Kosana Jovanović

TWO FUNERALS AND "TWO BODIES" OF KING RICHARD II

A Study on the Idea of Kingship, Transference of Power and Political Theology

MA Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest
May 2009

TWO FUNERALS AND "TWO BODIES" OF KING RICHARD II

A Study on the Idea of Kingship, Transference of Power and Political Theology

by

Kosana Jovanović

(Croatia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

_____

Chair, Examination Committee

_____

Thesis Supervisor

_____

Examiner

_____

Examiner

Budapest
May 2009

TWO FUNERALS AND "TWO BODIES" OF KING RICHARD II

A Study on the Idea of Kingship, Transference of Power and Political Theology

by

Kosana Jovanović

(Croatia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

_____

External Examiner

Budapest
May 2009

TWO FUNERALS AND "TWO BODIES" OF KING RICHARD II

A Study on the Idea of Kingship, Transference of Power and Political Theology

by

Kosana Jovanović

(Croatia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

_____

Supervisor

_____

External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2009

I, the undersigned, **Kosana Jovanović**, candidate for the MA degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 14 June 2009

_____

Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, Zorica Jovanović, whose unconditional support and most of all encouragement made it possible.

The two people who greatly contributed to this work and for whose patience, support and valuable advices I am more than grateful are Aziz Al-Alzmeh and Gabor Klaniczay. Their endless efforts placed into this work have nothing but my utmost gratitude. In addition, I am very grateful to Judith Rasson for correcting the thesis.

Also, I would like to express my gratitude to all those professors whose courses I attended in this academic year. In addition I would like to thank all the other professors at the Medieval Department as well as Annabella Pal.

Special thanks goes to my colleagues, all the new friends I met this year, who I will surely miss once we part and to whom I will always look back with love. In addition to that, special thanks goes as well to my friends from home who encouraged me to apply to CEU in the first place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The period of transition from the 14 to the 15 century in medieval England was turbulent and tempestuous. The image of a child prodigy, King Richard II, once regarded as the saviour of the nation with his triumph over the Peasant Revolt, was gradually fading in the eyes of his subjects. Richard II, approaching the end of his reign, grew increasingly distant from the norms expected of a just ruler. The discontent arose and manifested itself with great consequences for the realm. The leading figure of the discontented subjects was Henry of Bolingbroke, Duke of Lancaster, the man who ended the reign of Richard II abruptly and made himself the next ruler, King Henry IV.

The fate of Richard II never fully resided in his own hands for there were always others determining what would be the curse of his life. This is the reason why one cannot write a history of the life of Richard II without including other characters in the main scene. The other leading roles in this thesis are King Henry IV and his son and heir, King Henry V, the two men who gave Richard two funerals, so deeply different from each other in meaning as well as in symbolism. This thesis will address this questions and problems surrounding the two funerals of Richard II. The following text is constructed in the way that the first chapter will speak about the resignation and deposition of the English king, Richard II; the second and third chapters will speak about his first funeral and later reburial.

However, although Richard II will be mentioned quite often in this thesis, the following text will address another issue as well. It will be Ernst H. Kantorowicz and especially his famous theory encrypted in the work entitled "The King's Two Bodies, a Study in the Medieval Political Theology".[1] The theory itself arose from the milieu of political theology, a term constructed before Kantorowicz by Carl Schmitt.[2]

[1]E. H. Kantorowicz. *The King's Two Bodies, a Study in Medieval Political Theology*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997). (first published by Princeton University Press in 1957).(hereafter: Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*).

[2] For further reading about the development of the term political theology and its usage see G. Gereby."Carl Scmitt and Erik Peterson on the Problem of Political Theology: A Footnote to Kantorowicz". *Monotheisitic Kingship, The Medieval Variants.* ed Aziz Al-Azmeh and Janos M. Bak. (Budapest: CEU Press, 2004):31-63.

The case of King Richard II is interesting to test the theory of Kantorowicz or, conversely this is where the theory of the "King's Two Bodies" could prove itself helpful in discerning the meaning of ceremonials.[3] The methodology applied to the text is the following: the chapters are structured to first present the political situation as the environment in which the event in question took place followed by the description of the event (abdication, funeral and reburial) and finishing with introducing the elements of the "King's Two Bodies" theory as an aid to explaining the event. This theory will be added at the end of the text of each chapter as a gloss and will be confronted with the relevant accounts that came from the primary sources which will be in use. It must be stressed that this is not a pro-Kantorowicz work, nor one which will decide if the theory is true or false. The theory will be merely used as an aide and a guide for the accounts of the events coming from sources.

According to Kantorowicz the concept of the "King's Two Bodies" developed to account for the medieval legal aspect of transmission of power. The royal predecessor and successor are regarded as the same person as they both personify the royal title and dignity. The basic idea is simple; it states that a medieval king possessed two bodies. The first was the natural body given to him by birth and which like all things carnal must submit to the course of time, diseases as well as other earthly misfortunes and most of all decay and vanish. The other is the political body which the king acquires through the process of enthronement, by the ceremonial of anointing and consecration. This other body is characterised by universal and eternal repetition through the natural bodies of future kings. As the natural body consists of the various physical parts (legs, arms, head, etc.) so the political body is comprised of the parts which represent the whole society (the king and his subjects). The natural body is visible while of course the political one is not. According to this theory a king is defined as a *gemina persona* in as much as his duality is explained by the statement that the consecrated king is a

[3] For how the theory can be used in connection to various ceremonials see R. E. Giesey. "Inaugural Aspects of French Royal Ceremonials". *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*. ed. J. M. Bak. (Berkeley: University California Press, 1990): 35-45.(hereafter: Giesey, "Inaugural aspects"). And idem *Royal Funeral Ceremonial in Renaissance France*.(Geneva: Droz, 1961).(hereafter: Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*) See also P. Strohm."The Trouble with Richard: The Reburial of Richard II and Lancastrian Symbolic Strategy". *Speculum*. 71, no.1 (1996): 87-111. (hereafter: Strohm, "The Trouble with Richard"). See also J. Le Goff. *Il re nell Occidente Medievale*. (Rome: Edizioni Laterza, 2006), 3-51. See also M. Evans. *The Death of Kings, Royal Deaths in Medieval England*. (London: Hambledon and London, 2003). (hereafter: Evans, *The Death of Kings*).

human being by his nature but at the same time he is divine by the grace of God as his chosen representative on earth.[4]

The most significant characteristic of a medieval king was that of a Christian king, imitating the image of God, formulated as *rex imago Dei* with the king acting as God's vicar and servant on Earth. This concept developed over the course of the Middle Ages transforming itself from the initial theocentric concept to a more defined Christocentric concept. Kings possessed, apart from their temporal powers, a certain spiritual capacity which made them resemble the Divinity on Earth.[5] The concept of the king imitating Christ relates in the first instance to the procedure of anointing kings (a practice coming from the Old Testament). The earthly ruler by being anointed on the day of his ascension to the throne resembles and represents the one Anointed in Eternity. In relation to the Christocentric concept it is also stated that the king becomes a twin personality in the process of anointing and consecration, resembling even more the two natures of Christ (the human and the divine). The simplified explanation of the process was that the king had to be chosen by the grace of God, consequently his rule and person must resemble the image of God and once anointed he could represent Christ on Earth.[6]

The crucial point for Kantorowicz's theory is that the political body could never be liable to corruption and consequently disappear or die for it possessed an immortal, almost divine character. Alain Boureau, Kantorowicz's biographer, rightly points out that the idea entitled *dignitas non moritur* is the key concept of the work of Kantorowicz, for it represents the immortality of the royal office.[7] This is the reason for the emergence of this body division, for it was developed as a legal term with the

[4] For the issue of duality see A. Guéry. "La dualité de toutes les monarchies et la monarchie chrétienne". *La Royauté Sacrée dans le Monde Chretien*. ed. A. Boureau and C.S. Ingerflom. (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1992): 39-53.

[5] For the discussion and examples of the sacral aspect of kings see J. Revel."La Royauté Sacrée: éléments pour un débat". *La Royauté Sacrée dans le Monde Chretien*. ed. A. Boureau and C.S. Ingerflom. (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1992): 7-19. See also J. Le Goff. "Aspects religieux et sacrés da la monarchie française du X au XIII siècle". *La Royauté Sacrée dans le Monde Chretien*. ed. A. Boureau and C.S. Ingerflom. (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1992): 19-29.

[6] For further on the issue see Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 42-86.

[7] A. Boureau. *Kantorowicz, Stories of a Historian*. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2001), 97. (hereafter: Boureau, *Kantorowicz*).

aim of ensuring a legitimate basis for the continuation of reign when a state was at the threshold between two rulers. In this way the personification of the reign with the mortal ruler was avoided. When a king died only his natural body perished while the reign continued through his heirs and successors. The early 16 century exclamation "Le Roi est Mort, Vive le Roi" signifies thus the idea of the eternal reign and immortality of the body politic that is forever embodied through various heirs to the throne.[8]

The transmission of power or the "taking over" the body politic by the new ruler from his predecessor is seen in three main factors which facilitate the succession to the throne.[9] These three factors are the perpetuity of the Dynasty, the corporate aspect of the Crown and the immortality of royal Dignity. Symbolically the most interesting is the last factor in transmission, the immortality of royal Dignity. Through the course of this work the concept of the immortality of royal Dignity will be discussed with respect to the three main chronological periods of the thesis: the abdication (and the interregnum period), the funeral ceremony (particularly the use of funeral effigies) and reburial (its symbolic meaning for the transmission of power).

It has to be said that it is somewhat difficult to criticise Kantorowicz's work on the "King's Two Bodies".[10] However it must be stated that some scholars give an extensive criticism of his ideas.

[8] Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 411, 412. See also Giesey, "Inaugural aspects", 35-45.

[9] For the reference about one of the way in which this transmission was symbolically represented (through the use of funeral effigies) see R. E. Giesey."The Two Bodies of the French King". *Ernst Kantorowicz: Ertrage der Doppeltagung*. ed. R.L. Benson and J. Fried, (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997): 224-240.(hereafter: Giesey, "Two Bodies of the French King"). See also S. Bertelli. *The King's Body: Sacred Rituals of Power in Medieval amd Early Modern Europe*. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 7, 223. (hereafter: Bertelli, *The King's Body*).

[10]By far the fiercest attacks that Kantorowicz received came from Norman F. Cantor. He wrote the most critical review of Kantorowicz's works, and basically stated that the historian was a strong supporter of the Nazi party program, and made a comparison of the historian to that of another German medievalist, Percy E. Schramm. As Cantor points out "It is in this dominant school of *Geistesgeschichte* that both Schramm and Kantorowicz were trained. Both were interested in the liturgy and court ideology of kingship. Both wanted to make innovative use of art history as source material. Both had an interest in historical personality, trying to find the dynamic person behind the ideas". However, there is a significant difference between them, for Kantorowicz was, as opposite to Schramm's views, estranged to the Nazi regime and was a strong opponent to Hitler's rule and they surely cannot be referred to as the Nazi Twins, as Cantor does. See N. F. Cantor. *Inventing the Middle Ages. The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century*. (New York: W. Morrow, 1991), 83. For

Such is the example of Elisabeth A. R. Brown who pointed to some difficulties when applying the theory to a certain event (as for example the use and understanding of the symbolic meaning of the effigy in the royal funeral ceremony). [11] Other scholars tend to emphasize the evident problems in the theory, such as, for example, its eclectic character, non-contextuality, contempt for chronology, difficulties in grasping and determining the true subject matter, etc. However, the theory in its essence is not criticised as often as one might expect.[12] This fact can be explained by stating that either Kantorowicz's work is so well structured, presented and flawless that it can be used without any further discussion about its validity; or, on the other hand, that scholars use this work taking it for granted because it can coincide with and explain the concepts of their own research. There are several examples of such cases in which terms on political theology presented by Kantorowicz in the "King's Two Bodies" are merely reproduced in some other work related to a similar topic. In addition, it can be stated that precisely those key concepts are not questioned, nor they are filtered through critical research for they are taken as valid facts and not open to question. However, sometimes the theory is used in the context of topics which tend to be somewhat distant from the concepts of political theology. One example of how far this practice goes is certainly an article which tried comparing the "two bodied king" concept to the "reign" of the current French president Nicolas Sarkozy.[13]

One aim of this thesis will be to try to test the theory by relying on the accounts found in the primary sources which describe the abdication and the two funeral ceremonies of Richard II.

---

more on Cantors' views see John B. Freed, who correctly states that this could be considered the most controversial and most criticised chapter in the whole Cantor book. J.B. Freed. "Ernst Kantorowicz: An Account", *Central European History*. 32, no. 2, (1999): 221-227. For the defense of Kantorowicz see R. L. Benson, R. E. Giesey, M. B. Sevcenko. "Defending Kantorowicz" Reply by Robert Bartlett. *The New York Review of Books*. 32, no. 14, (1992).

[11] E. A. R. Brown ″Royal Bodies, Effigies, Funeral Meals and Office in the Sixteenth Century″. *Micrologus*, 7 (1999), 437-509.(hereafter Brown ″Royal Bodies, Effigies, Funeral Meals and Ofice″).

[12]For the critique of the "King's Two Bodies" see B. Smalley. "The King's Two Bodies"(review article), *Past & Present*. no.20, (1961): 30-35. See also H. S. Offler. "The King's Two Bodies" (review article), *English Historical Review*. 75, no. 295, (1960): 295-298. See also N. F. Cantor. "The King's Two Bodies" (review article), *American Historical Review*. 64, no.1, (1958): 81-83. See also C. Landauer. "Ernst Kantorowicz and the Sacralisation of the Past". *Central European History*.27, no. 1, (1994): 1-25. See also J. P.Genet."Kantorowicz and the King's Two Bodies: A non Contextual History". *Ernst Kantorowicz: Ertrage der Doppeltagung*. ed. R.L. Benson and J. Fried, (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997): 265-274.

[13] *Sarkozy: qual è il problema?* by Bernard-Henri Lévy, Le Point, March, 2008. trans. Daniele Sensi. http://bernard-henri-levy.blogspot.com/2008/03/sarkozy-qual-il-problema.html

Although, when writing about Richard II the work of William Shakespeare "The Life and Death of Richard II" emerges often, my primary interest of research are the primary sources and not Shakespeare.[14] In the empirical approach applied to the research on the sources there was no room for the speculative.

The sources which are used can be assessed by grouping them in three general categories, pro Ricardian, pro Lancastrian and ambivalent.[15] The chronicles which substantially cover the period of the early years of Richard II are the *Westminster Chronicle*,[16] *Chronicon Henrici Knighton*[17] and *Chronica Maiora* of Thomas Walsingham.[18] From these three contemporary chronicles on the reign Richard II only one is applicable to research the deposition, death and burial of this English king. That is the *Chronica Maiora* printed later under the title *Annales Ricardi Secundi et Henrici Quarti regum Anglie*.[19] Thomas Walsingham is considered to be the leading chronicler of the pro Lancastrian side.[20] He underwent a gradual transformation from a favourable view to an extremely hostile one. The

[14]It must be pointed out that Kantorowicz dedicated much attention to Shakespeare's work on Richard II and this became the central source for his work on the symbolic aspect of abdication. See Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 24-42. For further reference see C. Landauer."The King's Two Bodies and Kantorowicz's Constitutional Narrative". *Ernst Kantorowicz: Ertrage der Doppeltagung*. ed. R. L. Benson and J. Fried, (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997):211-224

[15] For the evaluation of the sources dealing with Richard II see L.D. Dules. *Richard II in the Early Chronicles*. (Paris: Mouton, 1975). See J. Taylor. *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987). See *Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400: The Reign of Richard II*. ed. and trans. C. Given-Wilson. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993). (hereafter: *Chronicles of the Revolution*) See J. Taylor. "Richard II in the Chronicles" *Richard II, the Art of Kingship.* ed A. Goodman and J. Gillespie.(Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999): 15-37.

[16] *The Westminster Chronicle 1381-1394*, ed. L. C. Hector and B. F. Harvey. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

[17] *Knighton's Chronicle 1337–1396*. ed. G. H. Martin. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).(hereafter: *Knighton's Chronicle*).

[18] *The St. Albans Chronicle: The* Chronica Maiora *of Thomas Walsingham: 1376-1394*, ed. and trans. J. Taylor, W. R. Childs and L. Watkiss, (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003). (hereafter: Walsingham, *Chronica Maiora*).

[19] Thomas Walsingham, a monk of St. Albans wrote a number of chronicles and other texts. This section of his work entitled *Chronica Maiora* represents the most extensive contemporary account on the events which took place between 1397 and 1400. *Annales Ricardi Secundi* were printed in the 19th century. See Thomas Walsingham. *Annales Ricardi Secundi et Henrici Quarti regum Anglie*. ed. H. T. Riley (London, 1866). For discussion of Walsingham's chronicles see V. H. Galbraith, 'Thomas Walsingham and the St Albans Chronicle 1272-1422', *English Historical Review* 47(1932): 12-30. See also G. B. Stow, 'Richard II in Thomas Walsingham's Chronicles', *Speculum* 59 (1984): 68-102. (hereafter: Stow, "Richard II in Thomas Walsingham's Chronicles").

[20] The chronicles which aimed to justify the seizure of power by the Lancastrian family and king Henry IV are applicable to this category. For more on the matter see *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 5.

reason for such changes might lie in the fact that the monks, like him, who compiled these *Chronicles* did not wish to fall into disfavour with the new dynasty. Walsingham's later work uses very harsh adjectives to describe Richard and his rule such as youthful, degenerate, and feckless tyrant, emphasising the negative features of his reign. The main reason for such oscillation in the portrait of Richard II's rule is the result of the shifts in public opinion and the prevailing political situation of that time. However, it is often emphasized that *when* the source was written bears more significance than *what* was written in it. Another pro Lancastrian work is *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi,*[21] which covers the period from 1390 to 1402, written by a monk of Evesham Abbey. However, although the monk of Evesham believed and wrote much that was discreditable toward Richard II and he based his accounts on official documents, it is still questionable whether he was as highly influenced by the Lancastrian propaganda as was Walsingham.[22] The third pro Lancastrian writing is the work of a Franciscan friar entitled *Continuatio Eulogii*.[23] This chronicle covers the period from the 1390 until 1400. It is believed that the friar acquired the information about the events from one of the main protagonists Archbishop Thomas Arundel, brother of the executed earl of Arundel.[24]

On the other side the French chronicles were written mainly to inspire the French nobility to take up arms against Henry IV. It is interesting to point how these chronicles gradually developed an interest in Richard II's reign, and what caused their sudden concern in this particular English king. Starting with the depiction of Richard II as primarily a lethargic ruler they ended up portraying the

[21] *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi*. ed. G. B. Stow (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977). See G. B. Stow. "The Vita Ricardi Secundi as a Source for the Reign of Richard II", *Vale of Evesham Historical Research Papers*, 4 (1973): 63-75.

[22] The monk of Evesham based his account of Richard's 'abdication' is really no more than a copy of his instrument of resignation and a list of witnesses, together with a copy of his so called 'protestatio'. For more on the matter see C. Given-Wilson. "The Manner of King Richard's Renunciation, A 'Lancastrian Narrative'?" *English Historical Review*.108. no. 427, (1993): 365-370. (hereafter: Given Wilson,"The Manner of King Richard's Renunciation, A 'Lancastrian Narrative'?"). See also G. O. Sayles, "The deposition of Richard II: Three Lancastrian Narratives", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* (1981): 257-270.

[23] *Eulogium (Historiarum Sive Temporis): Chronicon ab Orbe Condito Usque ad Annum Domini MCCCLXVI. Vol. III.* (London: BookSurge Publishing, 2001). (hereafter: *Continuatio Eulogii*). For the assessment of the chronicles see G.B. Stow "The Continuation of the Eulogium Historiarum, Some Revisionist Perspectives" *English Historical Review* CXIX. no. 482. (2004), 667-681.

[24] For further reference see A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England II* (London: Routledge,1996), 158.(hereafter: Gransden, *Historical Writing in England*). See also *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 6.

demised king as the last of the English royal martyrs. There are several ways in which the French commentaries define Richard II and his destiny: political prophecy, his effort to maintain peace and the tragedy he suffered by his deposition and, as they state a violent death, as well as the consequence of his demise (namely the mystical and almost divine reputation with which he is granted in the literature). The anonymous author of the chronicle entitled *Chronique de Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Angleterre*[25] also emphasizes the reasons why Richard II met such a cruel and dreadful end, and as the main culprit he points toward the kings' subjects who are viewed as traitors and scabs of the true king and crown. The *Traison et Mort*, as well as the *Histroire du Roy d Angleterre Richard*, attributed to Jean Creton,[26] were of course, written under the influence of the daily political circumstances. They all rely on the sole narration of political events and their analysis, but under the strong influence of politics. Some of the later chronicles used the work of Jean Creton to assess the events of the last years of the reign of Richard II. This was the case for example of the *Dieulacres Chronicle* compiled in a Cistercian abbey in Staffordshire in the north of England (usually considered to have been favourable to Richard II).

In the third category one can place the writings of Adam of Usk. The *Chronicle* of Adam of Usk[27] cannot be qualified as pro Lancastrian or pro Ricardian but is rather ambivalent because the author does not seem to have a strong position on the fate of Richard II, and somehow avoids the trap of aligning himself with one of the opposing views. Certainly Adam of Usk did not wrote an independent account of Richard II's reign, for he most probably was writing under the influence of the Lancastrian propaganda pamphlets (which he used to gather facts about Richard II to which he had no access otherwise); however, Adam of Usk seems to concentrate not so much on the evaluation of

[25] *Chronicque de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Angleterre*. ed. B.Williams. (London: English Historical Society, 1846) (hereafter: *Chronique de Traison et mort*). See J. J. N. Palmer, "The authorship, date and historical value of the French chronicles on the Lancastrian revolution", *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* (1978-79): 145-81, 398-421.

[26] This chronicle was written in verse and it is commonly known under the name *Metrical History*. Jean Creton. *Metrical History of the Deposition of King Richard the Second*. ed. J. Webb (London, 1824). For more on Jean Creton see *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 7, 8.

[27] Adam of Usk: *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, ed. and trans. C. Given-Wilson. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). (hereafter: *Chronicle of Adam of Usk*). See *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 6.

Richard II's personality but rather on the issue of kingship. It is interesting that although there was apparently a strong connection between Adam of Usk and Richard II, and the king even received the monk while imprisoned in the Tower, this author constrained himself from giving a subjective account of the king and his fate. On the other hand Adam of Usk emphasized the issue of kingship, and stated his belief in a strong ruler and a society governed by a strong monarch who respects his position, and thus gives a good example of the contemporary critique about the role of kings. The most extensive 'official' sources are the *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, the formal minutes of parliament. Although *Rotuli Parliamentorum* rarely deviates too far from the official line, they do not suppress every hint of opposition to the crown, and frequently provide background information on decisions taken by the king.[28]

Although it is clear that one cannot separate the source from the influence under which it was created, it is still possible to filter the relevant information from the sources and thus create one picture of the last years and days of Richard II's reign and life. The most valuable part of these sources, apart from the fact that they provide an outstanding portrait of Richard II, is precisely that they are an account of the idea of kingship and what was considered to be a just reign. They are pure narrative sources which do not provide a deeper analysis of Richard II's reign, than it is strictly necessary. However, I do not consider this to be a disadvantage, for they point out the aspects which define righteous rule (of course, some only by Lancastrian standards) and can be used freely for a comparison to Richard II's reign.

