

HISTORICAL REMARKS

ON THE

DEATH OF RICHARD THE SECOND.

IT is generally known, that much obscurity hangs over the common stories relative to the death of Richard the Second, and that Henry the Fourth was greatly annoyed by reports of the captive king having escaped to Scotland ; reports which he, of course, invariably treated as false, and which all our modern historians, both of England and of Scotland, have been disposed to consider fabulous ; some contenting themselves with a brief notice, that an impostor appeared under the name of Richard the Second, and others passing over the circumstance altogether.

In investigating this obscure part of our history, it was lately my fortune to discover some very interesting evidence, which induced me to believe that there was much more truth in these reports than I was at first disposed to admit. This led to an examination of the whole proofs relative to Richard's disappearance, and alleged death in England, and the

result was, a strong conviction that the king actually did make his escape from Pontefract castle ; that he succeeded in conveying himself to Scotland, where he was discovered, detained, and supported, by Robert the Third and the Duke of Albany ; and that he actually died in that country, long after his reputed murder in England. I am well aware that this is a startling proposition, too broadly in the face of long-established opinion to be admitted upon any evidence inferior almost to demonstration. It is quite possible, also, that there may exist in the manuscript treasures of the public libraries of England, or of France, absolute proof that Richard was murdered, or that he died in prison ; and one great object of these observations will be attained, if they have the effect of directing the attention of the learned to the farther investigation of a subject still very obscure. In the meantime, I trust I shall succeed in showing, that my hypothesis, as to Richard's escape, for it pretends to no higher name, is supported by a body of direct as well as of negative evidence, superior to that which could be adduced upon many other historical facts, the truth of which has not been questioned by the most fastidious and sceptical writers.

It is stated by Bower, or Bow-makar, the continuator of Fordun, and one of the most ancient and authentic of our early historians, that Richard the Second found means to escape from Pontefract castle ; that he succeeded in conveying himself to the Scottish isles, and, travelling in disguise through those remote parts, was accidentally recognised and discovered,

when sitting in the kitchen of Donald Lord of the Isles, by a jester who had been educated at the court of the king in his better days. The same historian proceeds to say, that Donald of the Isles sent him, under the charge of Lord Montgomery, to Robert the Third, with whom, as long as the Scottish monarch lived, he was supported as became his rank; and that, after the death of this king, the royal fugitive was delivered to the Duke of Albany, then governor of Scotland, by whom he was honourably treated; and he concludes this remarkable sentence, which I have given nearly in his own words, by affirming, that Richard at length died in the castle of Stirling, and was buried in the church of the preaching friars, on the north side of the altar.¹

In another part of his history, the same writer, in describing the devastations committed by Richard in his expedition into Scotland, alludes in equally posi-

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii p. 427. "Isto modo rex Ricardus fuit regno privatus et perpetuis carceribus, cito deficiendus deputatus; sed subtiliter abinde ereptus, et ad insulas Scotiæ transvectus, et in coquina Dovenaldi domini Insularum, a quodam fatuo qui in curia Regis Ricardi dum floreret, educatus fuerat cognitus et re-pertus, et a dicto domino Insularum ad Regem Scotiæ Robertum Tertium per Dominum de Monte-Gomorry transmissus, cum quo dum Rex Scotiæ vixerat reverenter, ut decuit, procuratus, et post mortem regis Duci Albanici gubernatori Scotiæ presentatus; cum quo regifice quoad statum honoratus, tandem in castro de Strivelyn mortuus, et in ecclesia fratrum ejusdem ad aquilonare altaris cornu tumulatus."—"Hic Ricardus fuit filius Edwardi principis Walliæ, filii Eduardi Windesor, qui rexit annis viginti duobus; mortuus sine liberis."

tive terms, and almost in the same words, to his subsequent escape into that country, and his being discovered by Donald of the Isles;¹ again, in the passage in which he mentions the death of Robert the Third, the same historian remarks, that about this time many persons fled out of England from the face of Henry the Fourth, and came to King Richard in Scotland; amongst whom were Henry Percy, the elder, with his grandson, Henry Percy, the younger, who had come a little before this, and being of the same age with James the First, had been brought up with him in the castle of St Andrews. At the same time, he continues, there came also the Lord Bardolph, two Welsh prelates, the Bishops of St Asaph and of Bangor, the Abbot of Welbeck, and other honourable persons; but, adds he, King Richard would in no wise be persuaded, either by the governor, or by any other persons, to have a private interview with the Earl of Northumberland;²

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. 402. “Unde ad id deventum est, ut ipse idem Rex Ricardus II., qui olim in florenti majestate sua, stipatus, turnis militum, et multitudine clientum, Salomoni magno in expensis æquiparabatur, tandem carceres evadens, insulas Scotiæ petens, cognitus est a quodam fatuo, qui in sua curia ante hoc educatus fuerat, et inventus in culina, tanquam vilis elixa, Dovenaldi domini Insularum.”

² Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 441. “His diebus fugerunt multi de Anglia a facie regis Henrici IV., et in Scotiam ad regem Ricardum venerunt. Venit enim Henricus Percy, senior, cum nepote suo Henrico juniore qui paulo ante venerat et cum principe nostro Jacobo I. coævus in Castro Sancti Andreæ extiterat. Venitque tunc temporis, dominus de Bardolf, cum diversis honestis personis, et

lastly, under the events of the year 1419, he has this brief entry, "In this year died Richard, King of England, on the Feast of St Luke, in the castle of Stirling."¹ These passages are sufficiently direct and positive, and in estimating the weight to which they are entitled, it must be remembered that the historian states them upon his own knowledge, that he was a contemporary engaged in the collection of materials for his history at the period in question, and that, from his rank in the church, from his employment in responsible offices of state, and his connexion with those best able to give him information upon this subject, his evidence is of an unexceptionable kind. It is indeed true, that in the remote annals of the country, he may be convicted of error; but with regard to events falling within the range of his own personal observation, Bower is entitled to high credit; and he assuredly does not throw out the slightest suspicion as to the identity of the king.

But the credit due to this passage is much strengthened by the circumstance, that he is corroborated in the greater part, if not in the whole of his story, by another valuable original writer, Andrew Winton, whose testimony cannot be regarded as borrowed from Bower, as we know that his Chronicle

duo Episcopi Wallenses, viz. Dominus Griffinus Episcopus Bangorenis et alius episcopus, viz. Assavensis et Abbas de Welbeck. Quo in tempore rex Angliæ Ricardus non potuit induci, neque per gubernatorem nec alios quoscunque ad habendum familiare colloquium cum Comite Northumbriæ."

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 459.

was completed before the history of Bower was begun.¹ It is stated by this historian, in a passage of singular simplicity, of the contents of which I now give a literal transcript, “that after Richard’s deposition by King Henry the Fourth, he was confined in the Tower of London; they then, says he, brought him to Pontefract, where he was delivered to two gentlemen of rank and reputation, named Swinburn and Waterton, who felt compassion for him, and spread a report of the king’s death; after which there arose a rumour that King Richard was still alive.” Winton then proceeds to say, “that he will tell how this report arose, as he heard, although he possesses no information as to the manner in which the king effected his escape from Pontefract: But,” says he, “at this time a poor traveller appeared in the Oute Isles of Scotland, and it happened that he was met by a lady of the family of Bisset, a daughter of an Irish lord, who was wedded to the bro-

¹ Winton, by M’Pherson, preface, p. 22. “It was at his request (Sir John of the Wemyss) that he undertook his Chronicle, 1 Prolog. 54, which was finished between the 3d of September, 1420, and the return of King James from England in 1424, as appears by Robert Duke of Albany being mentioned as dead, and the prayer for the prosperity of his children. ix. xxvi. 51.”—“Bower was born in 1385. In 1403, when eighteen years old, he put on the habit; he afterwards completed his theological studies at Paris, and having returned to Scotland, was elected Abbot of Inchcolm in 1418. After this, he was employed in various offices of trust under the government; and at length, in 1441, began his continuation of Fordun, whose Collectanea he had in his possession.”—Goodal’s Preface to Fordun, p. 3.

ther of the Lord of the Isles. She had before seen the king in Ireland, and she immediately declared to her husband, that this traveller was King Richard; upon which he called him, and enquired whether this was true; but he denied it, and would not allow that it was so. However," continues Winton, "they sent this person to the Lord Montgomery in haste, and afterwards he was kept by Robert, King of Scotland; then he was held for some time by the Lord of Cumbernauld, and lastly delivered to the Duke of Albany, who kept him for a long time after this." The historian then concludes his notice of this mysterious person by the following observation: "Whether he had been the king or not, there were few who knew for certain. He was little inclined to devotion, and seldom showed a desire to hear mass; from the manner in which he conducted himself, it seemed likely that he was half mad or wild."¹ Such is almost a lite-

¹ After describing Richard's deposition, Winton thus proceeds—vol. ii. pp. 387, 388, 389.

“ Wythoutyn dout the court wes hard
 Wyth this forsaid King Richard,
 For in the Toure of Londone syne
 Haldyne he wes a quhile in pyne :
 And eftyre that on purpos set
 Thai brocht hym north on til Powmfret ;
 Thare wes he delyverit then
 Tyl twa wele trowit famous men,
 Swynburn and Wattyrtyn,
 Men of gud reputacioune ;
 Thare he bade, and wes hard stade,
 Gret pitè of hym thir gud men had,

ral translation of Winton's testimony, who was Prior of Lochleven at the time of Richard's appearance,

The word in Yngland thai gert spred
 That this Richard king wes dede,
 Bot eftyr that thare ras tithand,
 That this King Richard wes livand.
 And quhon that rais, I will tel here
 As I hard thare-of the manere.
 Bot I can nocht tell the case
 Off Poumfret as he chapit wase.

