare Clarence, appointed his 'dearest kinsman Henry Duke of Buckingham' as Lord High Steward (*Rolls of Parliament*, vol. 6, p.195, translated for me by Gillian A. Falla). As Steward of England Buckingham pronounced the death sentence on Clarence which had been passed by

Parliament (*The Croyland Chronicle*, edited by H. T. Riley, London 1854, p.480).

The presence of Buckingham, as Steward of England, was 'required for the purpose of the execution of justice'. Since pronouncing sentence was not the same as having justice carried out this seems to indicate that Buckingham was to be present at Clarence's death. As Buckingham was promised the co-operation of all those concerned in carrying out his duties it also seems as if he was intended to have a practical role in Clarence's execution rather than merely pronouncing sentence (*Rolls of Parliament*, vol. 6, p.195, and see C. Halsted, *Richard III*, reprint Gloucester 1976, vol. 1 p.321).

If Buckingham had to handle Clarence's execution his subsequent loss of favour may indicate that Edward IV did later regret his brother's death; or it may be that Buckingham's appointment and Edward's possibly feigned regret were calculated to deprive Buckingham of any hope of office under Edward because of his association with Clarence's execution.

Whatever Edward's reason, Buckingham's experience of being restored to favour and quickly losing it in 1478, may have made him prepared to risk his great — but to him uncertain — gains in 1483 for the possible 'security' of the crown.

Sheriff Hutton Chantry Chapel

Mrs. Pauline Routh writes:

Further to Peter Hammond's note on 'a Chantry Chapel at Sheriff Hutton' (*Ricardian* vol. 6, no. 82 September 1983, p.237), it perhaps might be pointed out that the entry cited from British Library Manuscript Harleian 433 was quoted as long ago as 1847 by William Atthill in his *Documents relating to the foundation and antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Middleham in the County of York* (Camden Society vol. 38, pp.14-15), as an example of Richard III's continuing personal generosity to his College personnel. A 'Sir' William Symson was 'second priest' of the College at its foundation in 1478, and Atthill, correctly or not, identifies him with the chantry priest at Sheriff Hutton. As a parallel, he identifies William Beverley, Dean of Middleham as the 'Maistere William Beverley Deane of the Kinges Chapelle', who was given the Deanery of Wymborne Minster in Dorset (*BL. Harleian Manuscript 433*, vol. 1, p.190), 'the pension of Thabbey of Yorke' (*ibid.*, p.276), and who was described as 'oure fulle trusty clerik & Counsellor Maistere William Beverley Deane of our Chapelle' in February 1484.

A 'Sir' William Symson in 1525 figures in the will of John Norman, Alderman of York (*Testamenta Eboracensia* vol. 5, Surtees Society vol. 79, 1884, pp.213-5), being there described as 'chaplayne of a chantry in the church of St. Nicholas Without Walmgate Barre', and it is possible that it was the same man.

The most likely identification of 'Our Lady Chapel beside the church of Sheriff Hutton' of which Symson was chantry priest in 1484, is that founded by Ralph Lord Neville of Raby mid-fourteenth century, at 'the altar of St. Mary and St. Peter built in the south part of the said church,' of which the piscina survives. The aisles could be described as 'beside the church', that is alongside the unit formed by nave and chancel.