In addition, I must point that there are several portraits of Richard II and depictions of the funeral ceremony, however, as my prime interest are the accounts coming from the textual sources I will not use this material in the thesis.[29]

[28] The full text of the Parliamentary Rolls for the years 1272-1509 are available at http://find.library.duke.edu/results.php?type=databases&searchtype=details&resourceid=DUK01731|Parliament%20rolls%20of%20Medieval%20England,%201275-1504

[29] The two pictorial representation of the funeral ceremonial of Richard II in 1400 can be found in London, British Library, MS Harley 4380, fol. 197v. and Funeral of Richard II of England. (BNF, FR 2646) Jean Froissart, *Chronicles* fol. 339 Flandres, Bruges 15th Century.

I. The Abdication of Richard II (1399)

To understand the reasons that led to the deposition of the English King Richard II (January 6, 1367-February 14, 1400) one must seek an insight into events of the crucial years of his reign that eventually lead to the end of his rule. This period covers the years from 1389 until 1399 when several events took place and thus determined and sealed Richard II's fate. These historical facts extend from the personal and emotional state of the king to the political decisions concerning the question of inheritance, but moreover they relate to the king's relationship with the high nobility.

The purpose of this chapter will be to sketch the events which preceded the abdication and how they influenced it. The political atmosphere in which Richard II was eventually deprived of his royal rights is complex and demonstrates how the tragic destiny of one man made a great impact on the society as a whole. The abdication of Richard II had great consequence for the further transmission of power to the usurper new ruler Henry IV. This could present itself as an excellent opportunity to put to test the well known idea presented by Ernst H. Kantorowicz on the king's two bodies which will be examined in the end of this chapter in relation to the various points connected to the abdication.

The Political Conflict in the Last Years of Reign of Richard II

The reign of Richard II was mostly characterized by the fact that he was strongly influenced by certain nobles who had a great impact on the path of the king's politics[30]. For the first years of his reign the main advisors were his uncles, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester.[31] They were influential not only during the earlier years of the king's reign but, their impact on the later years of Richard's reign was also significant. This might have been the main reason why the king, by trying to escape this influence, wanted to surround himself with more trustworthy people such as his half brother John Holland and others in whom Richard II was

[30] C. Given Wilson. "Richard II and the Higher Nobility" *Richard II, the Art of Kingship*. ed. A. Goodman and J. L. Gillespie. (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1999),110, (hereafter: Given-Wilson, "Richard II").

[31] N. Saul. *The Three Richards: Richard I, Richard II, Richard III.* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), 51-52, (hereafter: Saul, *Three Richards*).

confident.[32]Consequently the king was now surrounded by favourites, disputable figures who had a great impact and influenced him, which was seen as disturbing by the public, mostly the nobility.[33]

The relationship between the king and the nobility deteriorated over time not just because of the king's choice of friends and advisors, but also because of the question of finances. The commons reproved Richard several times on the question of how he was managing his finances and just how much the king's household should burden and impoverish the crown.[34]

On the issues of current politics, these early years of Richard II's reign were characterised politically by constant attempts to maintain an atmosphere of peace with France, which on the other hand, had plans for a massive invasion of England in 1386. The preparations to meet such an invasion demanded more expenses, but the request of Chancellor de la Pole to increase the grant was not taken easily by the commons, which demanded that the king discharged him from his duties, a demand which Richard II avoided and delayed, thus causing more tensions with the nobility and the commons. Richard II's foreign politics, his domestic finance issues, and his overall submission to the counsel of figures who were not respected by the nobility, provoked a serious break in the king-nobility relations.

The year 1388 can be regarded crucial for the worsening of this rupture. In this year five of the most prominent members of the English high nobility, the Duke of Gloucester, the Earl of Arundel, the Earl of Warwick, the Earl of Derby and the Earl of Nottingham formed an alliance that is remembered under the name of the Lords Appellant.[35] In the same year the Lords Appellant presented their protest in the form of thirty-nine charges, all appealing against the king's favourites whose

[32]Given-Wilson, "Richard II", 107.

[33] For instance, one such example is Robert de Vere, to whom Richard II extended property in lands with several very substantial grants and than in 1386 granted him the title of Duke of Ireland, a gesture which did not go well with the nobility. A. Tuck. *Crown and Nobility, England 1272-1461.* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 1999), 155, (hereafter: Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*).

[34] In the year 1385 Richard II was forced to accept the appointment of a committee which had a task to safeguard his expenses, and through an investigation of his finances try to diminish his outcomes. Ibid, 160.

[35] Chris Given Wilson points that there were strong reasons for the formation of this opposition to the king's current political and economical decisions which joined together the Appellants Thomas of Woodstock, Henry of Bolingbroke, Thomas Mowbray, Richard Fitzlan and Thomas Beauchamp. C. Given-Wilson. *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages, the Fourteenth Century Political Community*. (London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987), 49, 50, (hereafter: Given-Wilson, *English Nobility*).

influence on Richard's politics became unbearable. Although these appeals were a mere result of the circumstances, they had greater consequences. According to Anthony Tuck the despised king's counsellors, de Vere and Pole were sentenced in absence to death and their lands were confiscated; in addition the commons demanded the execution of the four chamber knights of Richard II. Another committee was formed to watch over the king's decisions.

In the following year, however, the situation changed in favour of Richard II, for he was able to regain the influence he had lost during the struggle with the Appellants, mostly taking advantage of the fact that the Lords Appellant had lost their popularity for not being able to make a proper response to the growing threat coming again from France, but this time from Scotland as well. Richard seems not to have understood the situation, which he considered ideal, but in fact was not. Richard's reign was still scrutinised by the public which, however, never could accept the influence that his favourites had on him. In addition, his somewhat submissive politics towards France as well as the ever-present finance issues surely did not help his popularity.

In the following years Richard again burdened his household with several newly appointed favourites.[36] As a result, in 1397 the commons made another complaint directed towards the Parliament concerning the expenses of maintaining such a household. This conflict marked the beginning of a larger set of circumstances which emerged from Richard II's intention not to repeat the situation from 1388 of a supervisory committee. In addition, Richard by this time gave the titles of dukes, a fact which will be remembered in the chronicles as the making of the *duketti*, to some of his closest allies such as Henry Bolingbroke (Hereford), Thomas Mowbray (Norfolk), John Holland (Exeter), Thomas Holland (Surrey), and Edward of Rutland (Aumale).[37]

[36]This new circle around the king was formed by his half brothers John and Thomas Holland, earls of Huntingdon and Kent, earl of Rutland and Edward, son of the duke of York, and John Beaufort the son of John of Gaunt. Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 180. See Given-Wilson, *English Nobility*, 48.

[37]For the matter of the later creation of the so called *duketti* see Walsingham, *Chronica Maiora*. For further explanation of the meaning of the term see Given-Wilson, *English Nobility*, 52, 53, and M. Mckisack. *Fourteenth Century: 1307-1399*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 483-484, (hereafter: Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*).

Moreover Richard took advantage of his dominance in the so-called Revenge Parliament, and as a result brought to trial his former opponents, the three Lords Appellant, the Duke of Gloucester, and the Earls of Warwick and Arundel who were charged with treason. The Earl of Arundel was sentenced to death and executed; the Earl of Warwick was sentenced to exile, while the Duke of Gloucester did not survive to hear his sentence.[38] This act ensured Richard some moments of peace for he did not experience any signs of open hostility from the nobility, still under the impression of the swift removal from the scene of the king's opponents.

As the king was determined to exercise his newly acquired power and position he went on with the confiscations of lands of the Appellants. However, Richard did not stop himself at this point, for he also wanted to expand the crown's possession at the expense of the House of Lancaster and that of Norfolk by charging both the Duke of Norfolk as well as Henry of Bolingbroke with treason and banishing them to exile.[39] Later he confiscated those lands and thus provoked another rupture, but this time with unimaginable consequences.[40]

In addition to Richard's constant issues with the nobility, another crucial problem arose, and that is the issue of inheritance of the throne. Richard II remained childless as his first wife Ann of Bohemia died in 1394 without giving birth to an heir.[41] The political situation of that time became essential in the search for a new bride. The main threat coming from France, in addition to the mutual desire of Richard II and Charles VI and their counsellors to maintain peace, resulted in the agreement that the English king should marry the daughter of his French counterpart. In 1395 Richard married the six-year old Isabella of France who upon his capture in 1399 was sent back to France. However,

[38] M. Giancarlo. "Murder, Lies, and Storytelling: The Manipulation of Justice(s) in the Parliaments of 1397 and 1399". *Speculum*. 77, No. 1, (2002): 76-112. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 478-482 on the matter of the arresting and imprisonment.

[39] Henry of Bolingbroke was exiled by the king in 1398 for a period of ten years because of his involvement in an court conspiracy. He was however granted by Richard II the right to claim the Lancastrian inheritance since it was inevitable that his father, John of Gaunt will soon die. Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 189. For further reading see J.L. Kirby. *Henry IV of England*. (London: Constable, 1971).

[40] Given-Wilson, "Richard II", 123.

[41] For the view on the sources which speak about the king's childlessness see M. Hanrahan " A Straunge Succesour Sholde Take Youre Heritage: The Clerk's Tale and the Crisis of Ricardian Rule" *The Chaucer Review*. 35, no. 4, (2001): 335-350.

due to the bride's youth the marriage was never consummated and thus Richard was left without a legitimate male heir who would take his place on the throne.

Another point which is often emphasized in the literature is the over-impressionable, emotionally unstable, and impulsive character of Richard II that sometimes made him overreact in cases where perhaps a more subtle approach would have been better and more efficient.[42] The king was reported to be sensitive to every type of criticism, which in his eyes manifested as an attack on his position and prerogatives and consequently he regarded such things as acts of treason.[43] It can be easily argued that his personal conduct made it easy for the nobles' to claim the right to overthrow Richard's absolute rule.

Richard II and Henry of Bolingbroke, preparation for the deposition

At this point it is crucial to describe how the concept of kingship and sovereignty, as conceived by Richard, might have lead to his downfall. It is often underlined by the scholars who have dealt with this topic that Richards' so called tyranny in the period from the 1397 till 1399 was in fact the result of the humiliations which he suffered in the first part of his government and the first conflicts with the nobility and the commoners. The consequence of such action was that once Richard gained some power he exercised it by taking revenge on whoever wronged him in the past.[44]

It can be argued that after the time of the conflict with Henry of Bolingbroke and the Duke of Norfolk Richard altered his behaviour and presented another side of his rule characterised by suspicion and the loss of self control. The proofs of his tyranny was that he deprived people of their rightful inheritance and driven them into exile, condemned his enemies by meddling with the parliamentary roll and then imprisoned them and deprived them of an honest trial[45]. His main goal was to punish all

[42] G. B. Stow."Stubbs, Steel and Richard II as Insane, the Origin and the Evolution of and English Historiographical Myth" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*.143, no. 4, (1999): 601-638

[43] Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 162, 181.

[44]N. Saul."The Kingship of Richard II" *Richard II, the Art of Kingship*. ed A. Goodman and J. Gillespie. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999): 37-59. On the matter of the tyranny see C. M. Barron. "The Tyranny of Richard II" *Historical Research, the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*. 41, no.103, (1968): 1-18.

[45] For a full list of accusation of how Richard II deprived his subjects and the novelties he imposed see ThomasWalsingham, *Historia Anglicana*. II, 203. in *English Historical Documents*, Vol. 4*(1327-1485).* ed.

those who acted against him before and by doing so he even managed extensively to profit financially. Richard applied all sorts of different ways in which to enhance his finances, like for example every person who participated or was associated in one way or the other with the Appellants had to seek individual pardon with large fees, which also extended to the counties that were recovering the royal favour with large fines. All these extra earnings went to finance the lavish and extravagant life which the king sought appropriate for him[46]. Nigel Saul argues that because of the behaviour of Richard as well as the novelties which he tried to impose in regards to kingship and the matters of sovereignty eventually led to his deposition.[47]

It is pointed that even the way in which the king ought to be addressed or represented altered. This image building included the obligation of a newly fashioned vocabulary of addressing the king; the expression "Your majesty" or "Your highness" replaced the outdated phrase "my Lord", thus emphasizing even more the distance between the unreachable ruler who reigns above his subjects. In addition, a change in representing the king occurred; he was now portrayed as the only one worthy of the company of the Divinity and the one set apart from the world of his mortal subjects.[48]

In 1399 Richard felt himself strong enough and sufficiently confident in the security of his position that he decided to invade Ireland. He felt secure enough to leave the throne unattended and disregarded the fact that somebody could challenge his right to hold the crown. Henry of Bolingbroke (April 4, 1366-March 20, 1413), the son of John of Gaunt, whose full titles comprised that of the Earl of Derby, Earl of Northampton, Duke of Hereford and the second Duke of Lancaster, upon his father

A.R. Myers, 1912-1980, D.C. Douglas, 1898-(London: Eyre & Spottiswoode,1969),172. See also Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 495.

[46] The examples were the investments in buildings, tournaments, and moreover furniture, dress and lavish presents. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 490.

[47]N. Saul."Richard II, the Author of His Own Downfall?" *History Today*.49, no. 9, (1999): 36-41. For the further reading on this matter see B. Wilkinson."The Deposition of Richard II and the Accession of Henry IV" *English Historical Review*.54, no.214. (1939):215-239. See G. O. Sayles. "King Richard II of England, a fresh look" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*.115, no.1, (1971): 28-31. See G.B. Stow. "Richard II, Leader and Tyrant" *Great Leaders, Great Tyrants*, ed. A. Blumberg. (Greenwood Press, 1995): 276-282.See C. D. Fletcher. "Manhood and Politics in the Reign of Richard II" *Past and Present*.185,(2005): 3-39.

[48]N. Saul." Richard II and the Vocabulary of Kingship" *English Historical Review*.110, no. 438, (1995): 854-877. See *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*. ed. D. Gordon, L. Monnas. and C. Elam. (London: Harvey Miller, 1998). See M. Rubin. *The Hollow Crown, a History of Britain in the Late Middle Ages*. (London: Allen Lane, Penguin Group. 2005),160.

death landed in England. There were no misunderstandings concerning the Duke's arrival in England defying Richard's decision to ban him from the kingdom on a longer period. The Duke arrived:

> and landed toward the north coast of England and had with him eight small ships and two boats of passage...,[49]

with the intention to claim his inheritance of the possessions of the House of Lancaster, to which he was entitled. He wanted however, to make an even greater claim: the throne of England, even though at this point he did not openly declare his intention to seize the crown from Richard.[50]

It can be argued that the claim of Henry of Bolingbroke for the inheritance of the House of Lancaster was justified. In March 1399 Richard took advantage of his newly acquired power and superiority in the Parliament to accomplish the revocation of Henry of Bolingbroke's rights of inheritance as stated:

> Be it remembered...how that Henry Duke of Hereford, after the judgement given to him in Coventry by authority of the parliament,....that he might by his attorneys sue and have livery of such heritage or successions...,as fully appears by the letters patent made thereon. But these letters were granted to the duke by inadvertence and without suitable advice, or proper deliberation...And therefore it was adjudged by our lord the king and....knights coming from the parliament....that the letters patent with all their circumstances and dependencies, should be entirely revoked, annulled, broken, ad repealed, and their enrolment in chancery cancelled. [51]

Upon his return to England Henry of Bolingbroke met with several English nobles who were more than willing to follow him and support his cause. He first met with the Duke of Northumberland and the Earl of Arundel;[52] joining him later many other nobles brought with them the military support which he needed to proceed and submit to his will those parts of the land that still remained loyal to King Richard II. Henry of Bolingbroke went on to spread his influence and gain more power with every town or duchy that sided with him. That was the case of London, to whose citizens the Duke of Lancaster wrote a letter asking for their support:

[49] *Chronicque de la Traison et mort* 179. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 492.
[50] *An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI*. ed. J. S. Davis. (Cambridge: Camden society original series, 1856), 15 (hereafter: *An English Chronicle*).
[51] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, III, 372, *English Historical documents.*178.
[52] *An English Chronicle* 15. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 492.

> Thanne wroot the said duke of Hereforde to the citizeyns of Londoun, and callied himself duke of Lancaster ans stiward of Englond, and said that he wolde refourme and amende that was amys; and anon Londoun him fauerid and supportid, and alle the kyngis castellis were delyuerid to the duke.[53]

Caroline M. Barron points out that since the relationship between Richard and the Londoners deteriorated over time it is no wonder that the city sided with Bolingbroke in his quest for the throne.[54] By the beginning of summer Henry of Bolingbroke had also the duchies under his command and practically controlled most part of the kingdom. Bolingbroke achieved that by pointing to the misrule of Richard II which he stressed in the letters sent around the country:

> Duke of Lancaster...sent to different towns and different castles, to the prelates, the lords, and the commons a hundred and fifty pairs of letters falsely railing, by different artful fabrications, against King Richard and his government.[55]

At this point, left with no other choice, King Richard was forced to abandon his military expedition to Ireland and return to save his crown. He returned probably in July 1399 only to find out that most of the nobles had crossed over to Henry of Bolingbroke.[56] In addition, he received some more grief for soon after his arrival he realized that he was abandoned by his closest counsellors, like for example by Sir Thomas Percy, the Steward of the Household.[57] This desertation of the people around King Richard II, lead inevitably to the disintegration of his armies, for the lords which abandoned him were followed by their military forces.[58]

In such an environment, Richard had no alternative but to follow the rules of the game set by Henry of Bolingbroke. The few advisors who remained at his side proposed that Richard should flee and find safety in Bordeaux and wait there until his forces were once again reassembled and he could learn just on how much support he could rely. Richard refused this proposal and instead sent his half

[53] *An English Chronicle* 15.
[54] C. M. Barron. "Richard II and London" *Richard II, the Art of Kingship*. ed. A. Goodman and J. Gillespie. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999): 129-155, (hereafter: Barron, "Richard II and London").
[55] *Chronicque de la Traison et mort* 180. For the content of the letters see same source, 181, 182, 183.
[56] D. Johnston. "Richard II s Departure from Ireland, July 1399" *English Historical Review*. 98, no.389, (1983): 785-805. See G.O. Sayles. "Richard II in 1381 and 1399"*English Historical Review*. 94, no. 373,(1979): 820-829.
[57] *An English Chronicle* 15,16.
[58] *Chronicque de la Traison et mort* 190, 191.

brother John Holland, the Earl of Huntingdon to meet Henry of Bolingbroke and find out what exactly his demands were.[59]

Because of the drastic dissolution of his army continued Richard was forced to find refuge in the castle of Conway. There he accepted a meeting with the Earl of Northumberland, an advisor of Henry of Bolingbroke, and, according to the sources began to negotiate his surrender to Bolingbroke.[60] Interestingly, only one source mentions a curious detail that Richard II gave his two crowns as well as other treasures to Bolingbroke's representative, presumably, as a token for their future meeting scheduled to take place in the castle of Flint.[61]

At this point the sources tend to disagree on the matter of how exactly the king reached the castle of Flint. According to the chronicles of Adam of Usk as well as the *English Chronicle* Richard went willingly to the castle and they do not mention any other details. The *Chronique de Traison et mort*, however, extensively portrays that Richard II was in fact tricked and falsely reassured that he would be well taken care of during his meeting with Bolingbroke and, thus upon these promises he followed the Earl of Northumberland's suggestion to ride to Flint.[62]

Whatever the circumstances were under which Richard II reached the castle of Flint, he met his fate there for he was captured and placed under tight surveillance as stated:

> ...they lodged the king and his companions in the castle; and the earl and Erpingham set a strong guard over them.[63]

[59] "...and you shall go yourself tomorrow to Henry of Lancaster, to learn his wishes".Ibid,192.

[60] *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 58. Other sources mention archbishop Arundel to be also present at this meeting. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 493.

[61] *...et sic traditis eius duabus coronis suis, ualoris centum millarum mercarum, cum aliis thesauris infinits, se uersus castrum de Flent statim transtulit protinus*. *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 58.

[62] According to the *Chronique*, Henry of Bolingbroke detained Richard II half brother which came to him earlier at Chester. There is where, after a discussion with Bolingbroke, the earl of Huntingdon wrote two letters which Northumberland brought with him to show them to Richard and thus reassure him about Bolingbroke's intentions, and that is to only make a claim for the Lancastrian inheritance. As well, according to that same chronicle, earl of Northumberland gave an oath to the king swearing about the truthfulness of Bolingbroke's promises of safety for the king. Upon that fact the king decided to follow Northumberland to Flint castle. See *Chronicque de la Traison et mort* 195-200. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 493.

[63] *Chronique de Traison et mort* 201.

The *English Chronicle* mentions that while still in Flint Richard received a visit from the Thomas Arundel (the brother of the executed Earl of Arundel). Thomas of Arundel was the first to make accusations against the king and his government by mentioning some of the points which were later emphasized in the formal charges of the Parliament presented to Richard upon his deposition.[64]

After his capture in Flint Richard was visited by Henry of Bolingbroke, who made his claims for the inheritance of the House of Lancaster,[65] but also made a speech on the nature of Richard II rulership and "kindly" offered his help in governing England as could be seen from this passage:

> My lord, I am come before you sent for me; and I am come to help you to govern the kingdom of England, which you have not ruled well these twenty-two years that it has been in your government; and therefore, with the consent of the commons, I will help you govern it .[66]

On the second day after his capture the king was moved to the castle of Chester where the Duke of Lancaster was staying.[67] Afterwards he was moved to the Tower of London, where he was to expect the decisions of the Parliament:

> And thanne the kyng and the duke and the othere seid lordes reden in fere to Londonward: and in the first day of Septembre they comen to London everych on: and in the morwe suynge kyng Richard was put into the tour of London tyl tyme that the parlement, whiche began at Westm on seynt Jeromys day the last day of Septembre.[68]

According to some chronicles, the procession to the Tower was a humiliating experience for Richard, but at the same time a clear expression of power which was now undoubtedly in the hands of Henry of Bolingbroke. Thus, the *Chroniques de Traison et mort* mentions that the king was humiliated

[64] *An English Chronicle* 16.

[65] Jean Froissart: *Chronicles (1337-1410)*. ed. G. Brereton. (London: Penguin Classics, 1978), 463, (hereafter: Froissart *Chronicle*). For the insight on how Bolingbroke's claims changed see C.D. Fletcher. "Narative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II" *Journal of Medieval History*. 30, no. 4, (2004): 323-341.

[66] *Chronicque de la Traison et mort* 209.

[67] Adam of Usk mentions also the fact that at this point the representatives of London came to him and pledged their obedience to him. *Dum dux tunc Cestrie erat, tres da uiginti quattuor senioribus London ex parte eiusdem ciuitatis, cum aliis quinquaginat ciuibus eiusdem, ad ducem ueniebant sub sigillo communi ipsius, ciuitatem sibi recomendando et regi Ricardo diffidenciam mittendo*. *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 60.