“ Bot in the Owt-Ilys of Scotland than
 Thare wes traveland a pure man,
 A Lordis douchtyr of Ireland
 Of the Bissetis, thare dwelland
 Wes weddit wyth a Gentyman,
 De Lord of the Ilys bruthir than,
 In Ireland before quhen scho had bene,
 And the King Richard thare had sene,
 Quhen in the Islis scho saw this man,
 Scho let that scho weil kend hym than,
 Til hir Maistere sone scho past
 And tauld thare til hym als-sa fast,
 That he wes that King of Yngland
 That scho be-fore saw in Ireland,
 Quhen he wes therein before
 As scho drew than to memore ;
 Quhen til hir Mastere this scho had tauld,
 That man rycht sone he tyl hym cald.
 And askit hym, gyf it wes swa.
 That he denyit ; and said nocht, Ya.
 Syn to the Lord of Montgwmery
 That ilke man wes send in hy ;
 That ilke man syne eftyr that
 Robert oure King of Scotland gat,
 The Lord als of Cumbirnald
 That man had a qubile to hald.

and must have had the best opportunities of informing himself of the truth of the story. He cautiously, indeed, declines giving us his own opinion upon the subject, contenting himself with declaring, that few knew for certain whether this mysterious person was the king; but this, I think, may be accounted for, from his high admiration of Albany, and his evident desire not to reveal any thing which might throw a stain upon his government, or that of his son, Duke Murdoch.

We know, from his own words, that Winton regarded Henry the Fourth as an unprincipled usurper, who had unjustly dethroned the rightful king;¹ and to have admitted that Albany detained Richard in an honourable captivity, whilst he recognised the title of Henry to the throne, would have little corresponded with the high character which he has elsewhere given of him. This disposition of the historian is strikingly illustrated by the manner in which he passes over the murder of the Duke of Rothsay. It is now established by undoubted evidence, that the prince was murdered by Albany and Douglas;

The Duke of Albany syne hym gat,
 And held hym lang tyme eftyr that :
 Quhethir he had bene king, or nane,
 Thare wes bot few, that wyst certane.
 Of devotioune nane he wes
 And seildyn will had to here mes,
 As he bare hym, like wes he
 Oft half wod or wyld to be."

¹ Winton, vol. ii. p. 386.

yet Winton omits the dreadful event, and gives us only a brief notice of his death.¹ And I may observe, that in his account of the deposition of Henry, and the subsequent escape of Richard into Scotland, he has introduced a remark which is evidently intended as an apology to the reader for the concealment of part of the truth. "Although," says he, "every thing which you write should be true, yet in all circumstances to tell the whole truth, is neither needful nor speedful."²

Yet although the cautious Prior of Lochleven did not choose to commit himself by telling the whole truth, he states two remarkable circumstances which do not appear elsewhere. The first of these is the denial, by the person in question, that he was the king, when he was discovered by Donald of the Isles; a very extraordinary step certainly to be taken by an impostor, but a natural one to be adopted by the fugitive king himself, for at this time Donald of the Isles was in strict alliance with Henry the Fourth.³ The second is the new fact, that Richard was delivered at Pontefract to two trust-worthy and well-known gentlemen, Swinburn and Waterton. Such strict secrecy was observed by Henry as to the mode in which

¹ Winton's Chronicle, vol. ii. p. 397.

² Ibid.

"And in al thing full suth to say
Is noucht neidful na speidful ay.
Bot quhat at suld writyn be
Suld be al suth of honestè."

³ Rotuli Scotiae, vol. ii. p. 156.

the dethroned monarch was conveyed to Pontefract, and the persons to whose custody he was intrusted, that neither in the public papers, nor in the contemporary English historians, is there any particular information upon the subject. But it is certain, that Sir Thomas Swinburn and Sir Robert Waterton were two knights in the confidence and employment of Henry, and that Waterton, in particular, was steward of the honour of Pontefract;¹ a circumstance which tends strongly to corroborate the account of Winton, and to show that, although he did not think it prudent to tell the whole truth, he yet possessed sources of very authentic information. There is no mention of Winton in Bower's additions to Fordun; a strong proof, I think, that this last author had never seen his Chronicle, so that we are entitled to consider these two passages as proceeding from two witnesses, who,

¹ Whitaker's *Loidis and Elmete*, p. 269. Waterton was master of the horse to Henry the Fourth, who employed him in a foreign mission to the Duke of Gueldres. *Cottonian Catalogue*, p. 245. No. 88, also p. 244. In May 7, 1404, Sir Thomas Swinborne was sent on a mission to the magistrates of Bruges. *Ibid.* p. 244. See also *Fordun a Goodal*, vol. ii. p. 428. I have much pleasure in acknowledging the polite and friendly attention of Sir John Swinburn, Bart. of Capheaton, to my enquiries upon this subject. From his information I am enabled to state, that although in his own family there is no evidence, either written or traditionary, on the subject of Richard the Second, yet in the family of the present Mr Waterton of Walton-Hall, the descendant of Sir Robert Waterton, Master of the Horse to Henry the Fourth, there is a long-established tradition, that his ancestor had the charge of Richard the Second in Pontefract castle.

being totally unconnected with each other, yet concur in the same story. Nor is it difficult to account for the more particular and positive account of Bower, if we recollect that this author composed his history under the reign of James the Second; twenty years after Winton had completed his Chronicle, when all were at liberty to speak freely of the actions and character of Albany, and time had been given to this writer to investigate and discover the truth.

In an ancient manuscript in the Advocates' Library, which I conjecture to have been written posterior to the time of Fordun, and prior to the date of Bower's continuation, I have found three passages which corroborate the accounts of this author and of Winton in a very striking manner. The manuscript is entitled, *Extracta ex Chronicis Scotiae*, and at folio 254 has the following passage: "Henry Percy Earl of Northumberland, with his nephew Henry the younger, and many others of the prelates and nobles of England, who fled from the face of Henry the Fourth, came into Scotland to King Richard, at this time an exile, but well treated by the governor."¹ In another part of the same manuscript, the account given of the death of Richard, by Bower, is thus briefly but positively confirmed, with the valuable addition of the monkish or leonine

¹ "Percy Henricus Comes Northumbriae cum nepote suo Henrico minore et multi alii nobiles Angliae ac praelati fugientes a facie Henrici quarti Regis Angliae Scotiam venerunt ad regem Ricardum exulem, per gubernatorem bene tractati."—*Extracta ex Chronicis Scotiae*, folio 254. MS. Adv. Lib.

epitaph inscribed above his tomb: "Richard the Second, King of England, died in the castle of Stirling, in the aforesaid year, and was buried on the Feast of St Lucie the Virgin, on the north side of the high altar of the Preaching Friars;" above whose royal image there painted, it is thus written:

"*Angliæ Ricardus jacet hic rex ipse sepultus.
Loncaste quem Dux dejecit arte, mota prodicione
Prodicione potens, sceptro potitur iniquo.
Supplicium luit hunc ipsius omne genus.
Ricardum inferis hunc Scotia sustulit annis
Qui caustro Striveling vite peregit iter
Anno milleno quaterceno quoque deno
Et nono Christi regis finis fuit iste.*"¹

The church of the Dominican friars at Stirling has long since been destroyed, and other buildings erected on its site. It existed, however, in the time of Boece, who mentions the inscription over Richard's tomb as being visible in his day.² Such being the clear and positive statements of these respectable contemporary writers; whilst, as I shall afterwards show, the accounts of the reputed death of the king by the English historians were extremely vague and contradictory, and the reports of his escape frequent, I certainly did not feel disposed to follow Buchanan, and the whole body of English and Scottish historians who succeeded him, in treating the story as fabulous, or in considering the person whom Bower so positively asserts to have been the king, as an impostor. —

¹ Extracta ex Chronicis Scotiæ, fol. 263, verso.

² Boece, Hist. p. 352.

Having proceeded thus far in these researches, I began the examination of that part of the Chamberlain Accounts, which forms the continuation of those valuable unpublished records, of which I have already given a description, in the appendix to the second volume of this history. It contains the accounts of the great chamberlains and other ministers of the crown during the government of the Duke of Albany; and in examining them with that deep interest which such authentic documents demand, I came upon the following extraordinary passages, which I shall translate literally from the Latin. The first occurs at the end of the accounts for the year 1408, and is as follows: "Be it remembered also, that the said lord governor, down to the present time, has neither demanded nor received any allowance for the sums expended in the support of Richard King of England, and the messengers of France and of Wales, at different times coming into the country, upon whom he has defrayed much, as is well known."¹ Again, at the conclusion of accounts for the year 1414, the following passage is to be found: "Be it remembered also, that our lord the duke, governor of the kingdom, has not received any allowance or credit for the expenses of King Richard incurred from the period of the death of his brother our lord the king

¹ "Et memorandum quod dictus dominus gubernator regni non peciit neque recepit ad presens aliquam allocationem pro expensis suis factis super Ricardum regem Angliæ; et Nuncios Franciæ vel Walliæ diversis vicibus infra regnum venient: circa quos multa exposuit, ut est notum." Rotuli Compotorum, vol. iii. p. 18.

of good memory, last deceased.”¹ The same memorandum, in precisely the same words, is inserted at the termination of the Chamberlain Accounts for the year 1415;² and lastly, at the conclusion of the year 1417, there is this passage: “Be it remembered, that the lord governor has not received any allowance for the expenses and burdens which he sustained for the custody of King Richard of England from the time of the death of the late king his brother of good memory, being a period of eleven years, which expenses the lords auditors of accounts estimate at the least to have amounted annually to the sum of a hundred marks, which for the past years makes in all L.733, 6s. 8d.”³

The discovery of these remarkable passages in records of unquestionable authenticity, was very satisfactory. I considered them as affording a proof, nearly as convincing as the nature of the subject admits of, that the story given by Bower and by Win-

¹ “Et memorandum quod dominus dux gubernator regni non recepit allocationem aliquam pro expensis regis Ricardi, a tempore obitus bone memorie Domini regis fratris sui ultimo, defuncti.” *Rotuli Compotorum*, vol. iii. p. 69.

² *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 78.