[68] *Chronicle of London From 1089 to 1483*. Reprint of the ed. London, 1827. (Wales: Llanerch Enterprises,1995), 85, (hereafter *Chronicles of London*).

and mocked in front of the people of London.[69] Froissart tells quite the opposite, that the people of London were dissatisfied because the king was brought to the Tower in secrecy and thus avoided the crowd's expression of feeling towards Richard stating that:

> ...they were angry that the duke had not brought him through London openly, not to have done him honour, but shame, they hated his so sore.[70]

The act of deposition of Richard II

With Richard safeguarded in the Tower of London, Henry of Bolingbroke's intentions were finally clear and evident to all. Through the course of time, after he landed in England, Bolingbroke sometimes did not even make an effort to hide his true agenda.[71] His actions, nevertheless, stemmed from the heat of the moment, and were not a carefully prepared plan of action of a man who wanted to be king by all means. But what exactly were the foundations upon which Henry of Bolingbroke made his claim towards the crown and at the same time disclaimed Richard's right to rule?

The case of the deposition of Richard II was not without precedents in the English history of the Middle Ages. Henry of Bolingbroke could rely on the case of one of Richard's predecessor King Edward II to find out how to depose a king. It is most striking how the two fates of the deposed kings seem to coincide in more than one aspect. For instance, both of them were accused for being highly influenced by their favourites. In the case of Edward II that would certainly refer to his somewhat strange relationship with lord Gaveston and lord Despenser.[72] Another point in common was that both kings were reproved because of the household expenses. Edward II was known for his generosity which in the end burdened the courts finances.[73] Generally speaking both kings were not enjoying popularity among their subjects, which in the case of Edward II can be seen from a curious fact

[69] *Chronicque de la Traison et mort* 213, 214. See Barron, "Richard II and London", 129-155.
[70] Froissart *Chronicles* 465.
[71] Well before the capture of Richard II, Henry of Bolingbroke usurped the regal powers. And if one overlooks the way in which Bolingbroke is entitled "Henry by the grace of God, King of England and of France and Lord of Ireland", the rest of the following text testifies to the usurpation of powers usually related to a king. P.R.O. E404(Warrants under the Privy Seal). *English Historical documents* 179.
[72]Their close relationship has become fruitful ground for the emergence of the rumours of alleged homosexuality of the king. For further on the issue see M. Prestwich. *The Three Edwards*. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), 80 (hereafter: Prestwich, *Three Edwards*).
[73] See Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, 81.

(among many others) that the people were not so reluctant to come to him for curing the king's evil (scrofula) as they were to come to his father Edward I.[74]The final point of reference is that both Edward II and Richard II were facing the threat coming from the same house, that of the Lancaster.[75]

This king, who was considered to be a weak and futile ruler, was by no means unaware of the dangers he was to face.[76] After making a desperate attempt to escape his fate King Edward II was captured along with one of his favourites Lord Despenser by Henry of Lancaster, who sent the king into captivity at Kenilworth.[77] Left with no other choice but to resign Edward II acted as was expected of him. The formal reason for the deposition was that he refused to participate in the Parliament summoned for January 1327.[78] An assembly was made with the task to draw up the articles from which all the accusations against the king would be evident. Upon these articles a delegation was selected to appear before the king in Kenilworth. [79] There the articles were read to the king who in a desperate attempt made a plea for mercy and afterwards decided to resign the crown in favour of his son. Afterwards the archbishop of Canterbury proclaimed that Edward II was no longer king by the consent of the magnates, clergy and the people. [80]

In the case of Richard II there were three main points that had to be fulfilled in order to make the procedure for the abdication valid. The first one is that the king must abdicate by his own will and not under any type of persuasion. In this regard the later Lancastrian propaganda tried to model the public's opinion by stating that Richard offered his resignation well before even reaching the Tower

[74] Ibid, 82. See also M. Bloch. *I re taumathurghi, Studi sul carattere sovrannaturale attribuito alla potenza dei re particolarment in Francia e in Inghilterra*. (Turin: Einaudi, 1989), 76 (hereafter: Bloch, *I re taumaturhgi*).
[75] Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, 85.
[76] On the matter of the events preceding the capture and deposition of Edward II see Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, 80-83.
[77] Lord Despenser was tried, tortured in the most horrible way and finally executed at Hereford. See Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, 97, 98.
[78] N. Fryde. *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II 1321-1326*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 196 (hereafter: Fryde, *Edward II*).
[79] For the list of members present in this delegation see Fryde, *Edward II*, 199.
[80] See Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, 98. The articles included reasons for the deposition such as that the king was found to be insufficient, a destroyer of the Church , that he infracted the promises he gave in his coronation oath and that he was following bad counsel. For further on the matter see Fryde, *Edward II*, 198. See also C. Valente."The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II" *English Historical Review*.113, no.453, (1998): 852-881

and once he was imprisoned he repeated by his own will of course his offer of resignation in addition to expressing the wish that he should be succeeded by Henry of Bolingbroke.

The other point is that the act of deposition ought to be fortified by the acceptance of a body of representatives, the assembly of the estates of the realm with the support of the commoners. The main goal was to collect the proof of Richards' misrule and tyranny.[81] There are several pieces of evidence upon which Henry of Bolingbroke relied as sufficient enough to earn him the right to the throne. First, there was the undisputable fact that Richard II's rule was not well appreciated among his subjects, especially among the nobility, with whom the king had numerous disputes. By the time of his capture Richard II was left with so few supporters and their military backup that every resistance to Henry of Bolingbroke would have been futile. Thus, it can be concluded that Bolingbroke could rely on the support of the majority of nobles in his claim to the throne, in addition to the support of the commons. One thing which cannot be overlooked is that Bolingbroke established himself and his authority in most of the towns which, one way or the other, gave him support.

Another strong fact which worked in Bolingbroke's favour was that he could easily gather sufficient evidence which would prove just how unrighteous and criminal Richard II's reign was, giving him enough reasons to depose the king legally. By doing so Bolingbroke managed to apply the decree *Ad Apostolice*,[82] and thus provide legal foundations for the deposition and according to the canonical tradition charge the king with grave crimes, a sufficient reason for his deposition. This evidence for Richard's misrule were related by Adam of Usk, speaking of Richard's relationship with his subjects, personal or moral deficiencies, and the questioning of his mental capacities.[83]

Once all the evidence against Richard's rule was collected and there was an agreement between the estates and the people that the facts collected were notorious, it was finalized in the form

[81] Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 494.

[82] This decree was issued by Pope Innocent IV against the emperor Frederick II.

[83] *Per quos determinatum fuit quod periuria, sacrilegia, sodomica, subditorum exinnantio, populi in seruitutem redactio uecordia, et ad regendum inutilitas, quibus rex Ricardus notorie fuit infectus... Chronicle of Adam of Usk*..62. On the view on kingship by Adam of Usk see J. McCullagh. "Critics of Kingship in Late Fourteen and Early Fifteenth Century England". MA Thesis presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Akron. August, 2005.

of thirty three articles which were to be read before Richard II and presented afterwards in the Parliament, a day after the deposition of the king.[84] On September 29 a delegation of spiritual and temporal lords with the chief justice of the common bench visited Richard in his prison in the Tower, coming with the intention to ask, and moreover demand, his abdication on account of the crimes he committed against the crown during his reign.[85]At this point the sources disagree whether the king, who was basically presented with a finished case and left with no alternatives, voluntarily renounced his crown or not. The *English Chronicle* mentions that at first the king was reluctant to accept the inevitable, but then afterwards decided to renounce the crown of his own will, stating that:

> First he said Nay, and thanne they saide unto him that he moste nedis resigne withoute eny condicioun....[86]

The third and final point to be achieved in order to make the abdication legitimate is to agree on the terms upon which Henry of Bolingbroke could accede to the throne as a legitimate heir. The predominant argument in Bolingbroke's claim was that he had the right to the throne based on his inheritance rights. Henry of Bolingbroke was descended from line of Edmund of Lancaster, the son of King Henry III. The council which discussed what claims Henry of Bolingbroke should present for the throne decided to argue that Edmund of Lancaster was the eldest son of King Henry, but was "replaced" by his younger brother Edward in the hierarchy for the inheritance, because of his mental or physical incapacity.[87]

[84]"The Charges against Richard II" *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, III, 415-424, *Selected documents of the English Constitutional History 1307-1485*. ed. S.B. Chrimes. 1907-, A.L. Brown. (London: A. Black and C. Black, 1961), 187, 188,189, (hereafter: *Rotuli Parliamentorum,* Selected documents).

[85] "The Commission of Deposition" in *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, Selected documents, 190. See Given-Wilson. "The Manner of King Richard's Renunciation, A 'Lancastrian Narrative'?": 365-370.

[86] *An English Chronicle* 17.

[87] Adam of Usk presents this story and mentions that the council declared that Edmund was cast aside so to say because of his imbecility. ...*asserentes ipsum Edmundum regis Henrici tercii primogenitum esse, set ipsius geniture ordine propter ipsius fatuitatem excluso....Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 64. Another sources mention that the reason for „switching" the places between Edmund and Edward was the fact that Edmund was born as a crouchback. For recent scholar views on the reasons for claiming the throne see F. Grady. "The Lancastrian Gower and the Limits of Exemplarity" *Speculum*. 70, no. 3, (1995): 552-575. See Mckisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 495.

Henry of Bolingbroke played the inheritance card and made claim that his right of blood (and moreover the right blood) was a reason strong enough to appeal for the throne, stating:

> In the name of Fadir, Son, and Holy Gost, I Henry of Lancastre chlange this rewme of Yngland and the corone with all the membres and the appurtenances als I that am disendit be right Lyne of the blode comyng fro the gude lorde Kyng Henry therde, and thorgh that ryght that God of his grace hath sent me with helpe of my kyn and of my frendes to recover it, the whiche rewme was in poynt to be undone for defut of governance and undoyng of the gode lawes. [88]

This claim of blood right to the throne was also considered more desirable. Henry of Bolingbroke was advised against claiming the throne by the right of conquest, for that might lead to discrepancies in his future reign, and perhaps serve as encouragement for the future claimants to take this way to the crown, as well as because the conqueror was seen as the one who does not need to respect the laws or customs of the ones whom he now rules, and Bolingbroke followed this advice.[89]

But how was this act of abdication performed? There are several different versions which describe the scene that was played in the Tower. More or less unique pictures however can be portrayed form these various sources. The delegation that came to the Tower confronted Richard II with the accusation made about his reign and his misconduct towards his subjects. After that, the king was presented with a paper containing the text prepared for his abdication which stated that he voluntarily renounced his royal powers. It is interesting to point out that the charges were prefaced by Richard's coronation oath, as a comparison of what he had promised to do and what he actually did during his reign. The best example of this fact can be found in the part of the Thomas Walsingham's *Annales* of the reign of Richard II which quotes directly from the Lancastrian text entitled "Record and Process of the Renunciation of the King Richard the Second after the Conquest and the Acceptance of the same Renunciation together with the Deposition of the Same King" inserted in the official statements of the first Parliament of Bolingbroke.[90] When Richard II signed the paper[91] and the

[88] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, Selected documents, 191. See I. Mortimer. "Richard II and the Succession to the Crown". *History*. 91, no. 303, (2006): 320-336. (hereafter: Mortimer, "Richard II").
[89] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, Selected documents, 192. See Mckisack *Fourteenth Century*, 495.
[90] Stow."Richard II in the Thomas Walsingham's Chronicle", 68-102. See also J.M. Theilmann."Caught between Political Theory and Political Practice: The Record and Process of the Deposition of Richard II " *History of*

resignation was accepted by the estates and the commons the legal part of the abdication was finalized and at this point Henry of Bolingbroke could challenge the Crown basing his claim on the grounds of him descending from Henry III.

However, the symbolic part was yet to follow. In addition to the official signature of Richard II on this resignation paper, he also had to be stripped of his royal insignia to make the procedure complete. At this point the sources differ on what Richard did exactly to symbolize his renunciation of the throne and abdication. For instance, Adam of Usk relates that the king's coronation ring was removed, which according to Usk is a sign of deposition.[92] Stanley B. Chrimes takes into consideration this account and connects it with the transference of the signet from Richard II to Bolingbroke taken as a sign of the transmission of sovereignty.[93] Once Richard's resignation was accepted Henry of Bolingbroke presented this signet seen as a symbol that the deposed king approves of Bolingbroke's ascension.

On the other hand, the *Dieulacres Chronicle* mentions a unique situation in which the deposed king placed his crown on the floor and actually made a symbolic gesture of renouncing his throne and leaving his kingdom in God's hands.[94] Froissart also mentions the crown but in a different context. According to that chronicles Richard II willingly placed the crown in the hands of Henry of Bolingbroke and thus completed the deposition act stating that:

> Then king Richard took the crown from his head with both his hands and set it before him, and said: 'Fair cousin, Henry duke of Lancaster, I give and deliver you this crown, wherewith I was crowned king of England, and therewith all the right thereto depending.' The duke of Lancaster took it, and the archbishop of Canterbury took it out of the duke's hands.[95]

Political Thought. 25, no.4,(2004): 599-619. For the full text of the *Record* see *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 169, 170, 171, 172.

[91] *„...et manu propria se subscripsit*... Thomas Walsingham *Chronicon Angliae*, Selected documents, 180.

[92] *...ipsius anulo cum eis in signum deposicionis et priuacionis adempto, et cum eis ad ducem Lanc delato, et sibi in pleno parliemento, eodem die incepto tardito. Chronicle of Adam of Usk*. 68.

[93] S.B. Chrimes. *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Medieval England*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 215.

[94] *...et corona regni super humo posita Deo ius suum resignavit*. *Chronicle of Dieulacres Abbey*, Selected documents, 182.

[95] Froissart, *Chronicles*, 469. See G.B. Stow. "Richard II in Jean Froissart's Chroniques" *Journal of Medieval History*. 11, (1985): 333-345.

After overcoming the final obstacle, the deposition itself, Henry of Bolingbroke was at liberty to make his claim to the throne. The day following Richard's deposition Bolingbroke presented his appeal to the Parliament, where he stated that according to his inheritance right and the fact that Richard had renounced his crown he was free to claim it because the throne was empty. The throne remained empty until Bolingbroke's coronation in October 1399.

Deposition as ground for the "rupture" between the King's "two bodies"

The metaphors in this situation allude to the idea of the king who possessed two bodies. While the first, natural body was corruptible, submissive to diseases and consequently mortal, the second, the political body, represented the immortality of the dignity that the royal power brought to whoever was occupying the throne. The king in this case was considered as the head, the bearer of the political body which will, after the death of the ruler, be transferred to his successor.

At this time the situation occurred that the two bodies of the former king, Richard II, were separated. The body politic remained "hanging in the air" between the deposed king and the one who wanted to become the new king. At the same time, however, as Richard II legally ceased to exist as king and consequently the political body given to him was supposed to be transferred to his heir, the natural body of Richard of Bordeaux[96] was still alive. With the deposition of Richard his political body was beheaded and this fact presented a problem for the transfer of power.

By this act the political body did not disappear, but the rupture that occurred with the renunciation demonstrates that a moment of interregnum took place. This state of interregnum signified that the body politic was incomplete for it was missing its head, which is the new king-the new bearer of both bodies. If the theory of the King who never dies is true, the issue of the interregnum could only be solved if three factors were to be accepted. The first is the perpetuity of the

[96] The name Richard of Bordeaux was given by the chronicles because of the place of his birth; also, this title was used as a kind of reference to the story that Richard II was not a legitimate son of Edward the Black Prince, but a son of a monk which was in his mother company while she remained in Bordeaux.

Dynasty, the second is the corporate character of the Crown and the final one is the immortality of the royal dignity.[97]

Dynastic continuity, as Kantorowicz conceives it[98] relies primarily on the concept of inheritance by birth-right. As was shown the main argument which Henry of Bolingbroke used in his claim to the throne was based on his royal lineage.[99] Bolingbroke also relied on the fact that he did not need the consecration act to make his decisions legitimate, and thus he fulfilled the second requirement for perpetuity.[100] Before his coronation Bolingbroke acted as if he were in full possession of royal powers. One such example is transmitted by Adam of Usk, concerning the creation of forty-two knights which took place in early October 1399.[101] Another fact that speaks on behalf of Dynastic continuity is the practice of dating regal years. According to the *Chronicles of London* Bolingbroke began to count his regal year from the date on which Richard II abdicated,[102] following the practice established by Edward I in 1272.[103]

The other point of Kantorowicz, the corporate aspect of the Crown,[104] can be viewed in the case of Richard II through the charges which he faced, and which speak of his crimes against the subjects and all the people of the kingdom.[105] These charges were summarised in a way that they demonstrate Richard's grave crimes against the Crown, as can be seen through various examples in the

[97]Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*,316.

[98] The concept of the dynastic continuity is based on the legal claim that the king's reign began with the demise of the predecessor and on the premise that "..the king's true legitimisation was dynastical, independent of approval or consecration on the part of the Church and independent also of election by the people" The only source of royal power is God. Ibid,.330, 336.

[99] See footnote no. 36.

[100] *Et sic, uacante regno, consensu totius parliementi dictus dux Lancastr in regem erectus... Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 68.

[101] *In uigilia coronacionis rex Henricus, presente domino Ricardo olim rege, apud turrim London quadraginta duos creauit milites... Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 70.

[102] "...wiche day, in the tour of London, Kyng Richard resigned his dignyte in this yere of his regne xxii; abd duke Herry was be generall accorded in parlement chosyn kyng, his regne thanne begynnynge and sithen crowned." *Chronicle of London* 85. The beginning of the reign of Henry IV was considered from the day on which he challenged the Crown and that is September 30, 1399. Mckisack *Fourteenth Century*, 496.

[103] Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 329.

[104] Or better said the symbolic representation of the Crown which by being invisible and perpetual, represents the very substance of inheritance and extensively the whole kingdom. Ibid, 338.

[105]Ibid, 383.

articles. In the first article Richard II is accused of distributing the possessions of the Crown to unworthy persons.[106] Another example states not only Richard II's crimes against the Crown, but that the Crown was also independent and free of the king or any other man.[107] All the accusations made against the king were conceived as accusations for the crimes that were performed against the Crown and dignity.[108] Bolingbroke in his coronation ceremony, before he accepted the crown, took an oath to make his reign righteous[109].

Kantorowicz's third and final aspect of dealing with the interregnum is the immortality of the royal dignity.[110] He states that there is a difference between the Dignity and the Crown, because the first one refers to the:

> singularity of the royal office, to the sovereignty vested in the king by the people, and resting individually in the king alone.[111]

Thus, when Henry of Bolingbroke was made a candidate for the crown with the support of the members of the Parliament,[112] the commons and towns,[113] he was in fact invested by the people themselves who transferred the dignity to him, which moreover could be connected with the idea of cooperation, so to speak, between men and God, presented in the saying that the people act and God inspires.[114]

---

[106] *In primis obicitur regi, quod propter malum regimen suum, videlicet bona et possessiones ad coronam suam spectancia eciam personis indignis donando... Rotuli Parliamentorum*, Selected documents,187.

[107] *Item, quamvis corona regni Anglie et jura eiusdem corone, ipsumque regnum, fuerint ab omni tempore retroacto adeo libera quod dominus summus pontifex nec aliquis extra regnum ipsum se intromittere debeat de eisdem, tamen prefatus rex ad roboracionem statutorum suorum erroneorum supplicavit domino pape quod statuta in ultimo parliamento suo ordinataconfirmaret*.Ibid, 188.

[108] *Que omnia contra coronam et dignitatem...* Ibid.

[109] *Regem ante recepcionem corone domino Cant iurare audiui quod populum suum in misericordia et ueritate omnino regere curaret. Chronicle of Adam of Usk*. 72.

[110] *Dignitas non moritur* is an exclamation directed towards "the perpetuity of the sovereign rights of the whole body politic, of which the king is the head..." Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 383.

[111] Ibid, 384.

[112] See footnote no.52.

[113] See footnote no. 30.

[114] According to the formula presented by John of Paris which states *populo faciente et Deo inspirante*. Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 296.

This clearly shows that for acquiring the royal title it was not crucial, (although it proved itself to be quite convenient), to be a direct descendant of a bloodline of a king-father, nor the fact of mere pertinence to the family in possession of royal blood, but that the crucial fact was to have the support of the public which will side with one in his quest for the Crown.

II. The First Funeral of King Richard II (1400)

By the time that the English King Richard II resigned his office and was subsequently deposed, the situation with the quest for the crown of Henry of Bolingbroke was finished. The true nature of his landing in England and claiming the inheritance of the House of Lancaster was by then evident to everyone; it was clear that these actions were just serving as an introduction to a claim to the throne. Richard renouncing the crown meant that Henry of Bolingbroke was free to proceed with the next stage of the plan. The only obstacle still to overcome was that Richard II, now conveniently called Richard of Bordeaux, was still alive. This meant that he posed a constant threat to the new government of the Lancastrian dynasty. After his coronation Henry of Bolingbroke decided to deal with this problem as soon as possible and thus avoid the issues which might arise from the fact that the former king was still alive while the new one held the crown and power in his hands. The death of Richard II was a mysterious event, just as his life was somewhat surrounded by uncertainties. In addition, the peculiarities concerning Richard did not die with the king's demise, but instead continued and culminated in an unusual funeral ceremony.

The main goal of this chapter is to show the events which led to the death of Richard, to give an account of the various descriptions of how the king died, and to conclude with the display of the funeral ceremony accompanied by descriptions of some elements of it. The theory of the "King's Two Bodies" will serve here as an aid to defining what was so different in this funeral from other royal funerals of the time, as well as a guide to the description of how it was possible to symbolically depict the transmission of power for which the funeral was the best choice. The theory will in this case only be confronted with accounts of the primary sources and will address the issue of regicide and the use (or absence) of the effigy in the funeral ceremony.

The Inauguration and Coronation of Henry of Bolingbroke and the Fate of Richard II

Once Henry of Bolingbroke had ensured the deposition of King Richard II he was forced to make his next moves fast and with an astute attitude and thus strengthen his position and path towards

his ultimate goal, the crown of England. When the former King Richard II renounced his position as ruler, the throne stood legally vacant, waiting for Henry of Bolingbroke to make his claim.

Having now in his hand the formal document which proves that in fact Richard had resigned his office, Bolingbroke claimed the throne in the presence of the members of the Parliament, and the lords temporal and spiritual, brought into an assembly on September 30 1399. It is important to point that this was not considered a regular parliamentary session because all the summons of the Parliament were done in Richard's name and now with his renunciation they no longer valid.[115] Bolingbroke took advantage of this apparent lack of legitimacy. In fact, the only thing he wished to avoid was acknowledging that a Parliament had granted him title to the throne, and would lever over him in his future reign and contest his superiority. Therefore, an assembly that formally had the authority to proclaim a king but at the same time was lacking the true legal status of a Parliament proved to be the most efficient solution.[116]

Another interesting and symbolically fascinating fact concerning this meeting is that up to the point when Bolingbroke stood up and made his speech for the crown the throne was covered with a golden cloth, probably symbolising that although the bearer of the political body was at the moment not present in his seat, nevertheless the royal dignity still resided upon the throne.[117] As the sources mention, Henry of Bolingbroke stood up from his seat and made the sign of cross on himself and began the speech in which he laid out the reasons why he should take Richard's place. The future king introduced the reason of inheritance by blood, noting his kinship with King Henry III's lineage, and stating that as Richard had lost his right to wear the crown, he was now in fact the next in line for hereditary succession. Bolingbroke achieved the unanimous consent[118] of the lords who were present

[115] M, Keen. *England in the Later Middle Ages, a Political History*. (London: Routledge, 2003), 239 (hereafter: Keen, *England*).
[116] For further discussion see F. E, Jacob. *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961),17 (hereafter: Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*).
[117] See McKisack, *Fourteenth Century*, 496.
[118] One remark must be stressed here, and that is that just one of the sources, *Chronique de Traison et mort*, mentions the supposed protest of Bishop Carlise who spoke on behalf of the deposed king stating that he should be heard, but this protest ended badly for the bishop who was removed from the parliament and imprisoned. *Cronique de Traison et mort* 221, 222. See also Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 14.

that day, who declared themselves favourable to Henry ruling. As a clear sign of the legitimacy of his claim, Henry of Bolingbroke showed the signet which he had received (willingly or not that is unclear) from Richard and that now stood as a token of the deposed king's wishes that he should be succeeded by the Duke of Lancaster.