³ “Et memorandum quod dominus gubernator non recepit allocationem pro expensis et oneribus quas sustinuit pro custodia regis Ricardi Anglie, a tempore obitus bone memorie quondam domini regis fratris sui, jam per undecim annos. Quas expensas annuatim dni auditores compotorum estimant ad minus fuisse in quolibet, anno centum marcas. Quæ summa se extendit pro annis præteritis ad vii^c xxxiii lib. vi sh. viii d. quæ summa debetur domino duci.”

ton is substantially true ; as establishing, upon direct evidence, which hitherto I can see no cause to suspect, the fact so positively asserted during the reign of Henry the Fourth and Henry the Fifth, that Richard the Second had escaped into Scotland, and lived there for many years after his reputed death in England. That an impostor should, as we learn from Winton, deny that he was the king, or that, in the face of this denial, a poor maniac should be supported at great expense, and detained for more than eleven years at the Scottish court, seems to me so extravagant a supposition, that I do not envy the task of any one who undertakes to support it. It was due, however, to the respectable historians who had adopted the common opinion regarding the death of Richard in 1399, that the evidence upon which they proceeded should be diligently weighed and examined. This I have done, with an earnest desire to arrive at the truth in this mysterious story ; and the result has been, the discovery of a body of negative evidence, superior, I think, to that which could be brought in support of most historical facts.

And here I may first remark, that there is no certain proof furnished by contemporary English writers, that Richard the Second either died or was murdered in Pontefract castle ; the accounts of the best historians being not only vague and inconsistent with each other, but many of them such as can easily be proved to be false by unexceptionable evidence. So much, indeed, is this the case, that some ingenious English authors have of late years attempted to clear

up the mass of obscurity and contradiction which hangs over the fate of Richard, and after having done all which could be accomplished by erudition and acuteness, have been compelled to leave the question, as to the manner of his death, in nearly the same uncertainty in which they found it.¹

Walsingham, a contemporary historian of good authority, although attached to the house of Lancaster, affirms, that, according to common report, "*ut fertur*," he died by a voluntary refusal of food, on the 14th of February 1399. "Richard," says he, "the former king of England, when he had heard of these disasters, became disturbed in his mind, and, as is reported, put an end to his life by voluntary abstinence, breathing his last at Pontefract castle on St Valentine's day."² Thomas of Otterburn, however, who was also a contemporary, gives a story essentially different; for he informs us that the king, although he at first determined to starve himself to death, afterwards repented, and wished to take food, but that in consequence of his abstinence, the orifice of the stomach was shut, so that he could not eat, and died of weakness. "When Richard," he observes, "the late king of England, who was then a prisoner in Pontefract castle, had learnt the misfortune of his brother

¹ See the learned dissertations of Mr Webb and Mr Amyot, in the 20th vol. of the *Archæologia*.

² Walsingham, p. 363. "*Ricardus quondam rex Angliæ cum audisset hæc infortunia, mente consternatus, semetipsum extinxit inedia voluntaria ut fertur, clausitque diem extremum apud castrum de Pontefracto die Sancti Valentine.*"

John of Holland, and the rest of his friends, he fell into such profound grief, that he took the resolution of starving himself, and, as it is reported, he so long abstained from food that the orifice of his stomach was closed; so that when he was afterwards persuaded by his keepers to satisfy the craving of nature, by attempting to take nourishment, he found himself unable to eat, and his constitution sinking under it, he expired in the same place on St Valentine's day."¹

In direct opposition to this story of death by voluntary abstinence, (a mode of extinction which is pronounced by an excellent historian to be inconsistent with the previous character of the king,)² a completely different tale is given by the author of a French manuscript work, in the royal library at Paris, who seems to be the first to whom we owe the introduction of Sir Piers Exton, and his band of eight assassins, who murdered Richard with their halberts and battle-axes. This account has been repeated by Fabyan and Hall, in their Chronicles, by Hayward, in his Life of Richard, and in consequence of its adoption by Shakspeare, has become, and will

¹ Otterburn, pp. 228, 229. "Ricardus quondam rex Angliæ in castro de Pontefracto existens custoditus, cum audisset infortunium fratris sui Joannis Holland, et ceterorum, in tantam devenit tristitiam, quod semet inedia voluit peremisse, et tantum dicitur abstinuisse, quod clauso orificio stomachi, cum ex post, consilio custodum, voluisset naturæ satisfacisse comedendo, præcluso omni appetitu comedere non valeret, unde factum est, ut natura debilitata, defecerit, et die Sancti Valentini, diem clausit supremum ibidem."

² Turner, Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 339.

probably continue, the general belief of Europe. For a complete exposure of the falsehood of this tale of assassination, I shall content myself with a simple reference to Mr Amyot's paper on the death of Richard the Second, which is printed in the *Archæologia*.¹

There is lastly a class of contemporary authorities which ascribe the death of the king neither to voluntary abstinence, nor to the halbert of Sir Piers Exton—but to starvation by his keepers. The manuscript Chronicle of Kenilworth uses expressions which amount to this:—"Fame et siti, ut putatur, dolenter consummatus." A Chronicle, in the Harleian collection, the work of Peter de Ickham, is more positive: "Acibo et potu per iv. aut v. dies restrictus, fame et inedia expiravit." Hardyng, the chronicler, who was a contemporary, and lived in the service and enjoyed the confidence of Hotspur and his father, repeats the same story.² Whilst we thus see that the accounts of so many writers who lived at the time are utterly at variance; one saying that he starved himself, another that he repented, and wished to eat, but found it too late, and died; a third, that it took all the efforts of Exton and his accomplices, by repeated blows, to fell him to the ground; and the last class of writers, that his death was occasioned by his keepers depriving him of all nourishment, the proper inference to be drawn from such discrepancies in the various accounts amounts simply to this—that about

¹ *Archæologia*, vol. xx. pp. 427, 428.

² *Chron. Harl. MS.* 4323, p. 68. *Archæologia*, vol. xx. p. 282.

this time the king disappeared, and no one knew what became of him.

It may be said, however, that all contemporary writers agree that the king did die, although they differ as to the manner of his death; yet even this is not the case: on the contrary, the belief that he had escaped, and was alive, seems to have been entertained in England by many, and those the persons most likely to have access to the best information, almost immediately after his being committed to Pontefract, and apparently before there was time to have any communication with Scotland. This can be very convincingly shown.

Some time after Richard had been conveyed with great secrecy to his prison in Pontefract castle, and previous to his reported death, a conspiracy was formed against Henry the Fourth by the Earls of Kent, Salisbury, and Huntingdon.¹ These noblemen, along with the Bishop of Carlisle and the Abbot of Westminster, were the chief actors in the plot; but they had drawn into it many persons of inferior rank, and, amongst the rest, Maudelain, a priest, who had been a favourite of the king, and who resembled him so completely in face and person, that it is said the likeness might have deceived any one.² Their design was to murder Henry at a tournament which they were to hold at Windsor, and to restore King Richard. After every thing, however, as they supposed, had been

¹ Walsingham, pp. 362, 363.

² Metrical History of Deposition of Richard the Second, p. 213.

admirably organized, the plot was betrayed to Henry by one of their own number; and on arriving at Windsor, they found that their intended victim had fled to London. They now changed their purpose, and marched to Sunning, near Reading, where Richard's youthful queen resided, who had not at this time completed her ninth year. Here, according to the account of Walsingham and of Otterburn, the Earl of Kent, addressing the attendants and friends of the queen, informed them that Henry of Lancaster had fled to the Tower of London, and that they were now on their road to meet King Richard, their lawful prince, who had escaped from prison, and was then at the bridge of Radcote with a hundred thousand men.¹ The last part of the assertion was undoubtedly false; the first clause of the sentence contains the first assertion of Richard's escape which I have met with, and I may remark, that with the exception of the two dignified ecclesiastics, none of the conspirators, whose testimony could have thrown light upon the subject, were suffered to live. The Earls of Surrey and of Salisbury were taken and executed at Cirencester; the Lords Lumley and Despencer shared the same fate at Bristol; the Earl of Huntingdon was seized near London, and beheaded at Pleshy; two priests, one of them Maudelain, whose extraordinary likeness to the king has been already noticed, with another named

¹ The expressions of Walsingham, p. 363, are slightly different from those of Otterburn. Walsingham's words are, "Quia jam evasit de carcere et jacet ad Pontem-fractum cum centum millibus defensorum." Those of Otterburn are, "Qui jam evasit carcere et jacet ad pontem de Radcote cum 100,000 hominum defensionis," p. 226.

Ferby, were executed at London; Sir Bernard Brocas and Sir John Schevele shared their fate; and others, whose names Walsingham has not preserved, suffered at Oxford.¹ Rapin has asserted, that both the ecclesiastics who were involved in the plot, the Abbot of Westminster and the Bishop of Carlisle, died almost immediately, the abbot of a stroke of apoplexy, and the bishop of absolute terror;² but this is an error. The Bishop of Carlisle, who was tried and pardoned, undoubtedly lived till 1409. And although the Abbot of Westminster appears to have died of apoplexy, neither the cause nor the time of his death agree with the story in Rapin.³ It is quite clear, however, that previous to Richard's reported death, it was asserted that he had escaped from Pontefract castle.

A contemporary French manuscript, being a Metrical History of the Deposition of Richard the Second, which has been translated and published by Mr Webb in the *Archæologia*, whilst it confirms the story of Richard's alleged escape, adds, that to induce the people to believe it, they brought Maudelain the priest with them, and drest him up to personate the king. The passage, which is as follows, is amusing and curious:—"They," says this author, speaking of the conspirators, "had many archers with them. They said that good King Richard had left his prison and

¹ Metrical Hist. of Deposition of Richard the Second, p. 115, *Archæologia*.

² Rapin, vol. i. p. 490. Fol. ed. London, 1732.

³ Godwin, p. 767.

was there with them ; and to make this the more credible, they had brought a chaplain who so exactly resembled good King Richard in face and person, in form and in speech, that every one who saw him certified and declared that he was the old king. He was called Maudelain. Many time have I seen him in Ireland, riding through the country with King Richard his master. I have not for a long time seen a fairer priest. They armed the aforesaid as king, and set a very rich crown upon his helm, that it might be believed of a truth that the king was out of prison.”¹ I have given this passage from the metrical history, because I wish the reader to be possessed of all the contemporary evidence which may assist him in the discovery of the truth, whilst I acknowledge at the same time, that the additional circumstance as to the personification of Richard by Maudelain the priest, rather seems at first to militate against the accuracy of the story as to Richard’s escape. It ought to be remembered, however, that Walsingham says nothing of this personification ; and his evidence, which is that of a contemporary in England, ought to outweigh the testimony of the French

¹ Archæologia, vol. xx. p. 214. Translation of a French Metrical History of the Deposition of Richard the Second, with prefatory observations, notes, and an appendix, by the Rev. John Webb. Mr Webb’s notes are extremely learned and interesting, and have furnished me with some valuable corroborations of the truth of my theory as to Richard’s fate. In the above passage, Mr Webb translates “le roy ancien” “the old king.” At this time Richard was not thirty-three years of age. Perhaps “the late king” would express the meaning more correctly.

Chronicle, which in this part is avowedly hearsay. Neither does Otterburn mention this circumstance, although it was too remarkable to be omitted if it really occurred.

There is, however, another manuscript in the library of the King of France, entitled, "Relation de la prise de Richard Seconde, par Berry Roy d'Armes," which in some measure enables us to reconcile this discrepancy. According to the account which it contains, it was resolved at the meeting of the conspirators, which was held in the house of the Abbot of Westminster, that "Maudelain was to ride with them, to represent King Richard;" but this plan was not afterwards carried into execution. It appears from the same manuscript, that Henry himself, when marching against the conspirators, believed the story of Richard's escape. This, I think, is evident from the following passage: "Next morning Henry set out to meet his enemies, with only fifty lances and six thousand archers, and drawing up his men without the city, waited three hours for his reinforcements. Here he was reproached by the Earl of Warwick for his lenity, which had brought him into this danger; but he vindicated himself for his past conduct, adding, 'that if he should meet Richard now, one of them should die.'"¹ I do not see how Henry

¹ Archæologia, vol. xx. pp. 218, 219. From this curious manuscript, which belonged to the celebrated Baluze, large extracts were made by Mr Allen, Master of Dulwich College, a gentleman of deep research in English history, and communicated to Mr Webb, from whose notes I have taken them,

could have expressed himself in this way to the Earl of Warwick, unless he then believed that Richard had really escaped, and was about to meet him in the field.

It was almost immediately after the suppression of this conspiracy, and the execution of its authors, that Richard was reported to have died in Pontefract castle; and we now come to the consideration of a very extraordinary part of the story, in the exposition of the dead body by Henry, for the purpose of proving to the people that it was the very body of their late king. Of this ceremony Otterburn gives the following account: "His body was carried and exposed in the principal places intervening betwixt Pontefract and London; that part, at least, of the person was shown, by which he could be recognised, I mean the face, which was exposed from the lower part of the forehead to the throat. Having reached London, it was conveyed to the church of St Paul's, where the king, along with some of his nobles, and the citizens of London, attended the funeral, both on the first and the second day; after the conclusion of the mass, the body was carried back to Langley, in order to be there interred amongst the preaching friars; which interment accordingly took place, being conducted without any pomp, by the Bishop of Chester, and the Abbots of St Albans and of Waltham."¹ The manner in which this funeral procession to St Paul's was conducted, is minutely described in the following

² Otterburn, p. 229.

passage, extracted by Mr Allen from the manuscript in the royal library at Paris, already quoted : “ In the year 1399–1400, on the 12th day of March, was brought to the church of St Paul of London, in the state of a gentleman, the body of the noble king Richard. And true it is, that it was in a carriage which was covered with a black cloth,¹ having four banners thereupon, whereof two were the arms of St George, and the other two the arms of St Edward, to wit, azure, over all a cross or ; and there were a hundred and thirty men, who were all clad in white, and they went to meet the noble King Richard ; and he was brought to St Paul, the head church of London. There he was two days above ground, to show him to those of the said city, that they might believe for certain that he was dead, for they required no other thing.”²

This ceremony took place on the 12th of March, 1399, nearly a month after the king’s reputed death on the 14th of February ; and it would appear, from the expressions which are employed, that the citizens of London believed that Richard had escaped, and was

¹ “ There is a curious representation of this chariot in the fine illuminated Froissart in the British Museum, from whence it appears that the carriage was drawn by two horses, one placed before the other, just as the five horses were placed in the French carriage of Henry VII., as described by Hall, vol. iii. p. 800.” Gough’s Sepulchral Monuments, vol. iii. p. 166.

There is in the same MS. a portrait of Richard the Second when going to arrest the Duke of Gloucester at Pleshy.—Archæol. vol. vi. p. 315.

² French Metrical History.—Archæologia, p. 221.

alive, and that the exposure of the body was resorted to by Henry, as the most probable means of putting down this dangerous report. The question now immediately arises, if Richard was alive, according to the theory which I entertain, in what manner are we to account for this ceremony at St Paul's, and for the body lying in state at the different churches between Pontefract and London? My answer is, that the whole was a deception, ingeniously got up for the purpose of blinding the people, but when narrowly examined, betraying the imposition in a very palpable manner. It is accordingly positively asserted by the contemporary author of the French metrical history of Richard's deposition, that the body thus exposed in London was not that of the king, but of Maudelain the priest. I give the passage in Mr Webb's translation: "Then was the king so vexed at heart by this evil news, that he neither ate nor drank from that hour, and thus, as they say, it came to pass that he died; but, indeed, I do not believe it, for some declare that he is still alive and well, shut up in their prison, which is a great disgrace for them; and notwithstanding this, they caused a dead man to be openly carried through the city of London, in such pomp and ceremony as becometh a deceased king, saying that it was the body of the deceased King Richard. Duke Henry there made a show of mourning, holding the pall after him, followed by all those of his blood in fair array, without regarding him, or the evils which they had done unto him. * * Thus, as you shall hear, did they carry the dead body

to St Paul's, in London, honourably, and as of right appertaineth to a king. But I do not believe, for certain, that it was the late king; but I think it was Maudelain, his chaplain, who, in face, size, height, and make, so exactly resembled him, that every one firmly thought it was good King Richard. If, however, it were he, I heartily make my prayer to the merciful and holy God, that he will take his soul to heaven."¹

A late author, Mr Amyot, in an ingenious paper in the *Archæologia*, considers that the circumstance of Maudelain having been beheaded, rendered such deception impossible. To the support of my ideas as to Richard's escape, it is of little consequence whether Maudelain's remains were employed, or some other mode of deception was resorted to—all that I contend for is, that the body thus carried in a litter, or car, to St Paul's, was not that of the king. Now, the more narrowly we examine the circumstances attending this exposition of the body at St Paul's, the more completely shall we be convinced, I think, that the French historian is correct, and that it was not the true Richard. Of the king's person a minute description has been left us by the monk of Evesham. "He was of the common or middle size, with yellow hair, his face fair and rosy, rather round than long, and sometimes diseased."²

Keeping in mind this description of the person of

¹ French Metrical Hist. pp. 219, 220, 221.

² MS. Bib. Swan. quoted by Turner, *Hist. England*, vol. ii. p. 339.

the real Richard, and comparing it with the manner in which Henry conducted the exhibition at St Paul's, a strong suspicion arises that he was not in possession of the actual body of the king. Why was his head entirely concealed, and the face only shown from the lower part of the forehead to the throat? Richard's yellow hair was the very mark which would have enabled the people to identify their late monarch; and so far from being concealed, we should have been led to expect that it would have been studiously displayed. Had the king indeed died by the murderous strokes of Exton and his accomplices inflicted on the head, there might have been good cause for concealing the gashes; but it will be recollected this cannot be pleaded, as this story is now given up on all hands as a fable.

There is another circumstance, which in my mind corroborates this suspicion of deception. Henry's wish was to do public honour to the body of the late king. He attended, we see, the service for the dead, and held the pall of the funeral car; but no interment followed, the body was not permitted to be buried in London at all; although there was then a tomb ready, which Richard, previous to his deposition, had prepared for himself in Westminster Abbey, and to which Henry the Fifth afterwards removed the reputed remains of the king.¹ It was con-

¹ Richard the Second's Will is to be found published amongst the Royal and Noble Wills, p. 202. The king there directs his body to be buried in "Ecclesia Sancti Petri Westmonasterii—in monu-

veyed, apparently in the same car in which it lay in state, to Langley, in Hertfordshire, and there interred with great secrecy, and without any funeral pomp. "When the funeral service," says Walsingham, "was concluded in the church of St Paul, the king and the citizens of London being present, the body was immediately carried back to Langley, to be interred in the church of the Preaching Friars; the last offices being performed by the Bishop of Chester, the Abbots of St Albans and of Waltham, without the presence of the nobles, and unattended by any concourse of the people, nor was there any one who, after their labours, would invite them to dinner."¹ It must be evident to every one, that as Henry's avowed object was to convince the English people that Richard their late king was dead and buried, the greater concourse of people who attended his funeral, and the more public that ceremony was made, the more likely was he to attain his desire. In this light, then, the sudden removal from London, the secret burial at Langley, "*sine pompa, sine magnatum præsentia, sine populari turba,*" are circumstances which, I own, create in my mind a strong impression that Henry was not in possession of the real body of the king; that either the head of Maudelain the priest, or some other specious contrivance, was employed to deceive the people, and

mento quod ad nostrum et inclitæ recordacionis Annæ dudum Reginae Angliæ consortis nostræ, cujus animæ prospicietur altissimus erigi fecimus memoriam." A description and engraving of this monument is to be seen in Gough's Sepulchral Monuments.

¹ Walsingham, p. 363. Otterburn, p. 229.

that Henry did not think it prudent to permit a public funeral; because, however easy it may have been to impose upon the spectators, so long as they were merely permitted to see the funeral car in which the body lay covered up with black cloth, and having nothing but the face exposed, the process of removing from the litter, arraying it for the grave, and placing it in the coffin, might have led to a discovery of the deception which had been practised. It is perfectly clear, that the evidence of a single person who had known the king, had he been permitted to uncover the head and face, and to examine the person, would have been itself worth the testimony of thousands who gazed for a moment on the funeral car, and passed on; and it is for this reason that I set little value on the account of Froissart, (whose history of the transactions connected with Richard's deposition is full of error,¹) when he asserts that the body was seen by twenty thousand persons, or of Hardyng, who relates that he himself saw the "corse in herse rial;" and that the report was, he had been "forhungered or starved, and lapte in lede."