As the formal part of the assembly was reaching its end and all the proofs were displayed and accepted, the archbishop present at that time enthroned Henry of Bolingbroke. Following was the sermon delivered by Archbishop Arundel who justified the deposition of Richard II, commented on the fact that the king had left the throne without an heir, and finished by naming Henry of Bolingbroke's virtues. [119] Bolingbroke's title thus relayed on the claim of descent, the right by conquest, the support of the people, more precisely the Londoners, and finally parliamentary recognition. [120]

It is interesting to point out that there was a reason for mentioning that Richard had left no heir apparent to the throne for it related to an event coming from the early period of his rule, the proclamation of the young Earl of March, Roger Mortimer as his legitimate successor. Being aware that there was a chance for him to remain childless in 1385 Richard II had declared in Parliament that the Earl of March should be considered heir presumptive to the throne.[121] However, Richard was known for the constant mood swings and changing opinions and this case was no exception. Starting from 1390 he no longer supported his own proposition concerning Roger Mortimer, far from it. The episode concluded with the death of the Earl and no one wanted to support the cause of Roger Mortimer's son, still a minor at the time of Richard II's deposition.

[119] These virtues were mentioned as a part of the sermon delivered by Archbishop Arundel on the text *Vir dominabitur populo* (1 Samuel ix, 17) where he praises the vigour, good sense and strength of Henry of Bolingbroke as opposite to the flaws of Richard II. In the sermon he uses the metaphor of the folly of the youth and the wisdom of the age to compare the ending reign of Richard II to the one which was about to began with Henry IV. For further see *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 69. See also *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 186. See also Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 13.

[120] Keen states rightly that among all these claims it is not particularly clear which one should have precedence over the others. Keen, *England*, 240.

[121]Mortimer, "Richard II", 320-336. See also Saul, *Richard II*, 397. and idem *Three Richards*, 153-156.

A commission of the temporal and spiritual lords went the day after the assembly, on October 1, 1399, to the Tower where Richard was imprisoned to make it known to him about his abdication (which was accepted) and about the cause and procedure in his deposition. It is clear that Bolingbroke made all the necessary arrangements to legitimize his reign. He was in a hurry to do so, for a rapid action could prevent the rising of an unwanted political situation and anticipate a possible move coming from the French king. Bolingbroke made sure that provisions were in place before the first meeting of the actual Parliament, scheduled for October 6.

Henry of Bolingbroke understood that even before the meeting of the actual Parliament took place he must make provisions to ensure the continuity of the government. He did so by appointing and renewing the positions of the officials whose service terminated with Richard's abdication. This meant the re-appointment of judges, lieutenants of counties, escheators, collectors of customs and sheriffs.[122] The reason for such behaviour, apart from the fact that Bolingbroke surely wanted to retain the appearance of a normal transition of government, could be that he wished to avoid creating a group of dissatisfied nobles who would challenge his reign and rise in favour of someone who could assure their appointments once again, and that was Richard. An important point raised by Anthony Tuck is that Henry not only had the obligation to put out fires before they happened and keep the nobility content, but that his government would be seen as successful only if he was able to bring to his side and ensure the loyalty of all those who had supported Richard.[123] In addition Bolingbroke secured the loyalty of many by providing them with annuities and pensions.

All of these actions were an introduction to the formal meeting of the first Parliament of Henry of Bolingbroke, held on October 6, a week time before his coronation was scheduled to take place. The lords who gathered at this Parliament[124] agreed unanimously to a continuation, or better said adjournment, of Parliament until a day after the coronation of the new king. A day before the

[122]Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*,17. See also *Great Chronicles of London* .ed C.L. Kingsford, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 46.
[123] Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 197.
[124] There is a reference to seventy-four knights which were representing thirty seven counties along with 173 citizens and burgesses representing eighty five cities and boroughs. Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 19.

coronation, on October 11 Bolingbroke expressed his full possession of royal power by the act of creating forty-two knights, including his sons.[125] Three of them were knighted on this occasion while the eldest, the future Henry V, had already been knighted by Richard in Ireland. [126]

Bolingbroke's coronation took place on October 13, St. Edward's Day, an event which was carefully marked in the chronicles of the period. The coronation ceremony also aimed at representing the legitimacy of Henry's position. Froissart gives an extensive account in the *Chronicles* of how the ceremony took place. He states:

> And after dinner the duke departed from the Tower to Westminster, and rode all the way bareheaded, and about his neck the livery of France. He was accompanied with the prince his son, and six dukes, six earls and eighteen barons, and in all, knights and squires, a nine hundred horse: then the king had on a short coat of cloth of gold after the manner of Almaine, and he was mounted on a white courser and the garter on his left leg...Thus he was conveyed to Westminster....That night the duke was bained, and the next morning he was confessed and heard three masses, as he was accustomed to do: and then all the prelates and clergy came from Westminster church to the palace, to fetch the king with procession. And so he went to the church a procession, and all the lords with him in their robes of scarlet furred with minever, barred of their shoulders according to their degrees: and over the king was borne a cloth of estate of blue with four bells of gold, and it was borne by four burgesses of the ports, as Dover and other; and on every side of him he had a sword borne, the one the sword of the Church and the other the sword of justice;...Thus they entered into the church about nine of the clock; and in the midst of the church there was an high scaffold all covered with red, and in the midst thereof there was a chair royal covered with cloth of gold. Then the king sat down in that chair, and so sat in estate royal, saving he had not on the crown, but sat bare headed. Then at four corners of the scaffold the archbishop of Canterbury shewed unto the people how God had sent them a man to be their king, and demanded if they were content that he should be consecrated and crowned as their king. And they all with one voice said,'Yea,' and held up their hands promising him faith and obeisance. Then the king rose and went down the scaffold to the high altar to be sacred, at which consecration there were two archbishops and ten bishops, and before the altar there he was despoiled out of all his vestures of estate, and there he was anointed in six places, on the head, on the breast, and on the two shoulders behind, and on the hands. Then a bonnet was set on his head; and while he was anointing, the clergy sang the litany and such service as they sing at the hallowing of the font. Then the king was apparelled like a prelate of the Church, with a cope of red silk and a pair of spurs with a point without a rowel: then the sword of justice was drawn out of the sheath and hallowed, and then it was taken to the king, who did put it again into the sheath; then the archbishop of Canterbury did gird the sword about him. Then Saint Edward's crown was brought forth, which is close above, and blessed, and

[125] Adam of Usk mentions this number of forty four knights but the exact number is not sure; also he mentions four of Henrys sons being knighted on this occasion while omitting the fact that the eldest Henry had already received the title earlier. See *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 71.

[126] See P. McNiven. *Heresy and Politics in the Reign of Henry IV, the Burning of John Badby*. (Manchester: Boydell & Brewer, 1987), 138 (hereafter: McNiven, *Heresy and Politics*).

> then the archbishop did set it on the king's head. After mass the king departed out of the church in the same estate and went to his palace...[127]

Adam of Usk gives plenty of space in his chronicle to describe the various segments of the coronation ceremonial. He names the carriers of the four swords that were used in the ceremonial and depicts their symbolic significance. He states that the first, a scabbard, that symbolised military virtue, was in fact the Lancastrian sword which Bolingbroke wore on his landing in England, and was now carried by the most loyal of all the new king's companions, Earl of Northumberland, the very one who had delivered Richard to him. The second two swords, wrapped in red and bound in golden straps, symbolizing twofold mercy were carried by the Earls of Somerset and Warwick. The fourth one, Curtana, was carried unsheathed by the Prince of Wales, Henry's eldest son, who was holding in his hands the sword of justice. Other insignia, such as the sceptre and the rod, were carried by other members of the nobility.[128] Some of these insignia bear legendary symbolic meanings which date back from the earliest period of the Middle Ages. For instance, the Curtana was considered to have been a gift given to the Saxon ruler Ogier the Dane by Charlemagne himself. This sword has a particularity that can also be explained by this legend. While Ogier was fighting his fierce enemy Renowde he managed to break the top of the sward leaving it its present day shape.[129] Another insignia used in this ceremony was the sapphire ring of St. Edward. This ring also had a legendary background for it was believed that it travelled from King Edward's finger to that of a beggar to the hands of two pilgrims visiting the Holy Land and back into the king's hands.[130]

The coronation ceremonial continued with the act of consecration performed by the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Arundel. The oil used for the consecration had a somewhat miraculous appearance on the English political scene. As a response to the French custom of anointing rulers with the oil brought by the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, the English practice relied on their saint, Archbishop Thomas Becket. While he was in exile he apparently received a golden eagle shaped

[127] Froissart, *Chronicle*, 470, 471.
[128] *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 72, 73.
[129] For further on the destiny of the Curtana see B. Barker. *The Symbols of Sovereignty*. (Oxford: Westbridge Books, 1979), 78, 79 (hereafter: Barker, *Symbols of Sovereignty*).
[130] For further reference on the legend see A. Lloyd. *The Making of the King, 1066*. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1966), 126. See also Barker, *Symbols of Sovereignty*, 79,80.

container of holy oil from the hands of the Virgin. The oil was not used right away, but instead two hundred years passed before it entered the scene.[131] Thomas Walsingham in his *Annales* relates the story of the anointing being performed by Archbishop Arundel who was using this sacred oil. Although apparently even Richard II wanted to be re-anointed with this oil, as it was believed that whoever was consecrated with this oil could recover Normandy and Aquitaine and moreover defeat the infidels in the Holy Land, Archbishop Arundel had no desire to indulge the kings' wishes. Instead, the archbishop kept this oil for the anointing of the one who was worthy of receiving it and that was Henry IV. Walsingham writes the following on that issue:

> The archbishop, however, a man of wise counsel, absolutely refused to do as the king asked, as was indeed almighty God's intention. It was enough, he explained to the king, that he had already received his holy anointing once at the hands of the Metropolitan at his first coronation,and he should not do so again, for it might happen that by an act of such presumption he would in fact lay himself open to God's wrath... The archbishop, therefore, kept these treasures in his reverend custody until the coronation of the present king [Henry IV], who thus became the first king to be anointed with this precious liquid sent from heaven. And as a result of this many people believe that he was indeed that king, chosen by God, for whom this oil was so miraculously provided, and that greater things were promised to him than to any who had come before him …[132]

The *English Chronicle* also relates that this was the first time that this sacred oil has been used.[133] The chronicle known as the *Eulogium Historiarum* reveals a somewhat contradictory story for it relates that Richard II, probably sensing the danger that somebody might reach for this precious liquid, had it taken in 1399 from the Tower where it was kept along with the crown jewels. The chronicle states:

> *Rex intravit Turrim, et omnia jocalia pretiosa a praedecessoribus suis ibidem reposita tulit secum, ubi et invenit aquilam auream et ampullam lapidaem in ea clausam, cum quadam scriptura dicente quod Beata Virgo tradidit illam Sancto Thomae Cantuariensi archiepiscopo...*[134]

[131] For the complete account on the legend see Bloch, *I re taumaturghi*, 183, 184, 185, 186. See also Barker, *Symbols of Sovereignty*, 80, 81, 82.
[132] *Annales Ricardi Secundi*, *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 201, 202
[133] *An English Chronicle* 19.
[134] *Continuatio Eulogii* 380.

It can be concluded that the oil most probably came into the possession of Henry of Bolingbroke when he captured the king. Brian Barker raises an interesting point in relation to the use of this oil. He points to the unusual and somewhat convenient timing for the appearance of the oil and the legend around it at the moment when Henry IV had to defend his actions and the legitimacy to the throne by all means.[135]

On October 15 Henry, newly enthroned king of England, before starting the official rule with his first Parliament, first wanted to ensure the dynastic future of his house. On that day the archbishop of Arundel informed the Parliament on behalf of the new king that he wished to declare his eldest son the heir apparent to the throne. It is interesting to point out that Henry IV, by giving his son the title of Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornwall and Earl of Chester was in fact reviving the titles of Edward the Black Prince, Richard II's father. The Prince of Wales was invested:

> with five insignia namely the bestowal of a rod of gold, a kiss, a coronet, a ring, and his letters of creation. [136]

In this way he wanted to meet two goals, firstly to ensure the dynastic future of the House of Lancaster, but moreover to establish his son as the military and administrative lord over the counties that were considered to be more supportive of the former king than of him. It was precisely this part of the country which was considered to be the most economically stable, thus giving the new king economic leverage. The new Prince of Wales was also endowed with the Duchy of Aquitaine as well as with all the privileges of the Duchy of Lancaster, his house inheritance which was excluded from the property of the Crown and considered to be the personal property of the descendants of the House of Lancaster.

The day after the coronation the first Parliament of Henry IV began. The new king received the speaker of the commons and the liege homage of all the temporal and spiritual lords. The last Parliament of Richard II was declared invalid, making way for the main issues that were to be

[135] Barker, *Symbols of Sovereignty*, 82.

[136] *...per quinqe insignia, scilicet per uirge auree tradicinem, per osculum, per circulum, per anulum, et per sue creacionis litteras...Chronicle of Adam Of Usk* 77.

discussed in this Parliament. These issues were the revocation of all the legislation acts, penal measures and other acts directed towards the former king's opponents, most of whom were now present in the company of the new king, Henry IV. These acts analysed the measures of Richard during the last three years of his reign. The acts of Parliament of 1397/8 were revoked opening the door for the restoration of those who were wrongfully deprived and exiled, which would surely have applied to the remnants of the Appellants. The commons petitioned for enforcing the acts of the so called Merciless Parliament of 1388, which was granted.[137] Other acts included the nullification of Richard's blank charters, reaffirmation of the royal prerogative, precisely, that Henry IV should be granted the same royal liberty as his predecessors, denouncing Richard II's use of the signet, and taking measures against Richards' friends and supporters. The last act had serious consequences. On the second day of the Parliament several lords made a suggestion that the counsellors of Richard who had caused so much harm in the past should be formally arrested. This became a witch hunt of the persons who were known as the *duketti* whom Richard had invested and endowed with numerous properties.

The most interesting item that this Parliament dealt with was the fate of Richard II. The commons petitioned that the former king should be brought to them and made answer for all of the wrong doings with which he was charged. Henry IV, however, waited until all of the temporal and spiritual lords had gathered. On October 23 Archbishop Arundel once again proved himself to be one of the most loyal allies of Henry IV. The archbishop rounded up all the temporal and spiritual lords in outmost secrecy and demanded their allegiance and moreover their silence on what was pronounced at this meeting. Fifty-eight lords were all individually called by the Earl of Northumberland to give their opinions on what is to be done with Richard.

When reading the official rolls of this Parliament meeting, one could have the impression that all that followed regarding the destiny of Richard II was made within the sole intention of making the

[137] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, III, 425, Selected documents, 184, 185. See also Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 20. See also Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 197.

former king secure. All of the questioned lords consented to imprison the former king with the intent to save and preserve his life. The *Rotuli Parliamentorum* states the following:

> ...that it seemed to them [the summoned lords] that he should be put in safe and secret custody in a place where few people gathered and that he should be guarded by sure and trustworthy persons, and that no one who has been a servant of the former king should wait upon him, and that all this should be carried out in the most secret manner possible.[138]

Although it must be stated that part of this decision was probably aimed at stopping all future attempts of disillusioned people who wanted to take revenge upon the despised king, most of it certainly aimed at preventing an attempt to freeing the king by any of his remaining supporters and with the help of his former staff and the members of his household. This is why, as the result of this meeting, Henry IV appeared before the Parliament on October 27. On this occasion the Parliament made a decision to condemn the former king to perpetual prison. The place of his incarceration should remain a secret. [139] The most striking thing is that this case, as in others that preceded it and concerned Richard's life and future was discussed and arranged without him being present. All of the actions were constructed in such a way that they should not bear any sort of resemblance to a trial. The former king of England was supposed to be dealt in as much secrecy as possible, avoiding thus any potential problems that might arise.

The sources tend to state that by either October 28 or 29 Richard had already been moved from the Tower of London to a secret location which apparently was not so secret for some chronicles trailed the path that the former king had to take to reach his final destination, the castle of Pontefract. [140] Richard II was first moved from the Tower to Gravesend, from there to Leeds Castle in Kent and then finally to Pontefract. He was placed in the custody of Robert Waterton and Thomas Swynford, his former jailer from the time he spent in the castle of Calais. The first Parliament of Henry IV was

[138] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, III 426-427, Selected documents, 185.
[139] *On Monday, 27 October the king came into parliament in the great hall of Westminster, and there by assent of the lords spiritual and temporal Richard lately king of England was adjudged to perpetual prison, to remain there secretly in safe guard as stated above*. *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, III 426-427, Selected documents, 185. See also Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 23. See also Keen, *England*, 240.
[140] *Chronique de Traison et mort* 288.

dissolved on November 19 because it had achieved the goals for which it was summoned. The first was the matter of dealing with the deposed king and the second was the matter of the former councillors and dukes created by Richard II.

Rebellions against the New King and Dynasty and the Death of Richard II

Although one might think that the transmission of government proceeded without any disruptions, difficulties or problems, in the last month of 1399, the first year of Henry IV's reign, a rebellion arose, demonstrating to everybody that the new reign was not as stable as it was presented to the public. The apparently unanimous consent that Henry IV managed to achieve with his swift action of seizing the crown, now gradually faded in the minds of some. The last actions of the new king against Richard's misrule, although they had the approval of many dissatisfied and disinherited men, seemingly did not possess the overwhelming and undisputable support of the whole public.

Some of Richard's former close friends and allies could not cope with the fact that the former king was treated as he was, humiliated and deprived of the comfort that should have been provided to him by the mere status, position and office he once held and embodied. The lords resented that Henry IV treated the former king without any respect towards his persona and status by taking him into custody and away from the sight of the people, and saw the opportunity to rebel in the period of the reign when the new king had not yet completely secured his government.

The main protagonists of the conspiracy were the Earls of Kent, Rutland and Huntingdon. It cannot be stated that these lords were somehow affected by the transmission of power. They were among those who Henry IV chose to keep close even though they were known to be the supporters of the former king. In this respect they profited from the situation, because not only did they keep their estates but as those who had the confidence of the new king they found their way into his new court. These members of the kings' council meet in December 1399 with the Earl of Salisbury and Thomas Merke, ex bishop of Carlisle, Thomas Blount, Benedict Cely and Thomas Lord Despenser. They arranged a meeting in the house of an abbot of Westminster in order to formulate a plan which would

eventually lead to the restoration of Richard II.[141] The time which they thought would be appropriate for such an action was Epiphany, just before a tournament that was arranged at Windsor. The plan was to kill Henry IV and his sons and restore Richard to the throne. As the *Chronicle* of John Capgrave writes:

> These men...came to Wyndesore with IIII hundred armed men, purposing to kill the King and his progenie, and restore Richard ageyn onto the crowne.[142]

They spread the news that Richard II had escaped from prison and was joining the conspirators with an army of followers gathered in "Walys and Chestyschire".[143] They even made the uprising a bit more dramatic than necessary for they had with them a priest named Richard Maudelyn, who as the *Chronique de Traison et mort* states, closely resembled the deposed king and planed to impersonate the king until the real one joined the conspirators.[144]

The conspirators, supposedly trying to gain as much support as possible from the public, made a desperate move. [145] According to Capgrave's *Chronicle* they went on January 6[146] to the former Queen Isabelle and deceived her that her husband had managed to escape from prison and was joining them with a large army. The *Chronicle* states that:

> ...Therfor frendis know this, that Herri of Lancastir hath take the Toure at London, and oure very Kyng Richard hath brokyn prison, and hath gadered a hundred thousand fytyng men.[147]

The fact that Isabelle was the daughter of the King of France was not to be disregarded and her involvement in this unfortunate event could have provoked disastrous consequences.

[141] See Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 25. See also Keen, *England*, 241. and Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 199.
[142] John Capgrave's *Chronicle of England*. (Reprint of the ed. London, 1858. Kraus Reprint, 1972), 275 (hereafter: *Capgrave's Chronicle*).
[143] *Chronicles of London* 86.
[144] See *Chronique de Traison et mort* 229. and Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 25.
[145] Keen rightly points out that these men were not the most popular nobles in the land at that time and they certainly lacked the charisma of those whom the people would follow blindly in their quest for the restoration of the previous, much despised king Richard II. Keen, *England*, 240.
[146] *Annales Ricardi Secundi* mentions even the exact time when the conspirators arrived that day. *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 225.
[147] *Capgrave's Chronicle* 275.

To defeat these conspirators Henry IV once again relied on the help of the towns, especially London, whose citizens gave him the utmost support. By the time that the Earl of Kent managed to get Queen Isabelle on his side, Henry IV had raised over 20, 000 men. All the conspirators were captured. An agreement of surrender was arranged, but was difficult to maintain because the local mob overpowered the guardians of the conspirators and executed some of them in the streets. Henry IV confiscated the estates of the rebels who were sentenced to death and executed, and used them for the royal household.

There are three important aspects of this unfortunate event which said a great deal to the people who were involved in them and to those who just remained bystanders. The first and most obvious one is connected to the failure of the conspiracy and the attempted coup. The fact that no one of the most prominent members of the nobility joined the conspirators and the fact that at the end most of them were run down and judged in the street by the angry mob was a clear statement that no such behaviour leading to the restoration of the previous government of Richard II could ever be possible. To Richard II this was undisputable proof that by the death of the nobles involved in the conspiracy he had lost any chance to ever leave his prison and once again regain his office and crown. The second point is that by this event Henry IV learned that as long as Richard remained alive he would present a threat to his government. The third aspect of this event arose later, at the end of Henry IV's reign, creating an overwhelming confusion whether the former king Richard had escaped from prison or not.