Another proof of the conviction of the country, that this exhibition of the body of Richard was a deception upon the part of Henry, is to be found in the reports of his escape which not long afterwards arose in England, and the perpetual conspiracies in which men of rank and consequence freely hazarded, and in many cases lost their lives, which were invariably

¹ Webb's Translation of the Metrical Hist. of the Deposition of Richard the Second, p. 7. Archæologia, vol. xx.

accompanied with the assertion that Richard was alive in Scotland. It is a remarkable circumstance, that these reports and conspiracies continued from the alleged year of his death, through the whole period occupied by the reigns of Henry the Fourth and Henry the Fifth. The year 1402 absolutely teemed with reports that Richard was alive, as appears clearly from Walsingham. A priest of Ware was one of the first victims of Henry's resentment. He had, it seems, encouraged his brethren, by affirming that Richard was alive, and would shortly appear to claim his own rights; in consequence of which he was drawn and quartered. Not long after, eight Franciscan friars were hanged at London, for having asserted that Richard was alive, one of whom, a doctor of divinity, named Frisby, owing to the boldness and obstinacy with which he maintained his loyalty, was executed in the habit of his order. About the same time Walter de Baldock, Prior of Launde, in Leicestershire, was hanged because he had published the same story. Sir Roger de Clarendon, a natural son of the Black Prince, and one of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber to Richard the Second, along with his armour-bearer and page, were condemned and executed for the same offence.¹ In these cases there appears to have been no regularly formed conspiracy, as in the instances to be afterwards mentioned. The Franciscan friars, it is well known, were in the habit of travelling through various countries, and were in con-

¹ Walsingham, p. 365. Otterburn, p. 234. Nichol's Leicestershire, vol. iii. pp. 260, 305.

stant intercourse with Scotland, where they had many convents.¹ They had probably seen the king, or become possessed of certain evidence that he was alive, and they told the story on their return.

Of these reports, however, we have the best evidence in two papers issued by Henry himself, and preserved in the *Fœdera Angliæ*.² From the first of these documents, which is a pardon under the privy seal to John Bernard of Offely, we learn some interesting particulars of the state of public belief as to the escape and existence of Richard. Bernard, it seems, had met with one William Balshalf of Lancashire, who, on being asked what news he had to tell, answered, "That King Richard, who had been deposed, was alive and well in Scotland, and would come into England upon the Feast of St John the Baptist next to come, if not before it." Balshalf added, "That Serle, who was then with King Richard, had arranged every thing for his array and entrance into England, and that they would have timely warning of it; whilst he reported that Henry the Fourth, in fear of such an event, had collected great sums of money from his lieges with the intention of evacuating the kingdom, repairing to Brittany, and marrying the duchess of that country. Bernard then asked Balshalf what was best to be done, who bade him raise certain men, and take his way to meet King Richard; upon which he went to John White and

¹ Quetif et Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, p. 10, 11.

² Rymer, *Fœdera*, vol. viii. p. 262. A.D. 1402, 1st June.

William Threshire of Offely, to whom he told the whole story, and who immediately consented to accompany him to Athereston, near the Abbey of Merivale, there to await the king's arrival, and give him their support." This conversation Bernard revealed to Henry, and having offered to prove it on the body of Balshalf, who denied it, the king appointed a day for the trial by battle, which accordingly took place, and Balshalf was vanquished. The consequence was a free pardon to Bernard, which is dated on the 1st of June, 1402, and in which the above circumstances are distinctly stated. The person of the name of Serle here mentioned, as being with Richard in Scotland, was undoubtedly William Serle, gentleman of the bedchamber to Richard the Second, and one of the executors of his will.¹ He was infamous as one of the murderers of the Duke of Gloucester, and was soon after engaged in a second plot to restore the king. These transactions took place in 1402, and sufficiently prove the little credit given by the people of England to the story of the king's death, and the funeral service which was enacted at Westminster.

Friday Nov 29. —

Next year, in 1403, occurred the celebrated rebellion of the Percies, which ended in the battle of Shrewsbury, and the death of Hotspur. Previous to the battle, the Earl of Worcester and Henry Percy drew up a manifesto, which was delivered to King

¹ Richard's Will, p. 200. It is dated 16th April, 1399.

Henry upon the field by two squires of Percy, in which Henry is charged with having caused Richard to perish by hunger, thirst, and cold, after fifteen days and nights of sufferings unheard of among Christians. Yet, however broad and bold this accusation of murder, the principal persons who made it, and the only ones who survived its publication, afterwards altered their opinions, and employed very different expressions. This manifesto is drawn up in the name of the old Earl of Northumberland, although he had not then joined the army which fought at Shrewsbury, and it was sanctioned and approved by Richard Scrope, Archbishop of York. It commences, “*Nos Henricus Percy, comes Northumbrie, constabularius Angliæ;*” and Hardyng the chronicler, who was then with Hotspur and Worcester in the field, as he himself informs us, adds, “that their quarrel was be goode advyse and counsell of Maister Richard Scrope, Archebishope of Yorke.” Now, it will immediately be seen, that two years after this, in 1405, Scrope and the Earl engaged in a second conspiracy against Henry, and in the articles which they then published, the positive statement in the manifesto as to Richard’s death, is very materially changed.¹ I

¹ We owe the publication of this curious and interesting manifesto to Mr Henry Ellis. *Archæologia*, vol. xvi. p. 141. “*Tu ipsum dominum nostrum regem et tuum, proditorie in castro tuo de Pountefreite, sine consensu suo, seu judicio dominorum regni, per quindecim dies et tot noctes, quod horrendum est inter Christianos auderi, fame, scitu, et frigore interfici fecisti, et murthero periri, unde perjurus es, et falsus.*”

may here again use the words of Mr Amyot, in his paper on the death of Richard the Second. "On turning," says he, "from this letter of defiance in 1403, to the long and elaborate manifesto of Archbishop Scrope and the Yorkshire insurgents in 1405, we shall find a considerable diminution in the force of the charge, not indeed that one single day is abated out of the fifteen allotted to the starvation, but the whole story is qualified by the diluting words, '*ut vulgariter dicitur.*' So that in two years the tale which had before been roundly asserted as a fact, must have sunk into a mere rumour."¹ The accusation of the Percies, therefore, which is the only broad and unqualified charge brought against Henry by contemporaries, is not entitled to belief, as having been virtually abandoned by the very persons to whom it owes its origin.

This conspiracy of Hotspur having been put down in 1403, in 1404 Henry was again made miserable by new reports proceeding from Scotland regarding the escape of Richard, and his being alive in that country. These rumours, we learn from Otterburn, not only prevailed amongst the populace, but were common even in the household of the king.² Serle, one of the gentlemen of Richard's bedchamber, who, as we have already seen, had repaired to Scotland, returned from that country, with positive assertions that he had been with Richard, from whom he brought letters

¹ Archæologia, vol. xx. p. 436.

² Otterburn, p. 249. "Confabulatio quæ prius viguit non solum in vulgari populo sed etiam in ipsa dominis regis domo."

and communications, addressed under his privy seal to his friends in England.¹ Maud, the old Countess of Oxford, a lady far advanced in life, and little likely to engage, upon slight information, in any plot, "caused it to be reported," says Walsingham, "throughout Essex, by her domestics, that King Richard was alive, and would soon come back to recover and assert his former rank. She caused also little stags of silver and gold to be fabricated, presents which the king was wont to confer upon his most favourite knights and friends; so that, by distributing these in place of the king, she might the more easily entice the most powerful men in that district to accede to her wishes. In this way," continues Walsingham, "she compelled many to believe that the king was alive; and the report was daily brought from Scotland, that he had there procured an asylum, and only waited for a convenient time, when, with the strong assistance of the French and the Scots, he might recover the kingdom." Walsingham then goes on to observe, "that the plot of the Countess was not only favoured by the deception of Serle, but that she had brought over to her belief several abbots of that country, who were tried and committed to prison; and that, in particular, a clerk, who had asserted that he had lately talked with the king, describing minutely his dress, and the place of the meeting, was rewarded by being drawn and hanged."²

It is stated by Dr Lingard, in his account of this

¹ Walsingham, p. 370.

² Ibid, p. 371.

conspiracy,¹ on the authority of Rymer's *Fœdera*, and the Rolls of Parliament, that Serle being disappointed of finding his master alive, prevailed upon a person named Warde to personate the king; and that many were thus deceived. Although, however, this personification by Warde is distinctly asserted in Henry's proclamation, it is remarkable that it is not only omitted by Walsingham, but is inconsistent with his story; and the total silence of this historian, as also that of Otterburn, (both of them contemporaries,) induces me to believe, that the story of Thomas Warde personating King Richard, was one of those forgeries which Henry, as I shall afterwards show, did not scruple to commit when they could serve his purposes. What became afterwards of Warde cannot be discovered; but Serle was entrapped, and taken by Lord Clifford, and, according to Walsingham, confessed that the person whom he had seen in Scotland was indeed very like the king, but not the king himself, although, to serve his own ends, he had persuaded many, both in England and in Scotland, that it was Richard.² It would be absurd, however, to give much weight to this confession, made by a convicted murderer, and spoken under the strongest motives to conciliate the mind of the king, and obtain mercy for himself. To obtain this, the likeliest method was to represent the whole story regarding Richard as a falsehood. It may be remarked, also, that in Otterburn there is not a word of Serle's confession,

¹ Vol. iv. p. 398.