The first two aspects are connected. Less than twenty days from the Epiphany rising (as the sources call the attempted coup), French sources mention Richard II as being dead. There is a disagreement among the sources on how exactly Richard died. The *Chronique de Traison et mort* for instance states that this was not an accident and that the former king was murdered. The *Chronique* is the only source that mentions (twice) Henry IV's wish to put the former king to death. The first mentioning is on the day of his coronation and the second is on the day of the final battle with the conspirators where he supposedly stated that if he was to encounter Richard there he would deal with

him. These mentions of Henry IV's intentions to kill Richard serve as an introduction to what follows in the *Chronique:*

> ...King Henry...commanded a knight called Sir Peter Exton, to go and deliver straightaway from this world John of London, called Richard, for it behoved that the sentence of the parliament should be accomplished. The knight...rode to the castle where he found King Richard confined [at this point supposedly a struggle arose which is described by the Chronique in great length]...Sir Peter Exton was who gave him the death blow on his head that King Richard felt backwards on the ground.[148]

This is the only source which explicitly mentioned the former king being murdered, but others adopted this version and expressed doubt at the way the event was formally presented. One of these is the *Metrical History* attributed to Jean Creton who states:

> The king was so vexed at heart by this evil news that from that time onwards he neither ate nor drunk: and thus, so they say, it came to pass that he died. But, in truth I do not believe in it; for some declare for certain that he is still alive and well, shut up in their prison. It is terrible wrong that they commit.[149]

The most wide spread version of how Richard died is that he perished by starvation. Whether this was voluntary starvation as a protest, or a state of mind of the former king who apparently went into depression once he heard of the failure of his friends who had attempted to set him free and restore him to the throne, is questionable. Various sources explain this situation in a variety of examples. The version coming from the *English Chronicle* states:

> Whanne kyng Richard herde alle this [referring to the defeat of the conspirators] he was utterli in despeire, and confessid that this was do be his counsel, and for sorou and hunger he deide in the castle of Pountfret.[150]

Another account by Thomas Walsingham states:

> When Richard, former king of England,... heared of this disasters...he apparently became so depressed that he determined to starve himself to death. He is said to have abstained from food to such a degree that the orifice leading to his stomach contracted, so that later, on the advices of friends, he tried to satisfy his natural

[148] *Chronique de Traison et mort* 248, 249, 250. Some of the recent scholarships also adopted this view that Richard II was in fact murdered in prison. For further see Saul, *Three Richards*, 200. See also P. Strohm. *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimisation, 1399-1422*, (Yale University Press, 1998), (hereafter: Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*).

[149] *Metrical History*, *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 244.

[150] *An English Chronicle* 21.

> longings for eating, he found himself unable to eat anything...with the result that he was wasted away through natural debility, and finally died...on St. Valentines' Day.[151]

That perhaps the former king was starved to death is the account of Adam of Usk who writes:

> ...he [Richard] pined away even unto death, which came to him in the most wretched of circumstances in Pontefract castle, on the last day of February, tormented, bound with chains and starved of food by Sir N. Swynford. [152]

The chronicle *Vita Ricardi Secundi* states that the King deserved this fate:

> Thus was the fateful judgement spoken by the Lord in the gospels fulfilled with respect to this king: 'He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword.' For since he had in the past so thoughtlessly condemned many people to die by the earthly sword, so it came about that in the end he himself died, childless and friendless, by the sword of hunger[153]

As Maurice Keen rightly points out, even though most of the sources mention that the king starved himself to death voluntarily, "the date of his death seems too convenient" from which is deduced that the former king was probably killed by Henry IV.[154] One can pose a question, however, of why so much trouble went into disguising the real facts behind the way in which Richard died. And here is where one could relate to the king's two bodies theory. The theory links the concept of the mortal body with the immortal one, namely, the body politic which survived even though the natural body of the ruler died. If the bearer of the political body was the subject of regicide, the consequence would be that any wound inflicted on the bearer of the body politic could be considered as an attack on the body itself. The Old Testament story of David and the Amalekite inspired the idea of medieval times that it is a grave crime to kill the Lords anointed. St. Paul developed the matter further by defining regicide a sin that could not be justified by any type of situation.[155] As regicide was closely connected with treason and usurpation it is clear that such an act could never be carried out openly without consequences. Most of these consequences were certainly the problems that regicide would

[151] *Annales Ricardi Secundi, Chronicles of the Revolution*, 229. See also Thomas Walsinghm. *Historia Anglicana vol.II. 1381-1422*. ed. H. T. Riely. (London: Longman, 1864), 245,246 (hereafter: Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*).
[152] See *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 91
[153] *Vita Ricardi Secundi, Chronicles of the Revolution*, 241.
[154] Keen, *England,* 241.
[155] Evans. *The Death of Kings,* 120, 121.

create in the succession to the throne. This is why the *Chronique* by presenting the violent way in which the former king was supposedly put to death emphasized the unnatural nature of regicide. The last part of the *Chronique* states the regret of the knight who killed the former king expresses his remorse as:

> Alas! what is that we have done? We have murdered him who has been our sovereign lord the space of twenty two years. Now I have lost my honour...[156]

Another powerful analogy of body symbolism is that coming from Adam of Usk, who tries to relate the events that apparently happened during Richard's coronation and view them as omens of his bad reign that was to come. The chronicler states that there were three misfortunes at the coronation which predicted the rest of the reign:

> At this lords coronation, three symbols or royalty had foretold three misfortunes which would befall him: firstly, during the procession he lost one of the coronation shoes, so that to begin with the common people rose up against him, and for the rest of his life hated him; secondly, one his golden spurs fell off, so that next the knights rose up and rebelled against him[157]; thirdly, during the banquet a sudden gust of wind blew the crown from his head, so that thirdly and finally he was deposed from his kingdom and replaced by King Henry. [158]

Brian Barker points to an event that is also mentioned in the sources, that King Richard II was carried out of the abbey because he fainted probably as a result of the exhausting fasting before the coronation a sign that was taken as a mark that he will fail the crown and for that die.[159]

The Funeral Ceremony of Richard II (March, 1400)

The life of Richard II can be considered as a somewhat unusual and peculiar one, different from that ascribed to a typical medieval king. The peculiarity with which Richard was depicted in the writings that described his life continued even after he died. Therefore even the events which surrounded his death and those arising from his funeral ceremony were not so far from the mystery that encircled him.

[156] *Chroniqe de Traison et Mort* 250.
[157] Spurs were considered to be the symbols of chivalry and were presented to the new ruler as him being the military leader and fount of honour and chivalry. See Barker, *Symbols of Sovereignty*, 92, 93.
[158] *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 91.
[159] Barker, *Symbols of Sovereignty*, 84.

According to the prescriptions shown in work entitled *De Exequiis Regalibus cum ipsos ex hoc seculo migrare contigerit*[160] there are several steps which ought to be followed in order to make the funeral be acceptable as valid: bringing the body in the procession to the church, office for the dead, a requiem mass, funeral oration, absolution and burial. But not all are considered mandatory and some of them could even be omitted from the ceremonial. For example the funeral oration is optional, the mass may be omitted, the office for the dead can be abbreviated and on certain occasions even absolution is not given. What is most important, the full ceremonial could be repeated more than once in different churches, except the burial.[161] Although some of the segments prescribed by this document were followed in the case of Richards' burial, this can nevertheless be considered a highly unusually performed ceremonial.

This is best demonstrated in the way in which the funeral ceremony of Richard II, once an English king, differed in so many respects from that of his predecessors. To illustrate this it is best to repeat the accounts which deliver the most information concerning this unusual funeral ceremony. The first is the account given by Froissart's *Chronicle* where is stated:

> It was not long after that true tidings ran through London, how Richard of Bordeaux was dead; but how he died and by what means, I could not tell when I wrote this chronicle. But this king Richard dead was laid in a litter and set in a chare covered with black baudkin, and four horses all black in the chare, and two men in black leading the chare, and four knights all in black following. Thus the chare departed from the Tower of London and was brought along through London fair and softly, till they came into Cheapside, whereas the chief assembly of London was, and there the chare rested the space of two hours. Thither came in and out more than twenty thousand persons men and women, to see him whereas he lay, his head on a black cushion and his visage open. Some had on him pity and some none, but said he had long deserved death.... Thus when king Richard had lain two hours in the chare in Cheapside, then they drove the chare forward: and when the four knights that followed the chare afoot were without London, they leapt then on their horses, which

[160] This ordo probably dates from late fourteenth century England. It is presumed to have been written around the time of King Edward III but is usually found bound in manuscripts with the coronation ordo of the time of Richard II. The purpose of this ordo was to give guidance on how to conduct royal funeral ceremony. The text was published numerous times, first in1882 by Willaim Maskell under the name *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (London, 1882) and had several other publications since the last one by Romualdo Galdos in *Estudios Eclesiasticos*, VII (1928), 78-82. For further reference see Giesey. *Royal Funeral Ceremony*, (footnote 17), 82. See also C. Given-Wilson. "The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England" *English Historical Review* 124 no. 507 (2009): 257-282. (hereafter: Given-Wilson, "Exequies of Edward III")

[161] Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 159.

> were there ready for them, and so they rode till they came to a village called Langley, a thirty mile from London, and there this king Richard was buried. God have mercy on his soul! [162]

Another account on the funeral is given by Thomas Walsingham:

> His body was taken from there [Pontefract] to London, and it was exhibited in all the important places on the way-that is, at those places where they spent the night; or at least that part of his body by which he could be recognized was exhibited, namely from the base of his forehead to his throat. When they came to St. Albans, where they spent the night, the community held a solemn requiem service for his soul, and in the morning the abbot celebrated the mass; then he was taken on to St Pauls church in London where the king attended his obsequies both in the first day and then again, along with the various nobles of the realm and the citizens of London, on the following day. Then as soon as the mass was over, the body was taken back to Langley, to be buried among the friars, arriving there at dead of night. Soon after this messengers arrived from the king to the abbot of St. Albans ordering him, on the king's behalf, to make his way there by the following morning so that he could, along with the bishop of Chester and the abbot of Waltham, be present at the kings last funeral rites. This duly he did and thus, without ceremony and almost unattended was this royal corpse committed to the grave.[163]

Chronique de Traison et mort states that:

> In the year thirteen hundred fourscore and nineteenth, the twelfth day of March, was brought to the church of Saint Paul in London, in the state of the gentleman, the body of noble King Richard. And true it is that the car was quite covered with a black cloth, having four banners thereupon; whereof two were the arms of Saint George and the other two the arms of Saint Edward; to wit, Azure, over all a cross Or, between five martlets Or: and there were hundred men all clad in black, and each bore a torch. And the Londoners had thirty torches and thirty men, who were all clad in white, who went to meet the corpse of noble King Richard; and he was brought to Saint Paul, the mother church of London. There he was two days above ground, to show him to the people of London, that they might believe for certain that he was dead. [164]

The last account describing the funeral ceremony of Richard II which will be presented here is the *English Chronicle*:

> And whanne that king Harri wiste verili that he was ded, he leet close and sere him in lynne cloth alle saue the visage, and that was left openne that men myghte se and knowe his persone from alle othir, and so he was broughte to Londoun to Poulis, and there he had his Dirige and masse; and the same wise at Westmynstre, and thane he was buried at Langley.[165]

[162] Froissart *Chronicle* 472, 473

[163] *Annales Ricardi Secundi, Chronicles of the Revolution*, 229

[164] *Chronique de Traison et mort* 261.

[165] *An English Chronicle* 21.

On March 6, 1400 the funeral ceremony started by following the body from Pontefract to London stopped at several places and it had the sole intent of demonstrating that in fact it was Richard the one who was dead and not somebody who resembled the deposed king. In the church of St. Paul in London the new king Henry IV paid homage to his dead predecessor by being the pall bearer. Henry IV paid 13 pounds, 6s and 8d for the 1000 masses which ought to be held along the procession route of the dead king as it approached his resting place in Langley, Hertfordshire. After the obsequies the burial was held in Hertfordshire, approximately 30 kilometres outside of London, in the charge of the Black Friars and in the presence of the bishop Lichfield and abbots of Waltham and St. Albans.[166]

Richard II on the other hand had had in mind a more glorious funeral for himself, one which would testify to his, as he saw it, magnificent reign and witness just how wealthy he was. He prepared all the necessary arrangements for this as he conceived it a beautiful event. He drew up his will and in it he gave detailed instruction as to how the ritual should be performed.[167] It can be a matter of speculation whether Richard II by the act of drawing his own will was in fact following the tradition set by his father, Edward the Black Prince, who also left detailed instructions regarding his burial ceremony.[168] It was not unusual for European medieval rulers to write last wills. For instance, French king Philip the Fair wrote several of them.[169]

Richard II stated in his will that if he should die outside of London a great procession was to follow to the final resting place of the king in Westminster Abbey. Apart from the fact that he was following the burial practice already established earlier and adhering to the practice of the members of the English royal family to be buried at Westminster, he had another reason for wishing that his final resting place would be there. His first wife, Ann of Bohemia, was already buried there and he wanted to join her in the afterlife. Another interesting possibility for why Richard desired to be buried at

[166] Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 27.
[167] The will of the deposed king is now be in the British Library as Additional MS 45131. On the description of the content of the will see M. Duffy. *Royal tombs of Medieval England*. (Stroud: Tempus, 2003), 309 (footnote 70). (hereafter: Duffy, *Royal Tombs*). See also Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 101.
[168] For further reading on the issue see Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 106, 107.
[169]For further on the matter see E.A.R. Brown. "Royal Salvation and Needs of State in Early Fourteenth Century France" *The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial*. (Aldershot: Variorum, 1991): 1-56.

Westminster is that this was a reflection of the devotion Richard showed towards the one who inspired the rebuilding of the abbey as the royal tomb of England, St. Edward the Confessor.[170] To demonstrate this one just needs to examine a portrait of Richard II displayed on the Wilton Diptych that depicts Richards arms impaled with the arms of King Edward.[171]His well known admiration for Edward the Confessor was seen during his life when Richard made necessary restorations to the abbey.

His explicit wishes for his funeral comprised the following; his coffin was to proceed to Westminster at slow pace of fourteen to sixteen miles a day. This procession ought to be accompanied at all times by twenty four torchbearers. The procession would grow even bigger once it neared London. At that point it would be joined by another set of one hundred torchbearers. Richard II had in mind that the exequies were to be "maior et principalior et honorificentior" which included four days of masses. He even chose the attire appropriate for burial, following the custom of royal funeral ceremonial of that time. Richard wanted to be buried in the white satin robes and accompanied with the regalia of crown, sceptre and a suitably valuable ring:

> *Volmus et Ordinamus qoud Corpus nostrum in Velveto vel Sathanae Blanco more Regio vestiatur et etiam interretur, una cum Corona et Septro Regiis deauratis, absque tamen quibuscumque Lapidibus; quodque super digitum nostrum, more Regio, Anulus cum Lapide pretioso, pretii sive valoris Viginti Marcarum Monetae nostrae Anglie, ponatur*.[172]

In addition to taking care of the attire which would be suitable for his funeral Richard also invested much effort in appointing a large number of executors.[173]

[170] In the eleventh century King Edward the Confessor decided to re-found the abbey and he built a church influenced by Norman style. When he was canonised a century later the abbey thus became the shrine of a saint. Finally in the thirteenth century Henry III rebuilt the church in the shape that is known today. The fact that the body of St. Edward was lying there was reason enough for the English kings to want to be buried here. R. Jenkyns. *Westminster Abbey*. (London: Profile Books, 2004), 6. See also F. Barlow. *Edward the Confessor*. (University of California Press, 1984), 141.

[171] Evans, *The Death of Kings,* 28. See also S. Whittingham. "The Chronology of the Portraits of Richard II" *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*. 113, no. 814 (1971): 12-21. See also *The Regal Image of Richard II and the Wilton Diptych*. ed. D. Gordon L. Monnas and C. Elam. (London: Harvey Miller, 1998).

[172] Duffy, *Royal tombs,*167.

[173] For a complete list of the official executors see Duffy, *Royal Tombs*. 168.

The ceremony that was held was however, in a clear violation of the last will expressed by Richard II regarding his own burial. One can pose a question why was Westminster replaced by another location as distant and remote as Langley, when the body had already been displayed in the abbey. This fact speaks of Henry IV's desire to demonstrate that Richard II was perhaps unworthy to be buried in the presence of the other members of the royal family whose last resting place was in Westminster Abbey. Nevertheless, he was aware that he could not deprive Richard of some sort of public display of honour, for otherwise he would make him an unnecessary martyr. Thus some sort of formal funeral ceremony was conducted, although it differed in many ways from what was considered to be the proper burial of royals in addition to lacking some crucial steps and key figures which ought to be present there in order to demonstrate the transmission of power.

The first and most striking feature was the absence of a funeral effigy. The practice of making these funeral puppets of the demised royals began in early 14 century England and from there it spread to France, where it was much better received and accompanied every royal funeral almost without exceptions. This tradition followed a well established English practice of displaying the body of a demised king before the funeral, introduced as early as the end of the 12 century, probably from the funeral ceremony of Henry II in 1189. The English practice of making effigies was first recorded with the funeral ceremony of Edward II in 1327.[174]

A case which can certainly be compared to that of the funeral of Richard II is the ceremonial of the burial of King Edward II. The similarities are striking, for both kings were forced to resign, and then afterwards were kept in prison and probably murdered. Another point of resemblance between these two burials was the fact that Edward II was not granted interment close to the court at Westminster either, for he was buried at Gloucester Abbey.[175] Edward II was buried in full royal attire

[174] Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 82. See also Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 420.

[175] For further reference see P. G. Lindley."Ritual, Regicide and Representation: the murder of Edward II and the origin of the royal funeral effigy in England" *Gothic to Renaissance, essays on sculpture in England.* ed. P. G. Lindley, (Stamford, 1995): 97-112. See also Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 30.

with the presence of the coronation insignia. However, the chronicler Henry Knighton[176] points that the king was not buried in Westminster because he was not considered worthy to be buried there because of his misdeeds.[177] Edward II was probably badly tortured before death and consequently his body could testify to the signs of the violence he was submitted to. His body was disembowelled, embalmed and waited three months for burial and it is most likely that because of its appearance it was advisable to use a lifelike puppet to represent the king.[178] As the case of Richards' predecessor, Edward II, clearly demonstrates, if the body was not in shape to be displayed during the funeral ceremony than an effigy was used to assume the role of the demised king and moreover the immortality of his body politic. Miri Rubin rightly points out that the sole purpose for the use of the effigy was to hide the signs of violence that the deceased king's body suffered.[179] Although the circumstances in which Edward II lost his life are obscure, nevertheless the signs in the funeral ceremony, which would clearly state that the transmission of power was taking place and that the royal authority and power were transferred to another ruler, were not lacking.[180] Observing the accounts of the funeral of Richard II, this aspect is absent.

Omitting the use of the effigy in the case of Richard's funeral was probably due to the connection between the effigy and its symbolism and the immortality of royal Dignity. In the development of the funeral ceremonial this type of representation gained more symbolic significance, replacing the earlier practice of carrying the exposed body of a king during his funeral procession. The

[176] *Knighton's Chronicle.* Henry Knighton was a canon of St Mary's Abbey, Leicester, and wrote his Chronicle between 1378 and 1396. See Gransden, *Historical Writting in England*, 159, 160.
[177] See Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 118.
[178] See Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 82. See also Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 420. On the matter of the torture that the king supposedly suffered see Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 132. It is argued in the scholarship that only the sources made after the time of Edward II mentions the torture the king supposedly suffered in prison. The first source that mentions this event is the chronicle of Adam of Murimuth. See *Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum*. ed. E. M. Thompson. (London, 1889), 54. For further on the matter see Fryde, *Edward II*, 201, 202, 203. See also I. Mortimer. "The Death of Edward II in Berkeley Castle" *English Historical Review*. 120, no. 489 (2005): 1175-1214.
[179] M. Rubin."Introduction: Rites of Passage" *Rites of Passage, Cultures of Transmission in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. N. F. McDonald and W. M. Ormord (York: York Medieval Press, 2004):1-13
[180] J. Bourdern. "Re-Writing the Rites of Passage, The Peculiar Funeral of Edward II" *Rites of Passage, Cultures of Transmission in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. N. F. McDonald and W. M. Ormord (York: York Medieval Press, 2004): 13-31

effigy represented the king who was enclosed in a casket of wood placed inside a lead coffin. The effigy was carried in the funeral procession on a carriage in front of the casket or on top of the coffin. As the practice of displaying the dead body of the king was a tradition which belonged to the past the effigy was made in a way to resemble the demised king as much as possible. The effigies were usually used to represent the sempiternal power of the king who never dies,[181] a notion which would have not suited Henry IV, who had assumed full royal power. The effigy was not only considered to be the representation of the dead king but also the triumph of life over death, again a concept which would not have served Henry IV's case in assuming full regal powers, should the people observe the effigy of Richard II as that of a live monarch.[182]

According to the prescriptions coming from the ordo *De Exequiis Regalibus*[183] the preparation of the body for the funeral should begin with the ritual purification, embalming and anointment which should follow with the clothing it and adorning it with insignia. The body of the demised king should be then wrapped in a tunic and a royal mantle, while the head should be covered with a silk handkerchief. It was expected that the body should be adorned with insignia, the crown or a diadem, the hands covered with gloves decorated with orphreys, and the golden ring placed on the middle finger of the right hand; the right hand should be holding the orb, the left the sceptre; the legs should be covered with stockings of silk and slippers.[184]

---

[181] Elisabeth A. R. Brown in one of her article states that she does not agree with the idea presented by R. E. Giesey and E. H. Kantorowicz who claim that the effigy which was in use in late medieval France presented ″new political idea of that age″, for according to her findings the effigy only came in second place regarding its symbolic meaning to the other aspects (vitality of the royal corpse, character of the king and his charisma which he possessed during his life, etc.) that would be more relevant in relating the message of the immortality of the royal dignity. Although Professor Brown made a compelling argument, unfortunately her ideas could not be applied in the case of the funeral of Richard II. The reason for that would be the unusual circumstances in which King Richard II ended his life and the way in which his funeral was conducted. Professor Brown in this article refers only to the cases in which the transference of power occurred in the usual order of succession, when one ruler died the other immediately took his place, which was not the case with Richard II and Henry IV. For further on the issue see Brown ″Royal Bodies, Effigies, Funeral Meals and Office″. 437-509.

[182] Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 425. See also P. Binski. *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation*. (London: British Museum Press, 1996), 61(hereafter Binski, *Medieval Death*). See also Bertelli. *The King's Body*, 51, 52. See also Giesey, "Two Bodies of the French King": 224-240.

[183] See page 44 and footnote 159.

[184] Given-Wilson, "Exequies of Edward III", 265.

The body of Richard II was in fact attired in special royal robes, probably those which he wore at his coronation but with the presence of just one piece of royal insignia, the crown. Such a use of attire could have been aimed at showing that Henry IV was trying his best to prove that it was truly Richard who was buried, but at the same time managing to avoid paying him full respect as regards to the office he had held. This is the second point where a difference can be seen between this royal funeral and previous ones. In most royal funerals before and after this one the corpse or the effigy was attired in full royal attire with the presence of the whole set of royal insignia, of which the most important ones were the orb and the sceptre, which were conspicuously missing at the funeral ceremony of Richard II. As Kantorowicz states, the presence of the royal insignia during a funeral was a clear sign that the transmission of power was taking place.[185]

Besides the presence of the royal insignia, the participants in the funeral, that is the members of the king's council at the time the body and the coffin were interred, broke the batons and the official seal of the demised king marking thus that the new ruler had assumed his regal powers and they were no longer obliged to owe allegiance to the former king.[186] One of the most obvious differences between the two funerals is that in the case of Edward II the effigy representing the demised king and his dignity was adorned in the full royal attire with the presence of the entire sets of royal insignia, symbolising thus that the power once held in the hands of the demised king was now being transferred into those of his successor, something that was omitted from the funeral of Richard II[187] One of the few connections with the symbolism of the transfer of royal powers can be seen in the presence of the four knights who accompanied Richard's coffin. These four knights were dressed in black and their role in this ceremony could be seen as a connection with the one of the four Presidents of Parliament, who held the four corners of the mortuary pall in the case of French royal funerals. The symbolic role of these four members of the kingdom's supreme court was that they demonstrated the passage of

[185] Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 420, 422. French kings were almost always buried with the presence of insignia. For example King Philip V was buried in royal attire wearing a crown and holding the sceptre and the rod. For more on this matter see E. A. R. Brown." The Ceremonial of Royal Succession in Capetian France: The Funeral of Philip V".*The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial*. (Aldershot: Variorum, 1991), 266-293.