² Walsingham, p. 371.

although his seizure, and subsequent execution, are particularly mentioned.¹

The conduct of the king immediately after this is well worthy of remark, as we may discern in it, I think, a very striking proof of his own convictions upon this mysterious subject. He issued instructions to certain commissioners, which contain conditions to be insisted on as the basis of a treaty with Scotland;² and in these there is no article regarding the delivery of this pretended king, although his proclamation, as far back as the 5th June 1402,³ shows that he was quite aware of his existence, and his constant intercourse with that country must have rendered him perfectly familiar with all the circumstances attending it. Is it possible to believe that Henry, if he was convinced that an impostor was harboured at the court of the Scottish king, whose existence there had been the cause of perpetual disquiet and rebellion in his kingdom, would not have insisted that he should be delivered up, as Henry the Seventh stipulated in the case of Perkin Warbeck? But Warbeck was an impostor, and the seventh Henry never ceased to adopt every expedient of getting him into his hands; whilst Henry the Fourth, at the very moment that he has put down a conspiracy, which derived its strength from the existence of this mysterious person in Scotland, so far from stipulating as to his delivery, does not

¹ Otterburn, p. 249.

² Rymer, *Fœdera*, vol. viii. p. 384.

³ *Ibid.* vol. viii. p. 261.

think it prudent to mention his name. This difference in the conduct of the two monarchs, both of them distinguished for prudence and sagacity, is, I think, pretty decisive upon the question; for, under the supposition that he who was kept in Scotland was the true Richard, it became as much an object in Henry the Fourth to induce the Scots to keep him where he was, as in Henry the Seventh to get Perkin into his hands; and a wary silence was the very line of policy which it was most natural to adopt.

There is a remarkable passage in Walsingham, regarding an occurrence which took place in this same year, 1404, which proves that, in France, although Henry at first succeeded in persuading Charles the Sixth that his son-in-law Richard was dead, the deception was discovered, and, in 1404, the French considered the king to be alive. "The French," says this writer, "at the same time came to the Isle of Wight with a large fleet, and sent some of their men ashore, who demanded supplies from the islanders in the name of King Richard and Queen Isabella; but they were met by the answer, that Richard was dead."¹

An additional proof of the general belief in France of Richard's escape and safety, is to be found in a ballad composed by Creton, the author of the Metrical

¹ Walsingham, p. 370. "Gallici," says this writer, "circa tempus illud venerunt ante vectam insulam cum magna classe, miseruntque de suis quosdam qui peterent nomine regis Richardi et Isabellæ reginæ tributum, vel speciale subsidium ab insulanis. Qui responderunt regem Richardum fuisse defunctum."

History of the Deposition of Richard the Second, which has been already quoted. We see from the passage, giving a description of the exposition of the body at St Paul's, that this author inclined to believe the whole a deception, and gave credit to the report, even then prevalent, that the king was alive. In 1405, however, he no longer entertains any doubt upon the subject, but addresses an epistle in prose to the king himself, expressing his joy at his escape, and his astonishment that he should have been able to survive the wretched condition to which he had been traitorously reduced. I am sorry that the learned author, from whose notes I take this illustration, enables me only to give the commencement of the epistle, and the first stanza of the ballad; but even these, though short, are quite decisive. His epistle is thus inscribed: "Ainsi come vraye amour requiert a tres noble prince et vraye Catholique Richart d'Engleterre, je Creton ton liege serviteur te renvoye ceste Epistre." The first stanza of the ballad is equally clear and conclusive.

" O vous, Seignors de sang royal de France,
 Mettez la main aux armes vistement,
 Et vous avez certaine cognoissance
 Du roy qui tant a souffert de tourment
 Par faulx Anglois, qui traiteusement
 Lui ont tollu la domination ;
 Et pais de mort fait condemnation
 Mais Dieu, qui est le vray juge es saints cieulx
 Lui a sauvé la vie—Main et tart
 Chacun le dit partut, jeunes et vieulx
 C'est d'Albion le noble Roi Richart." ¹

¹ Metrical History of the Deposition of Richard the Second, with notes by Mr Webb. *Archæologia*, vol. xx. p. 189.

Not long after the plot of Serle had been discovered and put down in 1404, there arose, in 1405, the conspiracy of the Earl of Northumberland and Archbishop Scrope, to which I have already alluded. In their manifesto, published before the battle of Shrewsbury, they had accused Henry in unqualified terms of the murder, whereas now, in the "Articles of Richard Scrope against Henry the Fourth,"¹ the addition of the words "*ut vulgariter dicitur*," shows, as I have already observed, that the strong convictions of Henry's guilt had sunk by this time into vague rumour; but the Parliamentary Rolls,² which give a very minute and interesting account of the conspiracy, furnish us with a still stronger proof of Northumberland's suspicion of Richard's being alive, and prove, by the best of all evidence, his own words, that one principal object of the conspirators was to restore him, if this was found to be true.

It appears from these authentic documents, that in the month of May, 1405, the Earl of Northumberland seized and imprisoned Sir Robert Waterton, "esquire to our lord the king," keeping him in strict confinement in the castles of Warkworth, Alnwick, Berwick, and elsewhere. The reader will recollect, that according to the evidence of Winton, Richard was delivered to two gentlemen of the name of Waterton and Swinburn, who spread a report of his escape; and it is not improbable that the object of Northumberland, in the seizure of Waterton, was to arrive at the real

¹ Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, p. 362, pars ii.

² Rolls of Parliament, vol. iii. p. 605.

truth regarding this story of his escape, to ascertain whether it was a mere fable, and whether the king actually had died in Pontefract castle, or might still be alive in Scotland, as had been confidently reported. It is of consequence, then, to observe Northumberland's conduct and expressions regarding Richard, after having had Waterton in his hands; and of both we have authentic evidence in the Parliamentary Rolls. He, and the rest of the conspirators, the Archbishop of York, Sir Thomas Moubray, Sir John Fauconberg, Lord Hastings, and their accomplices, sent three commissioners, named Lasingsby, Boynton, and Burton, into Scotland, to enter into a treaty with Robert the Third, who died soon after, and at the same time to communicate with certain French ambassadors, who, it appears, were at that time in Scotland; and the avowed object of this alliance is expressly declared by Northumberland in his letter to the Duke of Orleans. It is as follows—"Most high and mighty prince, I recommend myself to your lordship; and be pleased to know, that I have made known by my servants, to Monsieur Jehan Chavbreliack, Mr John Andrew, and John Ardinguill, called Reyner, now in Scotland, and ambassadors of a high and excellent prince, the King of France, your lord and brother, my present intention and wish, which I have written to the king your brother. It is this, that with the assistance of God, with your aid, and that of my allies, I have embraced a firm purpose and intention to sustain the just quarrel of my sovereign lord King Richard, if he is alive, and if he is dead, to avenge his

death ; and, moreover, to sustain the right and quarrel which my redoubted lady, the Queen of England, your niece, may have to the kingdom of England, and for this purpose I have declared war against Henry of Lancaster, at present Regent of England." This letter, which is given at length in the note below,¹ is

¹ " Item puis apres, en le moys de Juyn adonques proschein ensuant, le dit Henri de Percy ordena et constitua par ses lettres patens desoubz le seal de ses armes, Henry de Boynton, Chev^r Will^m de Lasingsby, Esq. et Johan de Burton, clerck, pur cœr treter et concorder ovesque Robert Roy d'Escoce qui darrein morast, et aussi ovesque certains ambassadours de France de certains alliances faire par entre le dit Henry et les Escotes, et aussi les Franceys, en destrucion nostre sieur le roy son liege seigneur, son poair, et de son roiaume d'Engleterre comme par les tenures des lettres desoubz escriptz, plus au plein poit apparoir." P. 605.

" Tres haut et tres puissant prince, jeo me recomance a vostre seigneurie ; a laquelle plese asavoir que jay notifie par mes gentz, a Mon^r Johan Chavbreliak, Meistre Johan Andrew, et Johan Ardinguill dit Reyner, ambassatours de tres haut et tres excellent prince le Roy de France, vostre sieur et frere, esteautz en Escoce, mon entencione et voluntée, laquelle je escriptz au roy vostre dit sieur et frere ; laquelle est, que a l'aide de Dieu, de le vostre et des plusours mes allies, j'ay entencione et ferme purpos de sustener le droit querelle de mon sovereign sieur le Roy Richard, s'il est vif, et si mort est, de venger sa mort, et aussi de sustener la droit querele que ma tres redoubte dame le Royne d'Engleterre, vostre niece, poit avoir resonablement au Royaume d'Engleterre, et pur ceo ay moeve guerre a Henry de Lancastre, a present regent d'Angleterre ; et car jeo foy que vous ames et sustenez ceste querelle, et autres contre la dit Henry jeo vous prie et require, que en ceo vous moi voilles aider et soccorer, et ausi moi aider eius le tres haut et tres excellent prince le Roy de France, vostre dit sieur et frere, que les choses desquelles jeo lui escriptz, et dont vous enformeront au plain les ditz ambassatours, preignent bone et brief conclusion,

written from Berwick, and although the precise date is not given, it appears, by comparison with other deeds connected with the same conspiracy preserved in the *Fœdera* and the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, to have been written about the 10th of June. The Parliamentary Rolls go on to state, that in this same month of June, Northumberland and his accomplices seized Berwick, and traitorously gave it up to the Scots, the enemies of the king, to be pillaged and burnt.

It is of importance to attend to the state of parties in Scotland at this time. The Scots, with whom Northumberland confederated to sustain the quarrel of King Richard, were the loyal faction opposed to Albany, and friends to Prince James, whom that crafty and ambitious statesman now wished to supplant. Albany himself was at this moment in strict alliance with Henry the Fourth, as is shown by a manuscript letter preserved in the British Museum, dated from Falkland on the 2d of June, and by a mission of Rothsay herald, to the same monarch, on the 10th of July.¹ Wardlaw, bishop of St Andrews,

quar en vite, en tout ceo que jeo vous pourra servir a sustener de par decea les ditz querelles encontre le dit Henry, jeo le ferra volontiers de tout mon poair. Et vous plese de croiere les ditz ambassatours de ceo qu'ils vous dirront de par moy; le Saint Esprit tres haut et tres puissant prince vous ait en sa garde. Escript à Berwyck.

“A tres haut et tres puissant prince le Duc d'Orleans, Count de Valois et de Blois, et Beaumont et Sieur de Courcy.” No date is given, but it immediately succeeds June 11, 1405.