[186] Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 415

[187] Ibid.

sovereign justice from the demised king to his successor.[188] The attire of these judges and the presence of the insignia visible upon their attire were seen as demonstration of the transmission of a part of the royal dignity, that is, its legal aspect.

The body of Richard II is also an important topic because of the peculiar way in which it was displayed. It is stated that the hands of the demised king were not showing because the body was embalmed and sealed and covered in lead up to his neck. The point here would be to emphasize that the reason for leaving the face uncovered was that the people who paid homage to the dead king would testify that it was him indeed and not some other similar figure. Two sentences taken from the non-contemporary chronicles of Hall describe the manner in which the body, or better said, the face of the dead king was treated and they say that:

> ...the body was embaulmed and seared and covered with lead al save his face (to the entent that all men might perceive that he was departed out of his mortal lyfe); or in the other case ...that every man myght see and knowe that this was his body, and that he was soo deede for many men beleuyed that it not.[189]

If one followed the premises stated by Kantorowicz who points to the symbolism of the two bodies of the king, the mere fact that Richard's body was not displayed is peculiar. Moreover, it was a well established practice that if the royal funeral ceremony were conducted in absence of the effigy then the body of the demised king would be displayed instead. In the case of Richard this was omitted. The reason for this treatment can be explained by reference to Kantorowicz. One of the possible answers is that the king's body showed signs of mistreatment he suffered in prison. If this were the case than it would be understandable that it was wise to avoid any unnecessary questions and cover the late king's body. Visible wounds inflicted on the body natural of the king can also be perceived as inflicted on the body politic. According to Kantorowicz the king was "incorporated" with his subjects and they with him, forming in this way an inseparable entity. The king was the head, and the subjects

[188] Ibid. On the issue of the attendance of the members of the Parliament see Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 52.

[189] E. Hall. (*The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancastre and York*-original title). *Hall's Chronicle Containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eight*. (London, 1808), 20, (hereafter: *Hall's Chronicle*). See also Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, (footnote 27), 84.

the rest of this corporate body.[190] The body politic in this way was constructed by the king acting as the head and the subjects acting as the rest. The spectators at the funeral ceremony could have been outraged by the fact that the bearer of the body politic had been mistreated, for he was perceived as the representative of the whole community, disregarding the fact that Richard II was very much disliked.

[190] Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, 438.

III. The Second Funeral of King Richard II (1413)

The deposed English king Richard II obviously did not have the luxury to rest in peace as his predecessors did. The unfortunate first burial that he received upon his death proved to be an obstacle for Henry IV to fully embrace the royal dignity, which he was supposed to uphold as the monarch who succeeded the demised king. The suspicious circumstances in which Richard II ended his life and the rumours which were spread as a cause of such suspicions represented the fertile ground for the emergence of stories of the survival of the late king. Needless to say that such actions proved themselves serious for the reign of Henry IV as for his son and heir Henry V. The solution for such problems (putting an end to rumours that Richard II was still alive and at the same time resolving that of the transfer of power) was surprisingly simple, but at the same time original and moreover very efficient. The late king deserved a reburial with all the honours which accompanied a royal funeral. The theory of Kantorowicz, presented once again as all the accounts from the sources had been displayed, will be used as an explanation why Henry V chose such a strategy and whether this strategy was successful or not. Once again, the theory itself will not be judged a priori as a true or a false one, but will only serve as a tool in explaining what actually the event (reburial) was meant to signify.

Events following the first funeral of King Richard II

The years of the reign of Henry IV proved themselves to be very turbulent and distant from the stabile image he hoped for at the beginning of his quest for the crown. From the start his reign suffered blow after a blow as the persons unsatisfied with it rose against the newly established king-usurper. From the rebellion of the four earls who proved their loyalty to the former king, Richard II, up to the others who also had a common interest in instigating disturbance in the reign of the Lancastrian king.

Opposition to the rule of Henry IV began in 1400 when the first fires of riot rose in Wales. There the lord of Glyndyfrdwy, Own Glendower began the first revolts. The situation worsened when the lord of Glyndyfrdwy, was proclaimed Prince of Wales by the other landowners in that part of England, provoking a reaction from Henry IV. Wales suffered another revolt of local lords, the House of Tudors, who, as well as many others coming from this region were well known as being the supporters of the former king. The swift armed action taken by the new king against these insurgences

helped soothe the situation only briefly, for once he and his armies left the territory the situation deteriorated even more.[191] The lord eventually diverted his activities into kidnapping and holding several persons for ransom, which he demanded from the king. In one of those actions he captured and held for ransom Edmund Mortimer, the uncle of the Earl of March. The king saw this as an opportunity to dispose of a member of the house who had a claim to the throne and refused to pay the ransom. The result was that the lord of Glyndyfrdwy and Edmund Mortimer struck a deal that foresaw the lord as the ruler of Wales and Edmund as the ruler of England in the near future.[192] Fortunately for Henry IV the situation did not evolve in the way that the conspirators wished and hoped for but it continued to present a problem for the new king.

Apart from this revolt Henry IV was facing other problems as well. Only a year had passed since the burial of the body of the former king of England Richard II; during that year sympathy for the cause of the deposed king had spread across the land, mostly on the parts of the north and the midlands. Opposition rose in the years 1401/1402 from an unsuspected source. Franciscan monasteries confronted the new king and affected the course of events in several ways. Franciscan friars begun to spread pro Ricardian propaganda in the territories where there monasteries were situated, in Aylesbury, Northampton, Leicester, Nottingham and Stamford. The chronicle known as the *Eulogium Historiarum* states that in the year 1402 the first reports arose that King Richard II was still alive and living somewhere in Wales. This source reports:

> *Literae insupert venerunt ad amicos Regis Ricardi tanquam ab eodem missae quibus scribebatur quod ipse viveret, et hoc divulgatium fuit per Angliam.*[193]

A lay brother of one of the Franciscan monasteries in Aylesbury accused a priest who had declared himself happy to hear and consequently divulge the news that the deposed king Richard II was alive. This case opened a series of proceedings which Henry IV conducted against the Franciscan friars who favoured the deposed king. One of the friars charged was even questioned by the new king himself. The accused friar was reluctant to accept the legitimacy of Henry IV and the way he had

[191] Keen, *England*, 242.
[192] Ibid, 244.
[193] *Continuatio Eulogii*, 389.

acceded to the throne. He questioned the legitimacy of Henry IV taking the crown and whether this act resulted from Richard giving it willingly or under pressure. The friar placed a new perspective on the case by stating that if Richard II had not been held prisoner he would have never given up the crown, but he was pressured and had no other choice but to resign. The sentence that the friar presumably said to the king speaks about how Henry IV's enterprise was viewed at that time. He stated:

> *Dumesset rex vi armorum captus fuit, incarceratus, et regno spoliatus et vos invasistis coronam*. [194]

Henry IV had another thing to worry about, apart from the troubles provided by the lords of Wales and the friars of the Franciscan order. One of the king's closest allies rebelled against his rule, and the situation became more alarming. The members of the House of Percy and the Earl of Northumberland had served the Lancastrian king long and faithfully and supported his cause from the early beginnings of his quest for the throne. Now, however the situation was slightly changing and constant disagreements occurred between the king and the Percies as time passed.

Maurice Keen rightly points out that these uprisings had little to do with the question of Henry's legitimacy to the throne, but instead used this as an excuse to obtain the support of the public and to masquerade the true reason for the revolts which was to acquire more land or power or to affect the reign of the new king and profit from the situation. The pretext of working in favour of the deposed King Richard II proved itself to be the winning card for these uprisings. To the struggle in favour of the case of Richard II was added that of his possible heir, the Earl of March, whom Henry IV was "keeping safe" from succeeding to the throne.

The troubles between Henry IV and the Percies were more of an economic nature than anything else. The king refused to grant the members of the House of Percy some land and money they were entitled to. The Percies reacted by spreading the story of Richard II still being alive and well. In addition, the Percies were collecting an army with which to oppose the king, who, perfectly

[194] For the whole dialogue between the king and the accused friar see *Continuatio Eulogii,* 391, 392. See also Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 28, 29. See also Keen, *England*, 243.

reasonably, saw their move as nothing else but blunt treason.[195] Not much time passed before the Percies received reinforcements from the Welsh lord Glyndyfrdwy, Earl of March and Earl of Northumberland. Henry IV sent officers to arrest and imprison everyone in the counties of Wales who insisted still on assuring the people that Richard II was alive. In addition, Henry IV united a group of people who had the authority to incarcerate all those who were spreading false rumours against him such as that he did not observe the promises he made at his coronation. However, a military action was needed in this case as well, for the Perices rebellion inflamed a great part of the land. The battle lasted for a day, and by nightfall all was determined, the rebels were either captured or killed giving Henry IV a complete victory.

Just as one revolt was put down another re-emerged, that of the Welsh lord Glyndyfrdwy, who in 1403 had the support of the Scottish king and was negotiating an alliance with the French one, Charles VI, which bore fruits in 1404 when they made a formal alliance against King Henry IV. A year later, and still resisting Henry IV's attacks, the Welsh lord made a new alliance, that with the Earl of Northumberland, still highly disillusioned because of the failure of the Percies revolt. The Welsh lord appeared to be strong and victorious until the middle of 1406, when his power began to decline. The armies of King Henry IV overcame those of the Welsh lord and put an end to this massive rebellion which could have been crown threatening for him. The rebels who were still alive at the end of the clash were captured, sentenced to death, and executed. Their lands were confiscated and divided among other, more loyal lords. The only one who managed to escape was lord Glyndyfrdwy, who according to some chronicles hid and his hiding place was never known. Henry IV's son and heir, the Prince of Wales restored his powers in Wales by the middle of 1408.

In the midst of the rebellion of the Welsh lord, Henry IV made a formal attempt to legitimize his position and that of his dynasty in order to send a clear message to whomever might question it. In 1406 Henry IV had the statute approved that declared the inheritance of the crown, thus making his son Henry the heir apparent to the throne. If Henry would not able to accede to the throne he was to be

[195] Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 48.

succeeded by one of his younger brothers, Thomas or John. By this act he made it even more difficult for the rebels to support the cause of Earl of March and his claim to the crown, which was based on having been chosen for this role by King Richard II, by virtue of being the direct descendent from his father, Roger Mortimer who was supposedly appointed heir presumptive. The official document stated:

> ... and declared that my lord Prince Henry, eldest son of our said Lord the king, is to be heir apparent of our same lord the king to succeed him in [the possession of] the aforesaid crown, kingdoms, and dominions, and, after the death of our said lord the king, to have them with all their appurtenances for himself and the heirs of his body.[196]

One of the reasons for this act of legitimating may have been that over and again the tales about Richard II's survival kept re-emerging, but sometimes with much more potentially dangerous consequences that a simple gossip could cause. This was particularly visible in the problems that Henry IV faced in regards to Scotland. Despite the fact that the body of the late King Richard II was displayed during the funeral ceremony, thus proving to everyone that he was in fact dead, the rumours about his survival begin circulating in Scotland right after his burial and continued to be spread long afterwards.

The English king Henry IV had captured and kept under tight surveillance the heir to the Scottish throne, James, from 1406 onwards. The reign over Scotland was taken by the Duke of Albany who ruled in the absent kings' name.[197] To make the situation even more difficult the Scottish lords came up with a strategy which would ensure great trouble for the Lancastrian king Henry IV and in the near future even for his son and heir Henry V. They endorsed and launched the figure of one Thomas Ward of Trumpington on the political scene. This person was an impostor who claimed to be none other than the demised king Richard II.[198] It is interesting to point out that he was not only supported

[196] ...et déclarrez, qe muon seignur le prince Henry, eisne fitz nostre dit seignur le roy, soit heir apparent mesme nostre seignur le roy, pur luy succeder en les suisditz corone, roialmes et seignuries pur les avoir ove toutz les appurtenances après le deces dicell nostre seignur le roy a luy et a ses heirs de soun corps issantz. *Statute of the Realm*, II, 151, Selected documents, 226.

[197] C. Allmand. *Henry V*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 308, (hereafter: Allmand, *Henry V*)

[198] Another similarity comes in picture between Richard II and his predecessor Edward II and that is that there is an account coming from a priest named Manuel Fieschi who claimed that he heard a confession of the deposed

by the Scots in his false claims but even by a former chancellor of Richard II William Searle and a former Richard II supporter the countess of Oxford, Maud de Vere.[199]

Apart from the constant rebellions that Henry IV had to face on what seems like a daily basis, he was also strongly criticised by the public for his management of the finances of the crown. It cannot be overlooked that by the time he acceded to the throne the finances were in such bad shape because of Richard II's life style. However, when Henry IV acceded to the throne he made a promise that he would not burden the people with new taxes, for they already were heavily burdened by them in the past. Needless to say, he was not able to live up to that promise. Constant rebellions that arose in different parts of the country demanded his attention and his answer in the form of the military actions which were costly. In addition, he was forced to reward his allies and loyal friends with lands and grants in order to keep their friendship in such turbulent times which also proved to be expensive. The public was not so willing to accept that the king did not keep his promise and showed constant resentment of this fact.

Another misfortune came upon King Henry IV which affected his reign and the course of future events. Even though all the rebellions had been put down, Henry IV's bad health also proved weakness in his governing. Although there had been some earlier signs of Henry's problems with his health when he arrived in England, the first officially documented report about this issue comes from 1405.[200] Having sentenced Archbishop Scrope of York to death, the very day when he was executed the king had his first seizure, an event which was considered a sign of God's judgement.[201] His subjects regarded this seizure as a consequence of the king suffering from leprosy, an illness taken as a

king Edward II who told him that he was warned of the dangers to come and he managed to escape from Berkeley Castle, while a porter was buried in his place. In 1338 an impostor claiming to be Edward II appeared before his son Edward III, he was called William le Galeys. See Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, 99. See also Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 156. This letter, a copy of which is in the Archives départementales d'Hérault in Montpelier (G 1123), has been discussed by the following: *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II* . ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1883), cvi – cviii; T. F. Tout. "The Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon". *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* ,6 (1921), 69–113; Fryde, *Edward II,* 202, 203. On the discussion of the authenticity of the content of the Fieschi letter see P. Doherty. *Isabella and the Strange Death of Edward II* (London: Robinson 2004).

[199]Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 169. See also Allmand, *Henry V*, 308, 309.

[200] See P. McNiven. "The Problem of Henry IV Health, 1405-1413" *English Historical Review* 100, no. 397 (1985): 747-772 (hereafter: McNiven, "The Problem of Henry IV Health").

[201] Ibid

sign of divine displeasure.[202] The *Continuatio Eulogii* reports the king being affected by this disease in these words:

> *Et Rex incontinenti quasi leprosus apparere cepit...*[203]

Leprosy was a disease associated with sin, especially sexually related sin.[204] From this view of the nature and origin of leprosy the interpretation arose that the king must have suffered from some form of venereal disease which apparently had great consequences for Henry IV's appearance. For instance John Capgrave stated that:

> Kyng after that tyme [referring to the event of the execution of the archbishop Scrope] lost the beaute of his face. For as comonne opinion went, for that tyme until his deth he was a leper and evyr fowlere and fowlere.[205]

The *English Chronicle* relates that Henry IV was persuaded to give up the crown to his son precisely because the disease was afflicting him. The *Chronicle* says on this issue:

> ...entrete him to resigne the croune to the said Prince Harri, his sone, because he was so gretli vexid and smyte with the seeknesse of lepre.[206]

Again according to the *Continuatio Eulogii* Henry IV was so seriously afflicted by leprosy that the disease apparently clouded his judgements. This source states:

> In the same year an agreement was made between Prince Henry, first born son of the king, Henry, bishop of Winchester, and almost all the lords of England, that they should ask the king to give up the crown of England, and permit his first born to be crowned because he was so horribly afflicted with leprosy. When this advice was given, he was unwilling to agree to this counsel of certain lords but at once rode on horseback through a great part of England notwithstanding the leprosy.[207]

Another manifestation of his bad health was in 1408 with several seizures and an unknown illness that was taken so seriously that his will was drafted. The king was reported not to be the same

[202]K. B. McFarlane. *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 103 (hereafter: McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*). See also Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 208.
[203] *Continuatio Eulogii* 408.
[204] See S. N. Brody. *The Disease of the Soul: Leprosy in Medieval Literature*. (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1974). For more on the matter see C. Rawcliffe. *Leprosy in Medieval England*. (London: Boydell Press, 2006), 48, (hereafter, Rawcliffe, *Leprosy*).
[205] *Capgrave's Chronicle* 291.
[206] *An English Chronicle* 37.
[207] *Eulogium Historiarum*, Selected Documents, 207.

person ever again after this particular event which some ascribed to king being afflicted by syphilis.[208] It was also considered that perhaps the king suffered because of a sense of guilt about all that had happened in the past. Adam of Usk states that the king had been ill since he was struck with:

> the infection which for five years had cruelly tormented [Henry IV] with festering of the flesh, dehydration of the eyes, and the rupture of the internal organs that caused him to end his days..The festering was foreshadowed at his coronation, for as a result of his anointing then, his head was so infected with lice that his hair felt out, and for several months he had to keep his head covered.[209]

Recent views, however, discard all this and state that his bad health was probably caused by heart problems.[210]

Another rebellion was organized, taking advantage of Henry's poor health and the fact that he was gradually losing his powers. The king's half brothers, the Beauforts along with the heir apparent Henry the Prince of Wales, Henry IVs eldest son, were the main protagonists of this new revolt against the Lancastrian king.

Henry V

The Lancastrian heir to the throne was born on August 9th 1387 and was known as Henry of Monmouth, for the place of his birth. He was the eldest of the four sons of King Henry IV and his wife, Mary de Bohun. It seems that the later tradition wished to establish some mystery and symbolism around the birth of the future king. The legend arose that the first man who informed Henry IV of the birth of a male heir was a ferryman at Goodrich who accompanied him half way on his journey to Monmouth from Windsor.[211]

[208] McNiven, "The Problem of Henry IV Health",747-772.

[209] *...dolenter intoxicatus, unde carnis putredine, oculorum ariffaccione, et interiorum egressione per quinque annos cruciatus...Istam putredinem portentebat sibi sue coronacionis unctio, quia pediculorum in capite presertim generantia adeo quod nec crines sustinet nec discoopertum caput per pluras menses habere potuit. Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, 243. The mentioning of the (mis)usage of the holy coronation oil is supposedly an ironic remark of Adam of Usk on the anointment of the king usurper. It can be also seen as the view of a somewhat objective bystander who was aware of the problems arising from the issue of the king's right to the throne. For more on the matter see Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 72, 73.

[210] Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 208. See also Rawcliffe, *Leprosy*, 45.

[211] R. B. Mowat. *Henry V*. (London: Constable &Company, 1919), 9, (hereafter: Mowat, *Henry V*).

From the early age Henry of Monmouth had a special relation with Richard II, who apparently did not hold any grudge against the offspring of the person who was about to seize the crown.[212] While the boy's father was away on crusade expeditions the care of his son was taken up by King Richard II and one of the half brothers of Duke Henry, also named Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester.[213] King Richard expressed his affection for the child by taking him along on the campaign to Ireland at the time when his father was banished from the land. Although at that point he probably could not predict the outcome of Henry's plans to ask the throne, it can be considered that this move of Richard II was probably more a precaution than a sincere desire to spend time with a beloved young cousin.[214] Regardless the situation Richard II knighted the young Henry while they were still in Ireland and gave him advice for his future conduct apparently in these words:

> My fair cousin henceforth be gallant and bold, for unless you conquer, you will have little name for value.[215]

Once his father reached the throne his desire to make his dynasty legitimate became more than evident. In the first Parliament of Henry IV in 1399 he made his eldest son and heir, who was then only twelve, the Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornwall and Earl of Chester.[216] From that time onwards the young Prince was heavily involved in current political affairs that presented troubles for the reign of his father. Just when he was introduced to his principality the rebellions in the Wales began. This was a significant event for the young Prince as much as it was for his father, the king. The Prince, by his investiture, was given sovereignty over the very lands that were afflicted by rebellions and his intervention was expected. It was not until 1406, however, that the Prince, than nineteen years of age was able to make a substantial contribution to the affairs in Wales. The young Prince assisted and aided his father against all the revolts that were taking place in that period.

[212] Ibid,10.
[213] Mowat, *Henry V*, 10. See also McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*, 104.
[214] Some of the sources mention that the young Henry was actually imprisoned in the castle of Trim, outside Dublin, along with the young duke of Gloucester who was also taken to Ireland as a precaution. See Allmand, *Henry V*, 13.
[215] Mowat, *Henry V*, 14. See for the issue of the knighting McNiven, *Heresy and Politics*, 138.
[216] See page 37.

By the year 1408 all the revolts in Wales and the surroundings were more or less dealt with and they did not present an open threat to the reign of Henry IV. However, a more unexpected threat, possibly a more dangerous arose. The young Prince was now in charge of the conspiracy that aimed to acquire him the crown before his father passed on. The official reason for this uprising of the Prince was that he considered that he would be set aside in his father's council, the Privy Council, once Henry IV fell ill. Henry the Prince of Wales had become a part of this consultant body as early as 1406. Gradually the Prince gained more and more significance in this council whose sessions he attended regularly. The other person who was considered to be the second most important member of the council and whose advice the king welcomed often was the archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Arundel.[217] Undoubtedly some form of rivalry surged between these two men, so different in their standpoints, separated by an age difference of over thirty years. How influential was the role of the council can be detected from the fact that this body controlled the finances and thus there was no need for the Parliament to meet until January, 1410. It can be stated that Archbishop Arundel was in control in this matter.

Another person who was a member of this council was Henry Beaufort, the bishop of Winchester, one of King Henry IV's half brothers.[218] It was not long before the two sides, the Prince and Henry Beaufort and his brothers, joined forces to achieve the mutual goal of setting the young Prince on the throne even before his father's death. It cannot be stated that the Beauforts had any other agenda in this matter of supporting the Prince other than the best interest of the crown. The Beauforts probably had in mind that the ill king would be replaced by the popular young Prince, which would strengthened the Lancastrian dynasty even more, and they made a proposal in the Parliament for the king to be deposed in favour of his son. Their proposal, however, did not bear fruit for it was rejected by the members of the Parliament.[219] This little coup d'état was cut off at the roots by the king in November 1411 when he before the Parliament regained the authority he might have been deprived of

[217] Allmand, *Henry V*, 40.
[218] The Beauforts, John earl of Somerset, Henry bishop of Lincoln and Thomas chancellor of the king were the sons of Katharine Swynford and John of Gaunt, Henry IV's father.
[219] McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*, 108.

in the past, when the council had been in charge of the reign. Henry IV asserted that he was still in full control and that he would not tolerate the behaviour of his eldest son and heir.[220] Although the Prince had come to terms with the situation and even demonstrated his regret about the course of events, the differences between him and his father were still there.[221]

As Henry IVs health grew worse, the Prince had the opportunity to manage his affairs as he wished. By the beginning of 1413, Henry IV was seriously ill and his end was expected soon. That the Prince did not waste any time in taking power is illustrated in the *Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland* which states:

> The prince his sonne being hereof aduerotised entered the chamber, tooke awaie the crowne and departed.

When the king apparently realised that the crown was missing he summoned his son and asked him for an explanation. The Prince supposedly answered:

> Sir, to mine and all mens iudgements you seemed dead in this world wherefore I as your next heire apparant tooke that as mine owne, and not as yours.[222]

King Henry IV died in March 1413. For a monarch who had a great desire to meet a good death, on the crusade to the Holy land, as was considered desirable in the Middle Ages, destiny had a peculiarity in store.[223] Henry IV died in the chamber in the abbot's palace in Westminster named the Jerusalem Chamber. [224] During his life the king gave instructions about his funeral and those wishes were respected by his son and heir, Henry V. It is interesting to point out that the king made a specific request to be buried not along with his predecessors in office at Westminster, but at Canterbury. Some recent views on the matter suggest that the selection of this particular location might be connected

[220] Allmand, *Henry V*, 52.

[221] The sources describe that the Prince demonstrated his remorse by entering his father's chambers in a cloak and disguise, and with a knife in his hands willing to take his life if he was not pardoned by the king. See McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*, 111. See also *Eulogium Historiarum*, Selected documents, 208.

[222] Raphael Holinshed. *Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Vol. 3 (London, 1808), 57, (hereafter: *Chronicle of England*). Also mentioned in E. J. Tyler. *Henry of Monmouth, Memoirs of Henry the Fifth*. Vol. I. 311. (hereafter: *Henry of Monmouth*).

[223] For more on the issue see D. Codling."Henry IV and Personal Piety: Beliefs and Spiritual life of the Man Who Usurped Richard II, an Anointed King". *History Today* 57, no.1 (2007):23-29.

[224] See *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 243. See also *Continuatio Eulogii*, 421. See also *An English Chronicle* 38.

with the legend of the Holy Oil kept by St. Thomas Becket the late archbishop of Canterbury, the oil which was apparently first used to anoint Henry IV.[225] However, the choice of Canterbury was not as strange as it might appear at first glance. This cathedral housed the shrine of St. Thomas Becket, a rival so to speak of Edward the Confessor as the saint patron of England; this made it one of the most important pilgrimage sites, and also the seat of the archbishop. In this way Canterbury outranked Westminster in holiness as well as in prestige.

After Henry V commissioned his father's funeral hearse the ceremonial could begin.[226] The late king's body was first taken to Faversham and from there it proceeded to Canterbury to be interred with all the dignities that a royal funeral deserved. Interestingly there are only a few brief accounts describing the funeral ceremony. For instance, Adam of Usk dedicates only a few lines to informing the audience about where the king died and where was he taken for burial. He states:

> ...dying in the sanctuary of the abbots chamber at Westminster, whereby he fulfilled his horoscope that he would die in the Holy Land; and he was taken away by water to be buried at Canterbury.[227]

The chronicle known as the *Memorials of Henry the Fifth* give a brief passage:

> *His peractis, non est passus nobillissimus princeps parentis intermortui corpus, laudatione, pompa, exequiis, imaginibus spoliatum, sepulturae honore carere. Placuit regi justa solvere et parentalia in Cantuariensi ecclesia facere, ac clarissimi patris, qui summam fatalem jam confecerat, cadaver praesentia sua, quod pietatis argumentum fuit, cohonestare.*[228]

The *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* give an even more reduced survey of the event stating only:

> On Trinitie sundaie were the solemne exequies doone at Canturburie for his father, the king himselfe being present thereat.[229]

The *English Chronicle* states:

---

[225] See Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 199. For the use of this oil in anointing see pages 35, 36, 37.

[226] For the list of names of the persons commissioned for funeral necessities see Duffy, *Royal Tombs,* 200.

[227] *...apud Westm in camera abbatis, ipsius genesim yuod in terra sancta moreretur uerificando, infra sanctuarium,..., et per aquam transportatus sepelitur Cantuar*. *Chronicle of Adam of Usk* 243.

[228] *Memorials of Henry the Fifth King of England*. ed. C. A. Cole. (London: Longman, 1858), 15.

[229] *Chronicles of England* 62.

> And sone aftir he deide in the Abbeie of Westmynstre in a chambir callid Jerusaleme, aboute the feste of saint Cubert,...and iy yburied in Crichirche of Cauntirbury.[230]

Surprisingly the later anti Lancastrian inclined chronicle called the *History of the Martyrdom of Richard Scrope* mentions that Henry IV was in fact never buried in Canterbury for his body did not reach the burial site because it was cast from the funeral barge during a storm.[231] Excavations done in the resting place of the late king Henry IV, however, have shown that the king was in fact buried in Canterbury behind the high altar on the north side of the shrine of St. Thomas Becket. On the opposite side lays the tomb of his uncle Edward the Black Prince. Henry IV's tomb is placed alongside that of his second wife Joan of Navarre.[232] Interestingly, Henry IV was not joined in eternity with his first wife and mother of his heir apparent, Mary of Bohun, who had both personal and dynastic advantage and more importance than his second wife, Joan of Navarre. However, as Henry IV needed to reinforce his position and the legitimacy of holding the crown by all means, his second marriage to a member of one of the most ancient royal lines of Europe was meant to surely grant him precisely that.[233]

Apart from the fact that neither Richard II nor Henry IV were buried at Westminster (although only one of those decisions was made voluntarily), another common thing can be seen in these two funerals. As was already discussed the funeral ceremony of Richard II did not have a funeral effigy.[234] The same was true for the funeral of Henry IV. However, the situation with Henry IV's effigy is not as clear as the one at the funeral of his predecessor. Although no contemporary evidence and accounts have been found which would testify to the use of the effigy, nonetheless, there is still a strong belief that one was used. The facts that the body of the demised king had to be transported some distance

[230] *An English Chronicle* 38.
[231] For the sources that mention this event see Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*, 101, 102.
[232] Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 205.
[233] See Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 210.
[234] See pages 50, 51.

form Westminster to Canterbury and that the aforementioned excavations proved that the body was encased in lead seem to advocate in favour of the presence of an effigy.[235]

After having buried his father's body with all the dignities required of a royal funeral the Prince of Wales could step freely onto the political scene and claim what rightfully belonged to him, his father's crown and throne. On April 9, 1413 the Prince of Wales was crowned, anointed and consecrated in the office as the King Henry V. There is not enough evidence to support the claim from some sources that state that he was also anointed with the Holy Oil of St. Thomas Becket. This still is however a common assumption based on a single source that asserts that the oil was in fact used in this case.[236]

There is a tradition that once the Prince of Wales acceded to the throne he had a moment of swift transformation as a sort of conversion to sobriety. This tradition was supposedly compiled with the sole purpose of excusing the Prince's behaviour in the past and presenting him as a stable and reliable ruler, one who was misguided by certain persons who had an influence on him and was so to speak acting according to his young age. However the *Brut Chronicle* apparently felt the need to address the situation and come up with an explanation for it:

> And before he was king, when he was Prince of Wales, he fell and inclined greatly to riot, and drew to wild company....and likewise all his train of his household were round him and pleased with his governance, except three men of his household, who were very sad and sorry about his governance and they counselled him ever contrary and fain would have him to do well and forsake riot....And then he began to reign as king and he remembered the great charge and worship that he should take upon him....And thus were left in his household no more than those three men. And many of those who had aided and consented to his wildness fell afterwards to great mischief and sorrow.[237]

This is not the only account of the change of behaviour of the newly appointed king. Thomas Walsingham states:

[235] Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, (see footnote 28), 84, 85. See also J. Litten. "The Funeral Effigy: Its Function and Purpose" *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*. ed. A. Harvey and R. Mortimer. (London: Boydell Press, 1994), 4.

[236] Allmand, *Henry V*, (see footnote 10), 65.

[237] *The Brut Chronicle*. ed. F.W.D. Brie (London: Early English Texts Society, 1906), 594, (hereafter: *The Brut*)

> As soon as he was made King, he was changed suddenly into another man, zealous for honesty, modesty and gravity.[238]

This however is not the only tradition trying to shape the image of the new king and put a different perspective on the dynasty than the image left by his father Henry IV. The chronicle called *The First English Life of Henry the Fifth* stated that the new king manifested remorse for his past behaviour and decided to manifest his regret in a peculiar way. The source states that Henry V kept a vow of chastity from the moment of his father's death and his ascension to the throne in 1413 up to his marriage with Katherine of France which took place in June 1420.[239] This, in addition to other features of his character gave the new king something of a reputation as a priest-king.

King Henry V was viewed as a sort of saviour from the chaotic situation which had prevailed since the time of King Richard II. The young Prince of Wales before even becoming king was instructed and advised about the desirable type of kingship and sovereignty his governance must achieve to be considered just and fruitful. The role of the advisers, for the not yet appointed king, took the poets who were still deeply disillusioned by the Ricardian rule and who had not found the inspiration they were seeking and expecting in the reign of Henry IV. These court poets such as Chaucer and Gower, as well as many others, had great influence on the king just as they did on the public. Precisely because of that they were always regarded with respect, for their writings had served to build an image of a monarch. Henry V received advice from this source about several features of his rulership such as for example what the role of the king should be, and how he should behave in the matters of justice, counsel, finances, political harmony, chivalry, war and peace, religion, etc.[240] Once all the advices were read and absorbed so to speak and the king had proven to the public that he was far from the image of the rebel that had haunted him from a young age, Henry V was ready to step

[238] McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*, 123. See *The St. Albans Chronicle*, *Chronicles of the Revolution*, 69.

[239] McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*, 124. See *The First English Life of Henry the Fifth.* ed. C. L. Kingsford. (Oxford, 1911). The chronicle was supposedly written in 1513 by an anonymous author known commonly as the translator of Livius. See Grandsen, *Historical Writing in England*, 196.

[240] For the full description of the themes and the advices see G. L. Harriss. "Introduction: the Exemplar of Kingship" *Henry V, the Practice of Kingship*. ed G. L. Harriss.(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985): 1-31.

onto the scene and act in full possession of his dignities as the true heir and successor to the throne of England.

Reburial of King Richard II (December, 1413)

By researching the sources describing the life of Henry V one can learn just how much the young Prince, afterwards king, was perceived to be attached to his cousin and patron when the late Richard II was alive. It must have been a somewhat strange situation given the fact that Henry's father, at the time still just Henry of Bolingbroke was plotting to overthrow the government of King Richard II and take his place on the throne. The young Henry must have felt caught between the love and admiration he apparently cherished for Richard and a duty and obligation towards his own father and family. The *Brut Chronicle* tells about the relation between the two at the point when Henry of Bolingbroke was to invade England and when Richard II hinted what his next move would be:

> Then this young knight Henry brought the king to his chamber with a sorrowful heart, for cause he should depart from his godfather and his sovereign king, for he loved him entirely. And when he came into the king's chamber he told the king how he must the next day after, wait upon his father by straight and hard commandment. And then the king said to him these words: Good son Henry, I give thee leave to do thy father's commandment, but I know well there is one Henry shall do me much harm and I suppose it is not thou. Wherefore I pray thee be my friend, for I wot now how it will go. And so on the next day after Henry took his leave of the king his godfather with a heavy heart and went to his father.[241]

Henry V seems to have looked up to the late king Richard II and felt great remorse for the fact that his father was not willing to provide a funeral ceremony for the demised king and honour his wishes about this last ritual that would see him as a protagonist. One must not be deceived by the emotional aspect of the act, however, but look at the practical side of it as well. The new king in the first year of his reign after he paid honour to his father by observing his wishes about his funeral, had another burial to attend.

Henry V had in mind a scheme which would enable him to resolve multiple problems that were left behind form the times of his father's government. The constant rumouring that the late king Richard II was still alive had served as a political tool in achieving instability during the reign of

[241]McFarlane, *Lancastrian Kings*, 121. See *The Brut* 545.

Henry V. It was now associated with another burning problem, religious issues. The Lollard movement had already begun in the mid fourteenth century following the teachings of John Wycliffe[242] and over time gained much support among the public as well as among some influential English nobles. The Lollard issue at the time of Henry V was connected to the destiny of the deposed king. As Henry IV died the Lollard knights generated a plan to spread the rumours once again that the late king Richard II was still alive and that he would be brought back and thus cause difficulties for the newly enthroned king. The Lollards had in mind an uprising which would inevitably lead to the destruction of the Lancastrian dynasty and the establishment of the one which would be more favourable to their cause.[243] The main representative of the Lollard knights was Sir John Oldcastle, who served under Henry IV and proved his loyalty to the king by aiding him in the fights against the revolts in Wales.[244] The new King Henry V apparently greatly admired this old fashioned knight but was still somewhat cautious in entrusting Oldcastle with his full confidence. Rumours about Oldcastle's heresy and spreading heretical views were not to be disregarded. In this climate Henry V had the opportunity to put an end to the revolt of the Lollards as well as to resolve problems surfacing from the never forgotten past.

[242] The basic idea that Wycliffe propagated was that philosophy must be considered the ground for theology. In this respect he emphasized five basic principles for the understanding of the scripture and they are: knowledge of universals, an understanding of accidents, and a proper understanding of the eternity of God, that all created things exist eternally in the mind of God and that all created things are in their essence everlasting and unchanging. Wycliffe considered the Bible to be the most pure expression of Gods mind, the idea upon which he developed the theory of the logic of Holy Scripture. For further see R. Rex. *The Lollards*. (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 32, 33, 35, (hereafter: Rex, *Lollards*). See also M. Aston. *Lollards and Reformers, Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion*. (London: The Hambledon Press, 1984), 3, 4, 9, 10. See also K. Gosh. *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and Interpretation*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 22-67.

[243] When thinking about the ideal state Wycliffe had in mind a form of theocratic kingship which was best analyzed in his work *De Officio Regis* written in 1379. His idea was based on royal supremacy and a strong king who would undertake the reform of Christian life. The movement was in its core anti-clerical as well as anti-papal. See Rex, *Lollards*, 51. See also B. Wilkinson. *Constitutional History of Medieval England 1216-1399, (II-III.), Vol.II.: Politics and the constitution 1307-1399.* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952), 29. It can be argued that the Lollard movement found its initial place on the court of Richard II, who surrounded himself with various knights who were known for their support of the movement. For a full list of knights see Rex, *Lollards*, 61. For the connection to Richard II see Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 129, 181.

[244] See *Chronicle of Adam of Usk*, 245, 247. For the issue of Oldcastle's rising see Rex, *Lollards*. 84, 85, 86. See also Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, 129, 130. See also Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, 219, 220.

Another point must be made in this regard, that the restoration of the reputation and prestige of the House of Lancaster smudged by some of the acts of his father, was important for Henry V. By the end of his rule, Henry IV started to lose his initial support and his reign became more and more viewed as that of a usurper who had deposed the rightfully enthroned king. Numerous problems with his reign fortified the public's opinion of him as a mere tyrant who acceded to the throne without any right to it, a position which shifted completely from the one that was current at the beginning. In addition to constant uprisings of the unsatisfied nobility, another peculiar fact gained more and more significance in the public eye. As Richard had to be dealt with away from the public eye, for regicide was not something which should be displayed in spotlight, the facts concerning his last days were not evident to many. Fabulous stories developed about Richard II escaping torture, fleeing from prison and continuing his life under an alias.[245]

Consequently the emergence of imposters was inevitable. They claimed to be the deposed King Richard II who had somehow miraculously escaped from prison and was still alive. The fact which testifies to just how serious these claims were taken is that once they were supported by somebody like for example the rebellious Scottish lords they gained much more significance than Henry IV probably whished. The fruitful years for the resurfacing of the pseudo-Richards came with the last years of the reign of Henry IV. The imposters and those who supported them took advantage of the situation in which the king was seriously affected by illness and the political situation was uncertain. In the years of the transition of the government from the hand of Henry IV to those of his son and heir, Henry V, 1413/4, were the most afflicted by the actions of imposter claiming to be the late King Richard II.

Thomas Ward enjoyed the support of the Scottish court and lords as well as some of the former close allies of Richard II.[246] Now he found himself another valuable partner. John Wyghtlok, Richards' groom and yeoman joined the Scottish lords and Ward and gave his support to their cause. Wyghtlok's contribution to the situation was that he was responsible for spreading rumours among the

[245] See Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 169, 198.
[246] See page 59.

people of England about Richard II still being alive. His work and choice of time coincided with the two of the most important events in the period of the transmission of power from Henry IV to Henry V. His first "campaign" coincided with the last Parliament that still saw Henry IV alive while the second one took place during the coronation period of Henry V. Wyghtlok was subsequently imprisoned for his activities but somehow he managed to escape from the Tower, which was an additional embarrassment for the new ruler Henry V.[247] After this unfortunate event the new King Henry V was set to fight all the claims which came from individuals, but even they had people behind them with an agenda to meddle in the affairs of the crown and their influence was not discarded so easily. Drastic times were in need of peculiar methods.

Henry IV was clever in displaying Richard II's body with an uncovered face, but that did not stop the spread of the rumours that the deposed king had managed to escape his tragic destiny. These unfortunate whispers took a long time to die away. Besides the throne and the crown of his father Henry V inherited the problems which came with it. In this respect Henry V acted as was expected and tried to put to an end to all the suspicion and tried to resolve the problems left to him by his father. It can be argued that maybe the solution which he sought as the most desirable to end all of this, was not the most common but it cannot be stated that it was not original and in the end very fruitful. The action with which Henry V chose to restore a good image to his reign was that the late King Richard II should be reburied and that this ceremony should not differ for the most parts from what Richard hoped it would be. In 1413, the same year he assumed power, just before Christmas, Henry V had Richard II reburied in a tomb in Westminster, at the abbey of St. Peter, which the late king had commissioned for himself and for his wife during their lives. Several sources mention this event. The *English Chronicle* points to the more sentimental reasons for the re-burial of the late King Richard II by stating:

[247]P. Strohm."The Trouble with Richard", 87-111.

> And anon, the firste yeer of his regne, for the grete and tendere loue that he hadde to king Richard, he translatid his body fro Langley to Westmynstre, and buried him beside quene Anne his firste wiff, as his desire was.[248]

The *Chronicle of London* states:

> In this yere [1413], on seynt Edmondes day the kyng, there was a gret convocacion of clergye at Poules in London, whiche continued tyl the iiij day od Decembre; and thane was the kyng and his counseill accorded to fette the bone of kyng Richard fro Langele to London, and berye them at Westm; and there was don a dirige ryally; and on the morwe the masse was solempny songon.[249]

Hall's *Chronicle* states:

> When all thynges were thus settled and framed to his purpose, he caused the body of kyng Richard the second to be remoued with all funeral pompes conueniente for his estate, from Langley to Westminster, where he was honorably enterred with Queen Anne his first wife in a solempne toumb erected and set vp at the costes and charges of this noble prince kyng Henry.[250]

The most extensive account on the event comes from the *Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland*:

> When the king had settled things much to his purpose, he caused the bodie of king Richard to be remooued with all funerall dingitie conuenient for his estate, from Langlie to Westminster, where he was honorablie interred with queene Anne his first wife, in a solemne toome erected and set vp at the charges of this king. Polychronicon saith, that asfter the bodie of the dead king was taken vp out of the earth, this new king (happillie tendering the magnifience of a prince, and abhorring obscure buriall) caused the same to be conueied to Westminster in a roiall seat (of chair of estate) couered all ouer with blacke veluet & adorned with banners of diures armes round about. All the horsses likewise were apparelled with blacke, and bare sundrie sutes of armes. Manie other solemnities were had at his interrement, according to the qualitie of the age wherein he liued and died.[251]

To make the event as a solemn and respectful as possible Henry V paid close attention to providing the demised king with the ceremonial that he deserved. In this respect every aspect of the funeral ceremony was carefully thought through and executed. The King's Langley brethren were paid 22 pounds to remove the king's body. A London joiner named John Wydemmer supplied the new

[248] *An English Chronicle* 39.
[249] *Chronicle of London* 96.
[250] *Hall's Chronicle* 47.
[251] *Chronicles of England* 62.

coffin and carriage, at a cost of 4 pounds. It was estimated that 100 marks were spent on processional masses. Up to 120 torchbearers accompanied the procession to Westminster, the same number as the Henry IV's Canterbury procession, when he willingly decided to be buried there and not in Westminster. However, in this case Henry V instructed that his own household was to supply the surplus wax. The Canterbury monks were paid 10 pounds for various banners borrowed from them to put on the hearse, which was ordered to be placed within St. Peter's at Westminster for the exequies that took place on November 8.[252]

In December Henry V requested the banners and gytons which had been commissioned for his father's first anniversary hearse to be used for Richard's anniversary. According to the accounts in the *Brut Chronicle* Henry V ordered that four candles should burn constantly around Richard's tomb. The new king duly observed Richards' anniversary. The *Brut Chronicle* points out that Henry IV failed to pay respect to the demised king and his predecessor and made a moral assessment that the king suffered from leprosy and consequently died of it as a divine punishment for taking part in Richard's death.[253]

A parallel can be made at this point between a similar event which preceded the second burial of Richard II, the second burial of the French King Louis X. Although on June 5, 1316 just a few days after his death Louis X was given a solemn funeral ceremony which escorted the dead king's body from Bois de Vincennes to Notre Dame and finally to Saint Denis, a month afterwards a second burial was performed.[254] The main reason for such an unprecedented act in the medieval history of French kings up to then lays in the need for dynastic succession. That is, Louis X did not secure the throne with a male heir, but left instead an uncertain situation by proclaiming his daughter as the heir

[252] Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 170

[253] *The Brut*, 584. Duffy, *Royal Tombs*, 170. See also Evans, *The Death of Kings*, 142, 143. For the full list of people who were commissioned for the funeral ceremony necessities see Strohm, "The Trouble with Richard", 102.

[254] E. A. R. Brown."The Ceremonial of Royal Succession in Capetian France: The Double Funeral of Louis X" *The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial.* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994): 227-271, (hereafter: Brown, "Double Funeral of Louis X").

apparent. His widow Queen Clementia was pregnant at the time of his death and if she gave birth to a boy, he would undoubtedly be considered a legitimate heir to the crown of France.

However, the situation was far from ideal and became fertile ground for someone who wanted to take the opportunity to seize the crown for himself, that being the brother of Louis X, Phillipe le Long, count of Poitiers, who was absent from the first funeral of the king. As Elizabeth A. R. Brown rightly pointed out, the second burial was conceived for other purposes other than paying respect to the demised king of France.[255] Being older than the other brothers of Louis X, Philippe le Long could have claimed the throne himself if Louis X did not have a legitimate male heir to succeed him[256] and when the son that Queen Clementia gave birth to, died after several days the path to the crown opened for him.[257]

Philippe le Long was the main initiator of the second burial for he made all the necessary arrangements for it. These arrangements included, among other things, commissioning Turkish cloths to be placed over the body [258] and the building of a *chapelle*, which was a wooden structure that presumably had the purpose of holding lighted candles placed around and above the coffin.[259] The main idea of Philippe le Long was to use this ceremony as well as some other acts[260] as a demonstration of being the legitimate heir of Louis X. It was expected that the heir apparent would pay homage to his demised predecessor by being present at his funeral. Since Philippe le Long was absent from the first funeral the reburial of his brother proved to be the easiest approach. This form of political propaganda apparently worked well in both cases. Philippe le Long was successful in portraying himself as the legitimate heir of Louis X and obtained the crown, while Henry V was

[255] See Brown, "Double Funeral of Louis X", 231. and Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 43.
[256] Brown, "Double Funeral of Louis X", 236.
[257] For the story of alleged survival of the boy see T. di Carpegna Falconeri (transl. W. McCuaig).*The Man Who Believed He Was King of France, a True Medieval Tale*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).
[258] This implies that the cloth was placed over a fresh grave, which thus dismisses the theory that this act was not a second burial but rather a commemorative service. See Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 43.
[259] Giesey, *Royal Funeral Ceremonial*, 43.
[260] Apart from the funeral ceremony Philippe le Long expressed his authority by receiving oaths of fealty as well as acts of homage. For further see Brown, "Double Funeral of Louis X", 221-271.

equally successful in presenting his reign as legitimate succession from Richard II onward without any disturbances.