¹ Pinkerton, *Hist.* vol. i. p. 82. In the Cottonian Catalogue, p. 498, No. 114, I find a letter from Robert Duke of Albany to

Sinclair, Earl of Orkney, and Sir David Fleming of Cumbernauld, to whose care, it will be recollected, Winton informs us Richard of England had been committed, opposed themselves to Albany, and having determined for the sake of safety to send Prince James to France, entered, as we see, into a strict alliance with the Earl of Northumberland, in his conspiracy for overturning the government of Henry the Fourth.

The events which followed immediately after this greatly favoured the usurpation of Albany. Prince James was taken on his passage to France, probably in consequence of a concerted plan between Albany and Henry. David Fleming, according to Bower,¹ was attacked and slain on his return from accompanying James to the ship, by the Douglasses, then in alliance with Albany, and the old king, Robert the Third, died, leaving the government to the uncontrolled management of his ambitious brother, and his son, now king, a prisoner in the Tower. Meanwhile, Sinclair the Earl of Orkney joined Northumberland at Berwick,² but the rebellion of that potent baron and

Henry the Fourth, thanking him for his good treatment of Murdoch his son, and the favourable audiences given to Rothsay his herald. Dated Falkland, June 4, 1405.

¹ If we believe Walsingham, p. 375, however, the chronology is different. Fleming was not slain till some months afterwards, and lived to receive Northumberland and Bardolph on their flight from Berwick; after which he discovered to them a plot of Albany's for their being delivered up to Henry, and, by his advice, they fled into Wales, in revenge for which, Fleming was slain by the party of Albany.*

² John, son of Henry, says, in a letter to his father, Vesp. F. vii.

* Ypodigma Newstræ, p. 566.

his accomplices having entirely failed, he and the Lord Bardolph fled into Scotland, from which, after a short while, discovering an intention upon the part of Albany to deliver them into the hands of Henry, they escaped into Wales. We know, from the Chamberlain Accounts, that immediately after the death of Robert the Third, Albany obtained possession of the person of Richard. In this way, by a singular combination of events, while the Scottish governor held in his hands the person who, of all others, was most formidable to Henry, this monarch became possessed of James the First of Scotland, the person of all others to be most dreaded by the governor. The result was, that Albany and Henry, both consummate politicians, in their secret negotiations could play off their two royal prisoners against each other; Albany consenting to detain Richard so long as Henry agreed to keep hold of James. The consequence of this policy was just what might have been expected. Richard died in Scotland, and James, so long as Albany lived, never returned to his throne or to his kingdom; although, during the fifteen years of Albany's usurpation, he had a strong party in his favour, and many attempts were made to procure his restoration. It seems to me, therefore, that this circumstance of Albany having Richard in his hands, furnishes us with a satisfactory explanation of two points, which

f. 95, No. 2, that Orkney had joined Northumberland and Bardolph at Berwick. The letter is dated 9th June, in all appearance 1405, says Pinkerton, vol. i. p. 82. The circumstances mentioned prove that it was, without doubt, in 1405.

have hitherto appeared very inexplicable. I mean, the success with which the governor for fifteen years defeated every negotiation for the return of James, and the unmitigable severity and rage which this monarch, on his return, and throughout his reign, evinced towards every member of the family of Albany.

Even after this grievous disaster of Northumberland in 1405, the reports regarding Richard being still alive revived, and broke out in the capital, and Percy, the indefatigable enemy of Henry, along with Lord Bardolph, made a last attempt to overturn his government. "At this time," says Walsingham, speaking of the year 1407, "placards were fixed up in many places in London, which declared that King Richard was alive, and that he would soon come to claim his kingdom with glory and magnificence; but not long thereafter, the foolish inventor of so daring a contrivance was taken and punished, which allayed the joy that many had experienced in consequence of this falsehood."¹ Who the person was whom Walsingham here designates as the inventor of these falsehoods, does not appear from any part of his own history, or from any of the public papers in the *Fœdera* or the Parliamentary Rolls; but we may connect these reports, on pretty strong grounds I think, with Percy and Lord Bardolph, who, in 1408, proceeded from Scotland into Yorkshire, and after an ineffectual attempt to create a general insurrection in that county, were entirely defeated, Northumberland being

¹ Walsingham, p. 376.

slain, and Bardolph dying soon after of his wounds. The reader will recollect, perhaps, a passage already quoted from Bower,¹ in which this historian states, that amongst other honourable persons who fled with Northumberland and Lord Bardolph into Scotland, was the Bishop of Bangor; and I may mention it as a striking confirmation of the accuracy of this account, that the Bishop of Bangor, according to Walsingham, was taken in the battle along with Percy, and that, as the historian argues, he deserved to have his life spared because he was unarmed. His fellow priest, the Abbot of Hayles, who was likewise in the field, and had changed the cassock for the steel coat, was hanged.² When Bower is thus found correct in one important particular, I know not why we are entitled to distrust him in that other limb of the same sentence, which mentions the existence of Richard in Scotland.

It was originally my intention to have entered into an examination of the diplomatic correspondence which took place subsequent to this period between Albany the governor of Scotland, and Henry the Fourth and Fifth; in which, I think, it would not be difficult to point out various transactions, creating a strong presumption that Albany was in possession of the true King Richard. The limits, however, within which I must confine these observations, will not permit me to accomplish this; and any intelligent reader who will take the trouble to study this correspondence

¹ Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii. p. 441.

² Walsingham, p. 377.

as it is given in the *Rotuli Scotiae*, will not find it difficult to discover and arrange the proofs for himself. I must be permitted, therefore, to step at once from this conspiracy of Northumberland, which took place in 1408, to the year 1415, when Henry the Fifth was preparing for his invasion of France. At this moment, when the king saw himself at the head of a noble army, and when every thing was ready for the embarkation of the troops, a conspiracy of a very inexplicable nature was discovered, which, like every other conspiracy against the government of Henry the Fourth and Henry the Fifth, involved a supposition that Richard the Second might still be alive. The principal actors in this plot were Richard, Earl of Cambridge, brother to the Duke of York, and cousin to the king, Henry Lord Scroop of Marsham, and Sir Thomas Gray of Heton in Northumberland; and the only account which we can obtain of it, is to be found in a confession of the Earl of Cambridge, preserved in the *Fœdera Angliæ*, and in the detail of the trial given in the *Rolls of Parliament*, both papers evidently fabricated under the eye of Henry the Fifth, and bearing upon them evident marks of forgery and contradiction.

According to these documents, the object of the conspirators was to carry Edmund, the Earl of March, into Wales, and there proclaim him king, as being the lawful heir to the crown, in place of Henry of Lancaster, who was stigmatised as a usurper. This, however, was only to be done, provided (to use the original words of the confession of the Earl of Cam-

bridge) “ yonder manis persone, wych they callen Kyng Richard, had nauth bene alyve, as Y wot wel that he wys not alyve.”¹ The absurdity and inconsistency of this must be at once apparent. In the event of Richard being dead, the Earl of March was without doubt the next heir to the crown, and had been declared so by Richard himself; and the avowed object of the conspirators being to place this prince upon the throne, why they should delay to do this, till they ascertain whether the person *calling himself King Richard is alive*, is not very easily seen, especially as they declare, in the same breath, that they are well aware this person is not *alive*. Yet this may be almost pronounced consistency, when compared with the contradiction which follows; for we find it stated, in almost the next sentence, by the Earl of Cambridge, that he was in the knowledge of a plan entered into by Umfraville and Wederyngton, for the purpose of bringing in this very “ persone wych they name Kyng Richard,” and Henry Percy, out of Scotland, with a power of Scots, with whose assistance they hoped to be able to give battle to the king, for which treasonable intention the earl submits himself wholly to the king’s grace. It is difficult to know what to make of this tissue of inconsistency. The Earl of March is to be proclaimed king, provided it be discovered that the impostor who calls himself Richard is not alive, it being well known that he is dead, and although dead, ready, it would seem, to march out of

¹ Fœdera, vol. ix. p. 300.

Scotland with Umfraville and Wederyngton, and give battle to Henry.¹

The account of the same conspiracy given in the Parliamentary Rolls is equally contradictory, and in its conclusion still more absurd. It declares, that the object of the conspirators was to proclaim the Earl of March king, "in the event that Richard the Second, King of England, was actually dead;" and it adds, that the Earl of Cambridge and Sir Thomas Gray had knowledge of a design to bring Thomas of Trumpyngton, an idiot, from Scotland, to counterfeit the person of King Richard, who, with the assistance of Henry Percy and some others, was to give battle to Henry.² It was already remarked, in the account of the conspiracy of the old Countess of Oxford, in 1404, that the assertion then made by Henry the Fourth, in a proclamation in Rymer, that Thomas Warde of Trumpyngton "pretended that he was King Richard," was one of those forgeries which this monarch did not scruple to commit to serve his political purposes; none of the contemporary historians giving the least hint of the appearance of an impostor at this time, and Serle, in his confession, not having a word upon the subject. Besides, we hear nothing of Warde till 1404; and we know, from Henry's own proclamation, that Richard the Second was stated to be alive in Scotland as early as June 1402;³ whilst, in

¹ Fœdera, vol. ix. p. 300.

² Parliamentary Rolls, vol. iv. p. 65.

³ Rymer, vol. viii. p. 261.

1404, when Warde is first mentioned, he comes before us as having personated the king in England, or rather, as then in the act of personating the king in England. Here, too, by Henry the Fourth's description of him in 1404, he is an Englishman, and in his sound senses; how then, in 1415, does he come to be a Scotsman, and an idiot? The truth seems to be, that Henry the Fifth, in manufacturing these confessions of the Earl of Cambridge, having found it stated by his father that Thomas Warde of Trumpyngton, in 1404, pretended to be King Richard, and that "there was an idiot in Scotland who personated the king," joined the two descriptions into one portentous person, Thomas of Trumpyngton, a Scottish idiot, who was to enact Richard the Second, and, at the head of an army, to give battle to the hero of Agincourt. Most of my readers, I doubt not, will agree with me in thinking, that, instead of an idiot, this gentleman from Trumpyngton must have been a person of superior powers.