In the sources Henry V is often portrayed as regarding the late King Richard II with as much affection as his own father. For example the concluding sentence of the account of Thomas Walsingham on the reburial of the deposed king states how Henry V was venerating his demised predecessor and spiritual father as much as his "fleshly father" Henry IV. The following can be read from this chronicle:

qui fatebatur se sibi tantum venerationis debere, quantum patri suo carnali.[261]

Obviously the new king tried to rely on the both lines of succession coming from Richard II as well as from Henry IV. Henry V presented the legitimate succession by calling himself the spiritual son of Richard II who inherited the throne from his carnal father Henry IV.[262] The idea that followed from this was dynastic continuation. Henry V by paying respect to the last wishes of Richard II resolved two problems with just one simple act. He stopped all the allegations of Richards' survival, thus invalidating all the other claims directed at the throne, and at the same time by considering himself to be the spiritual son of the deposed king he presented a continuation of the rule coming from Richard II and thus put an end to all the allegations that Henry IV was a mere usurper and that the reign of his heir cannot be considered valid. And all that was achieved by a simple reburial.

As Paul Strohm rightly points out that in his theory about the two bodied king Kantorowicz has to present a clear situation. That is the king's *dignitas* must be assigned before it can be reassigned.[263] It was pointed out above that there could not be a situation in which two persons could embody the *dignitas* at the same time, but that one must release the quality and office for another to

[261]Walsingham. *Historia Anglicana,* 297. See also Strohm, *England's Empty Throne*. 118.

[262] Although Henry V did not go so far as to claim complete unity between him and Richard II as was for example the case of Queen Elisabeth I who apparently stated "I am Richard II know ye not that?", nevertheless he used the means of a reburial to prove his connection to the demised king. For the matter of Queen Elisabeth I see *The Progress and Public Processions of Queen Elisabeth*. ed. J. Nichols. (London, 1823), 552.

[263] Strohm, ″The Trouble with Richard″, 103. See also Boureau, *Kantorowicz*, 97, 98.

take his place.[264] When Henry IV had Richard II deposed and acquired the crown without any firm basis and indisputable evidence to back up his claim, he made an irreparable rupture in the process of the transmission of power from one ruler to the next. The *dignitas* was not successfully transmitted to the new ruler because the old one was still alive and in addition was forced to resign his office. This unorthodox way of dealing with the transference of power won Henry IV the unflattering title of a usurper who never actually possessed any rights to the throne and thus was unable to hold the *dignitas*.

To give a solemn reburial to the, as Paul Strohm states, dynastically legitimate father Richard II and to do that without the presence of his own legitimate by blood but dynastically illegitimate father Henry IV[265], the new king overcame the difficulties that such a reburial could present symbolically. By this act Henry V was successful in portraying that he descended from his father who had usurped the throne but at the same time he had acquired the royal *dignitas* from his spiritual father and true holder of the *dignitas* for all this time, King Richard II. In this way the continuation of the dynasty acquired a twofold aspect. Henry V claimed a twofold lineage, one from his legitimate father Henry IV and another from his spiritual father Richard II. To provide a respectful reburial to King Richard II and by doing so honour his own wishes about the ceremony, gave the new King Henry V the power to reunite the broken line in the transmission of the royal *dignitas* and consequently the transmission of the royal power itself.

[264] See page 4, and footnote 8.
[265] Strohm, "The Trouble with Richard", 104.

IV. Conclusions

The English King Richard II did not enjoy a good fate. The political situation and some of his personal decisions were probably the reasons why the king ended his reign so abruptly. It would be pointless to discuss whether the main reason in his fall lay in his own behaviour or in the triumphant victory of Henry of Bolingbroke. Probably, as with all things, the truth can be found somewhere in the middle. However, the goal of this thesis was not to reassess the reasons why Richard II met such a fate but instead use the example of the life and reign of this English monarch to test the theory of the king's two bodies on the primary sources.

The example of the English King Richard II clearly demonstrates how the rupture between the two bodies of a ruler could take place even if the monarch in question were still alive. It can be concluded that for the transmission of the second body, the political one, it was not necessary that the previous bearer of that body should be deceased. However, since the former head of the political body was still in full possession of his natural body and was among the living, this presented itself as a great problem for the transmission of the body politic to his successor. A conclusion can be drawn that this mere natural fact such as death was not sufficient reason per se for the transference of the power.

Henry of Bolingbroke was successful in his quest for the throne for he presented adequate reasons which proved the misrule of Richard II, making him thus unworthy of holding the title of the head of the political body. This was a clear case where the death of the ruler was not the reason for the successor to take his place in the hierarchy of the political body, but the fact that the monarch by his behaviour was considered to be unfit to bear this role. This of course does not mean that the body politic was abandoned at the time of the interregnum (that emerged in the moment of the deposition), because now the community as the part of the body politic was the one who had a more active role in the transference of power. The political body so to say independently "chose" to which natural body it wants to be joined, and that was Henry of Bolingbroke, the future King Henry IV.

However, something else stood in the way of Henry IVs aims of acquiring full regal powers, the fact that Richard II was still alive by the time he ascended to the throne. As it was shown, sources place extensive space for describing how the deposed king actually died. From those accounts even some unexpected consequences arose. Nevertheless, the point on which most of the sources agreed was that the deposed king was dead and, they went on to describe then his funeral ceremony.

Kantorowicz correctly identified a twofold aspect of the funeral ceremony. At the same time this ceremony symbolised both the triumph over Death and the triumph of Death. This is why the funeral rite in particular was regarded as having the greatest symbolic importance for the transmission of power from the demised ruler to his successor, the new king on the throne. In the case of Richard II the burial was a rupture in this connection. The funeral ceremony did not in fact satisfy the minimum requirements for the proper way to transfer power between medieval rulers. The various flaws and missing elements in the funeral procedure of Richard II (such as not observing the instructions of the will, the lack of an effigy, no use of insignia apart from the crown, burial performed at Langley and not in Westminster, etc.) served as a clear signal of how not to communicate to the public that a new ruler had come into possession of the body politic. That is why this particular funeral inspired so many controversies and had long-lasting and unforeseeable consequences for the ruling House of Lancaster, for Henry IV and for his son and heir, Henry V.

When Henry IV's son ascended to the throne the problem did not go away, for the heir of Henry IV was also expected to hold *dignitas* as a clear sign of his office. It would have been impossible for someone to transfer *dignitas* to another person if he never had it in the first place. In this case it would have been impossible for Henry V to receive the *dignitas* from his father if he were missing it from the time of his ascension to the throne. To deal with this problem Henry V came up with the simplest solution he could find, in the circumstances surrounding his accession to the throne. That was the reburial of the one from whom everything had to start and with whom everything had to end, King Richard II. Henry V may well have had deep feelings for the person who was his patron when he was young and who influenced much of his life and the course of events during his life,

whether he welcomed this influence or not. However, one must look away from these sentimental aspects and understand that this act of reburial was nothing more than a practical approach to a burning problem. When he was being enthroned and consecrated for his office, Henry V had to be in full possession of the royal *dignitas* if he wanted to be able to exercise his powers as a legitimate monarch. And he finally achieved this by honouring Richard II with a solemn royal funeral ceremonial.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum. ed. E. M. Thompson. London, 1889.

Adam of Usk. *The Chronicle of Adam of Usk*. Ed. and trans. C. Given-Wilson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI. Ed. J. S. Davis. Cambridge: Camden Society Original series, 1856.

Annales Ricardi Secundi et Henrici Quarti regum Anglie. Ed. H. T. Riley. London,1866.

Capgrave John. *Chronicle of England*. Ed. F.C. Hingeston. London, 1858. (Reprint Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1972).

Chronicle of London from 1089 to 1483. (Reprint of the ed. London, 1827).Wales: Llanerch Enterprises,1995.

Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II . ed. W. Stubbs. London, 1883.

Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400: The Reign of Richard II. Ed. and trans. C. Given-Wilson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Chronicque de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Angleterre. Ed. B. Williams. London: English Historical Society, 1846.

Creton, Jean. *Metrical History of the Deposition of King Richard the Second*. Ed. J. Webb. London, 1824.

English Historical Documents. Vol. 4,*(1327-1485)*. Ed. A.R. Myers, 1912-1980, D.C. Douglas, 1898, London: Eyre & Spottiswoode,1969.

Eulogium (Historiarum Sive Temporis): Chronicon ab Orbe Condito Usque ad Annum Domini MCCCLXVI. Vol. 3, London: BookSurge Publishing, 2001.

Froissart Jean. *Chronicles (1337-1410)*. Ed. G. Brereton. London: Penguin Classics, 1978.

Great Chronicles of London .Ed. C. L. Kingsford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Hall's Chronicle Containing the History of England during the Reign of Henry the Fourth and the Succeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry the Eight. London, 1808.

Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi Secundi. Ed. G. B. Stow. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

Histoire du Roy d' Angleterre Richard. Ed. and trans. J. Webb. London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1824.

Holinshed, Raphael. *Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Vol. 3, London, 1808.

Knighton's Chronicle 1337–1396. Ed. G. H. Martin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Memorials of Henry the Fifth King of England. Ed. C. A. Cole. London: Longman, 1858.

Selected documents of the English Constitutional History 1307-1485. Ed. S. B. Chrimes. 1907-, A. L. Brown. London: A. Black and C. Black, 1961.

The Brut Chronicle. Ed. F. W. D. Brie. London: Early English Text Society, 1906.

The First English Life of Henry the Fifth. Ed. C. L. Kingsford. Oxford, 1911.

The Progress and Public Records of Queen Elisabeth I. Ed. J. Nichols. London, 1823.

The St. Albans Chronicle: The Chronica Maiora *of Thomas Walsingham: 1376-1394*. Ed. and trans. John Taylor, Wendy R. Childs, Leslie Watkiss. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

The Westminster Chronicle 1381-1394, Ed. L. C. Hector and B. F. Harvey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Walsingham Thomas. *Chronicon Angliae*. Trans. E. M. Thompson. London: Rolls Series, 1874.

Walsingham Thomas. *Historia Anglicana.* Vol. 2. *1381-1422*. Ed. H. T. Riely. London: Longman, 1864.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Allmand, C. *Henry V*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Aston, M. *Lollards and Reformers, Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1984.

Barker, B. *The Symbols of Sovereignty*. Oxford: Westbridge Books, 1979.

Barlow, F. *Edward the Confessor*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Barron, C. M. "The Tyranny of Richard II." *Historical Research, the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 41, no.103 (1968): 1-18.

_____."Richard II and London." *Richard II, the Art of Kingship*. Ed. A. Goodman and J. Gillespie, 129-155. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Bertelli, S. *The King's Body: Sacred Rituals of Power in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

Binski, P. *Medieval Death: Ritual and Representation*. London: British Museum Press, 1996.

Bloch, M. *I re taumathurghi, Studi sul carattere sovrannaturale attribuito alla potenza dei re particolarment in Francia e in Inghilterra*. Turin: Einaudi, 1989.

Bourdern, J. "Re-Writing the Rites of Passage, The Peculiar Funeral of Edward II." *Rites of Passage,Cultures of Transmission in the Fourteenth Century*. Ed. N. F. McDonald and W. M. Ormord, 13-31.York: York Medieval Press, 2004.

Boureau, A. *Kantorowicz, Stories of a Historian*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Brody, S. N. *The Disease of the Soul: Leprosy in Medieval Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.

Brown, A. L. *The Goverance of Late Medieval England 1272-1461*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.

Brown, E. A. R. "Royal Salvation and Needs of State in Early Fourteenth Century France." *The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial*, 1-56. Aldershot: Variorum, 1991.

_____."The Ceremonial of Royal Succession in Capetian France: The Funeral of Philip V." *The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial*, 266-293. Aldershot: Variorum, 1991.

_____. "The Ceremonial of Royal Succession in Capetian France: The Double Funeral of Louis X." *The Monarchy of Capetian France and Royal Ceremonial*, 227-271. Aldershot: Variorum, 1994.

_____. ″Royal Bodies, Effigies, Funeral Meals and Office in the Sixteenth Century France″. *Micrologus*, 7 (1999), 437-509.

Cantor, N. F. *Inventing the Middle Ages. The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century*. New York: W. Morrow, 1991.

_____."The King's Two Bodies" (review article). *American Historical Review* 64, no.1 (1958): 81-83.

Chrimes, S. B. *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Medieval England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

Codling, D. "Henry IV and Personal Piety: Beliefs and Spiritual life of the Man Who Usurped Richard II, an Anointed King." *History Today* 57, no.1 (2007):23-29.

Daniell, C. *Death and Burial in Medieval England 1066-1550*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Doherty, P. *Isabella and the Strange Death of Edward II.* London: Robinson, 2004.

Duffy, M. *Royal Tombs of Medieval England*. Gloucestershire: Tempus, 2003.

Dules, L. D. *Richard II in the Early Chronicles*. Paris: Mouton, 1975.

Evans, M. *The Death of Kings, Royal Deaths in Medieval England.* London: Hambledon and London, 2003.

Falconeri Carpegna, T.*The Man Who Believed He Was King of France, a True Medieval Tale.* Trans. W. McCuaig. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Fletcher, C. D. "Narrative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II." *Journal of Medieval History* 30, no. 4 (2004): 323-341.

_____. "Manhood and Politics in the Reign of Richard II." *Past and Present* 185(2005): 3-39.

Freed, J. B. "Ernst Kantorowicz: An Account."*Central European History* 32, no. 2 (1999): 221-227.

Fryde, N. *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II 1321-1326*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1979.

Galbraith, V. H. “Thomas Walsingham and the St Albans Chronicle 1272-1422.” *English Historical Review* 47 (1932): 12-30.

Genet, J. P.“Kantorowicz and the King’s Two Bodies: A Non Contextual History“. *Ernst Kantorowicz: Ertrage der Doppeltagung*. Ed. R. L. Benson and J. Fried. 265-274, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.

Gereby, G.“Carl Scmitt and Erik Peterson on the Problem of Political Theology: A Footnote to Kantorowicz.“ *Monotheisitic Kingship, The Medieval Variants.* Ed Aziz Al-Azmeh and Janos M. Bak, 31-63. Budapest: CEU Press, 2004.

Giancarlo, M. “Murder, Lies, and Storytelling: The Manipulation of Justice(s) in the Parliaments of 1397 and 1399.” *Speculum* 77, no. 1 (2002): 76-112.

Giesey, R. E. *The Royal Funeral Ceremonies in Renaissance France*. Geneva: Droz, 1960.

_____. “Inaugural Aspects of French Royal Ceremonials.“*Coronations: Medieval and EarlyModern Monarchic Ritual*. Ed. J. M. Bak, 35-45. Berkeley: University California Press, 1990.

_____.“The Two Bodies of the French King.“ *Ernst Kantorowicz: Ertrage der Doppeltagung*. Ed. R.L. Benson and J. Fried, 224-240. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.

Given-Wilson, C. *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity: Service, Politics, and Finance in England, 1360-1413*. London: Yale University Press, 1986.

_____. *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages, the Fourteenth Century Political Community*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.

_____. “The Manner of King Richard's Renunciation, A ‘Lancastrian Narrative’?.” *English Historical Review* 108, no. 427 (1993): 365-370.

_____. “Richard II and the Higher Nobility.” *Richard II, the Art of Kingship*. Ed. A. Goodman and J. L. Gillespie. 107-129 Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

_____.“The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England.” *English Historical Review* 124, no. 507 (2009): 257-282.

Gosh, K. *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and Interpretation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Grady, F. “The Lancastrian Gower and the Limits of Exemplarity.” *Speculum* 70, no. 3 (1995): 552-575.

Gransden, A. *Historical Writing in England II*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Guéry, A. “La dualité de toutes les monarchies et la monarchie chrétienne.“ *La Royauté Sacrée dans le Monde Chretien*. Ed. A. Boureau and C.S. Ingerflom, 39-53. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautesétudes en sciences sociales, 1992.

Hanrahan, M. “A Straunge Succesour Sholde Take Youre Heritage: The Clerk's Tale and the Crisis of Ricardian Rule.” *The Chaucer Review* 35, no. 4 (2001): 335-350.

Harriss, G. L. “Introduction: the Exemplar of Kingship.“*Henry V, the Practice of Kingship*. Ed G. L. Harriss. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Jacob, F. E. *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Jenkyns, R. *Westminster Abbey*. London: Profile Books, 2004.

Johnston, D. “Richard II s Departure from Ireland, July 1399.” *English Historical Review* 98, no. 389 (1983): 785-805.

Kantorowicz, E. H. *The King’s Two Bodies, a Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. (Originally published by Princeton University Press, 1957.)

Keen, M. *England in the Later Middle Ages, a Political History*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Kirby, J. L. *Henry IV of England*. London: Constable, 1971.

Landauer, C. “Ernst Kantorowicz and the Sacralisation of the Past.” *Central European History* 27, no. 1 (1994): 1-25.

_____.“The King’s Two Bodies and Kantorowicz’s Constitutional Narrative.” *Ernst Kantorowicz: Ertrage der Doppeltagung*. Ed. R. L. Benson and J. Fried, 211-224. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.

Le Goff, J. *Il corpo nel Medioevo*. Rome: Editori Laterza, 2005.

_____. “Aspects religieux et sacrés da la monarchie française du X au XIII siècle.“ *La Royauté Sacrée dans le Monde Chretien*. Ed. A. Boureau and C.S. Ingerflom, 19-29. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1992.

Lindley, G.“Ritual, Regicide and Representation: the Murder of Edward II and the Origin of the Royal Funeral Effigy in England.” *Gothic to Renaissance, Essays on Sculpture in England.* Ed. P. G. Lindley, 97-112. Publisher: Stamford,1995.

Litten, J. “The Funeral Effigy: Its Function and Purpose.” *The Funeral Effigies of Westminster Abbey*. Ed. A. Harvey and R. Mortimer. London: Boydell Press, 1994.

Lloyd, A. *The Making of the King, 1066*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1966.

McCullagh, J. “Critics of Kingship in Late Fourteen and Early Fifteenth Century England.” MA Thesis University of Akron, 2005.

McFarlane, K. B. *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Mckisack, M. *Fourteenth Century: 1307-1399*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

McNiven, P. *Heresy and Politics in the Reign of Henry IV, the Burning of John Badby*. Manchester: Boydell & Brewer, 1987.

_____. “The Problem of Henry IV’s Health, 1405-1413.“*English Historical Review* 100, no. 397 (1985): 747-772.

Mortimer, I. “The Death of Edward II in Berkeley Castle.” *English Historical Review* 120, no. 489 (2005): 1175-1214.

_____."Richard II and the Succession to the Crown." *History* 91, no. 303 (2006): 320-336.

Mowat, R. B. *Henry V*. London: Constable &Company, 1919.

Offler, H. S. "The King's Two Bodies." (review article) *English Historical Review* 75, no. 295 (1960): 295-298.

Palmer, J. J. N. "The Authorship, Date and Historical value of the French Chronicles on the Lancastrian Revolution" *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* (1978-79): 145-81, 398-421.

Prestwich, M. *The Three Edwards*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980.

Rawcliffe, G. *Leprosy in Medieval England*. London: Boydell Press, 2006.

Revel, J."La Royauté Sacrée: éléments pour un débat." *La Royauté Sacrée dans le Monde Chretien*. Ed. A. Boureau and C.S. Ingerflom. 7-19, Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1992.

Rex, R. *The Lollards*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Rubin, M. *The Hollow Crown, a History of Britain in the Late Middle Ages*. London: Allen Lane, Penguin Group, 2005.

_____."Introduction: Rites of Passage." *Rites of Passage, Cultures of Transmission in the Fourteenth Century*, Ed. N. F. McDonald and W. M. Ormord, 1-14. York: York Medieval Press, 2004.

Saul, N. *The Three Richards: Richard I, Richard II, Richard III*. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006.

_____. *Richard II*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

_____."The Kingship of Richard II." *Richard II, the Art of Kingship*. Ed A. Goodman and J. Gillespie. 37-59, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

_____. "Richard II, the Author of His Own Downfall?." *History Today* 49, no. 9 (1999): 36-41.

_____." Richard II and the Vocabulary of Kingship." *English Historical Review* 110, no. 438 (1995): 854-877.

Sayles, G. O. "The Deposition of Richard II: Three Lancastrian Narratives." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* (1981): 257-270.

_____. "King Richard II of England, a Fresh Look." *Proceedings of the American PhilosophicalSociety* 115, no.1 (1971): 28-31.

_____. "Richard II in 1381 and 1399."*English Historical Review* 94, no. 373(1979): 820-829.

Smalley, B. "The King's Two Bodies."(review article) *Past & Present* 20 (1961): 30-35.

Stow, G. B. "Richard II in Thomas Walsingham's Chronicles." *Speculum* 59 (1984): 68-102.

_____. "The Vita Ricardi Secundi as a Source for the Reign of Richard II." *Vale of EveshamHistorical Research Papers* 4 (1973): 63-75.

_____. "The Continuation of the Eulogium Historiarum, Some Revisionist Perspectives." *English Historical Review* 119, no. 482 (2004): 667-681.

_____."Stubbs, Steel and Richard II as Insane, the Origin and the Evolution of an English Historiographical Myth." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 143, no. 4 (1999): 601-638.

_____. "Richard II, Leader and Tyrant." *Great Leaders, Great Tyrants*, Ed. A. Blumberg.276-282, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995.

_____. "Richard II in Jean Froissart's Chroniques." *Journal of Medieval History* 11 (1985): 333-345.

Strohm, P."The Trouble with Richard: The Reburial of Richard II and Lancastrian Symbolic Strategy." *Speculum* 71, no.1 (1996): 87-111.

_____. *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation 1399-1422*. London,: Yale University Press, 1998.

Taylor, J. *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

_____."Richard II in the Chronicles." *Richard II, the Art of Kingship.* Ed. A. Goodman and J. Gillespie. 15-37, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Theilmann, J. M. "Caught between Political Theory and Political Practice: The Record and Process of the Deposition of Richard II." *History of Political Thought* 25, no.4 (2004): 599-619.

Tout, F. T. "The Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon". *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* ,6 (1921), 69–113.

Tuck, A. *Crown and Nobility, England 1272-1461*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Valente, C."The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II." *English Historical Review*113, no. 453 (1998): 852-881.

Wilkinson, B. *Constitutional History of Medieval England 1216-1399,* Vol. 2.*: Politics and the Constitution 1307-1399.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.