It is impossible, in short, to believe for a moment that the accounts in the Parliamentary Rolls and in Rymer give us the truth, yet Cambridge, Scroop, and Grey were executed; and the summary manner in which their trial was conducted, is as extraordinary as the accusation. A commission was issued to John, Earl Marshall, and eight others, empowering any two of them, William Lasingsby, or Edward Hull, being one of the number, to sit as judges for the enquiry of all treasons carried on within the county by the oaths of a Hampshire jury. Twelve per-

sons, whose names Carte observes were never heard of before, having been impanelled, the three persons accused were found guilty on the single testimony of the constable of Southampton Castle, who swore, that having spoke to each of them alone upon the subject, they had confessed their guilt, and thrown themselves on the king's mercy. Sir Thomas Grey was condemned upon this evidence, of which, says Carte, it will not be easy to produce a precedent in any former reign ; but the Earl of Cambridge and Lord Scroop pleaded their peerage, and Henry issued a new commission to the Duke of Clarence, who summoned a jury of peers. This, however, was a mere farce ; for the commission having had the records and process of the former jury read before them, without giving the parties accused an opportunity of pleading their defence, or even of appearing before their judges, condemned them to death, the sentence being carried into instant execution.

It is perfectly clear, from the haste, the studied concealment of the evidence, the injustice and the extraordinary severity of the sentence, that the crime of Cambridge, Scroop, and Grey, was one of a very deep dye, and, even in the garbled and contradictory accounts given in the Parliamentary Rolls, we may discern, I think, that their real crime was not the design of setting up March as king, but their having entered into a correspondence with Scotland for the restoration of Richard the Second. That the story regarding March was disbelieved, is indeed shown by Henry himself, who instantly pardoned him, and per-

mitted him to sit as one of the jury who tried Scroop and Cambridge; but that Cambridge, Scroop, and Grey, were in possession of some important secret, and were thought guilty of some dark treason which made it dangerous for them to live, is perfectly apparent.¹

It seems to me that this dark story may be thus explained: Scroop and Cambridge, along with Percy, Umfraville, and Wederyngton, had entered into a correspondence with the Scottish faction who were opposed to Albany, the object of which was to restore Richard, and to obtain the return of James, Albany himself being then engaged in an amicable treaty with Henry, with the double object of obtaining the release of his son Murdoch, who was a prisoner in England, and of detaining James the First in captivity. At this moment the conspiracy of Cambridge was discovered; and Henry, in order to obtain full information for the conviction of the principals, pardoned Percy, and the two accomplices Umfraville and Wederyngton, and obtained from them a disclosure of

¹ We have seen, that Henry directs that one of the two justices who are to sit on the trial, shall be either Edward Hull or William Lasingsby; and it may perhaps be recollected, that William Lasingsby, Esq. was himself engaged with Northumberland in 1405, in the conspiracy for the restoration of Richard, being one of the commissioners sent into Scotland to treat with Robert the Third and the French ambassadors. It is probable, therefore, that he knew well whether Richard of Scotland was, or was not, the true Richard; and his being selected as one of the judges makes it still more probable, that the real crime of the conspirators was a project for the restoration of the king.

the plot. He then agreed with Albany to exchange Murdoch for Percy ; but we learn, from the MS. instructions regarding this exchange, which are quoted by Pinkerton,¹ that a secret clause was added, which declared, that the exchange was only to take place, provided " Percy consent to fulfil what Robert Umfraville and John Witherington have promised Henry in his name." Percy's promise to Henry was, as I conjecture, to reveal the particulars of the plot, and renounce all intercourse with Richard.

This conspiracy was discovered and put down in 1416, and the campaign which followed was distinguished by the battle of Agincourt, in which, amongst other French nobles, the Duke of Orleans was taken prisoner, and became a fellow captive with James the First. In July 1417, Henry the Fifth again embarked for Normandy, but when engaged in preparations for his second campaign, he detected a new plot, the object of which was to bring in the " Mamuet" of Scotland, to use the emphatic expression which he himself employs. I need scarcely remark, that the meaning of the old English word Mamuet, or Mammet, is a puppet, a figure drest up for the purpose of deception ; in other words, an impostor. The following curious letter, which informs us of this conspiracy, was published by Hearne, in his Appendix to the Life of Henry the Fifth, by Titus Livius of Forojulii. " Furthermore I wole that ye commend with my brother, with the chancellor, with my cousin of North-

¹ Vol. i. p. 97.

umberland, and my cousin of Westmoreland, and that ye set a good ordinance for my north marches ; and specially for the Duke of Orleans, and for all the remanent of my prisoners of France, and also for the King of Scotland. For as I am secretly informed by a man of right notable estate in this lond, that there hath bene a man of the Duke of Orleans in Scotland, and accorded with the Duke of Albany, that this next summer he shall bring in the Mamuet of Scotland, to stir what he may ; and also, that there should be foundin wayes to the having away especially of the Duke of Orleans, and also of the king, as well as of the remanent of my forsaid prisoners, that God do defend. Wherefore I wole that the Duke of Orleance be kept still within the castle of Pomfret, without going to Robertis place, or any other disport. For it is better he lack his disport, than we were disteyned of all the remanent.”¹ With regard to Albany’s accession to this plot, it is probable that Henry was misinformed, and that the party which accorded with Orleans, was the faction opposed to the governor, and desirous of the restoration of James. The letter is valuable in another way, as it neither pro-

¹ Titi Livii Forojul. Vita Henrici V. p. 99. This letter, also, is the first in that very interesting publication of Original Letters, which we owe to Mr Ellis. Neither this writer, however, nor old Hearne, have added any note upon the expression, the Mamuet of Scotland, which must be obscure to an ordinary reader. The letter itself, and the proof it contains in support of my theory of Richard’s escape, was pointed out to me by my valued and learned friend, Adam Urquhart, Esq.

nounces the Mamuet to be an idiot, nor identifies him with Thomas of Trumpyngton.

There is yet, however, another witness to Richard's being alive in 1417, whose testimony is entitled to the greatest credit, not only from the high character of the individual himself, but from the peculiar circumstances under which his evidence was given: I mean Lord Cobham, the famous supporter of the Wickliffites, or Lollards, who was burnt for heresy on the 25th of December, 1417. When this faithful martyr was seized, and brought before his judges to stand his trial, he declined the authority of the court; and being asked his reason, answered, that he could acknowledge no judge amongst *them*, so long as his liege lord King Richard was alive in Scotland. The passage in Walsingham is perfectly clear and decisive. "Qui confestim cum summa superbia et abusione respondit, se non habere judicem inter eos, vivente ligio Domino suo, in regno Scotiæ, rege Richardo; quo responso accepto, quia non opus erat testibus, sine mora jussus est trahi et suspendi super furcas atque comburi, pendens in eisdem."¹ Lord Cobham, therefore, at the moment he was about to seal his faith by his blood, and when he knew that the unwelcome truth which he told was of itself enough to decide his sentence, declares that Richard the Second, his lawful prince, is then alive in Scotland. It is necessary for a moment to attend to the life and character of this witness, in order fully to

¹ Walsingham, p. 591.

appreciate the weight due to his testimony. It is not too much to say, that, in point of truth and integrity, he had borne the highest character during his whole life; and it is impossible to imagine for an instant, that he would have stated any thing as a fact which he did not solemnly believe to be true. What, then, is the fair inference to be drawn from the dying declaration of such a witness? He had sat in parliament, and had been in high employments under Richard the Second, Henry the Fourth, and Henry the Fifth. He was sheriff of Herefordshire in the eighth year of Henry the Fourth, and, as a peer, had summons to parliament among the barons in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth of that king's reign, and in the first of Henry the Fifth. He was, therefore, in high confidence and employment, and could not have been ignorant of the measures adopted by Henry the Fourth to persuade the people of England that Richard was dead. He sat in the parliament of 1399, which deposed him; there is every reason to believe he was one of the peers summoned in council on the 9th of February 1399-1400, only four days previous to Richard's reputed death, and that he sat in the succeeding parliament, which met on the 21st January, 1401. The exhibition of the body at St Paul's, where all the nobility and the barons attended, the private burial at Langley, and the proclamations of Henry, declaring that Richard was dead and buried, must have been perfectly well known to him; and yet in the face of all this, he declares in his dying words, pronounced in 1417, that Richard the

Second, his liege lord, is then alive in Scotland. We have, therefore, the testimony of Lord Cobham, that the reputed death of Richard in Pontefract Castle, the masses performed over the dead body at St Paul's, its burial at Langley, were all impudent fabrications. It is, I think, impossible to conceive evidence more clear in its enunciation, more solemn, considering the time when it was spoken, and, for the same reason, more perfectly unsuspecting.

I know not that I can better conclude these remarks upon this mysterious subject, than by this testimony of Lord Cobham, in support of the hypothesis which I have ventured to maintain. Other arguments and illustrations certainly might be added, but my limits allow me only to hint at them. It might be shown, for instance, that not long after Sir David Fleming had obtained possession of the person of Richard, Henry the Fourth engaged in a secret correspondence with this baron, and granted him a passport to have a personal interview; it might be shown, also, that in 1404, Robert the Third, in his reply to a letter of Henry the Fourth, referred the English king to David Fleming for some particular information; that Henry was about the same time carrying on a private negotiation with Lord Montgomery, to whom the reader will recollect Richard had been delivered, whilst there is evidence, that with the Lord of the Isles, and with the chaplain of that pirate Prince in whose dominions Richard was first discovered, the King of England had private meetings, which appear to have produced a perceptible change

in the policy of Henry's government towards Scotland. I had intended, also, to point out the gross forgeries of which Henry had condescended to be guilty, in his public account of the deposition of Richard, in order to show the very slender credit which is due to his assertions regarding the death and burial of this prince ; but I must content myself with once more referring to Mr Webb's Notes on the Metrical History of the Deposition of Richard, from which I have derived equal instruction and amusement.

In conclusion, I may observe, that whatever side of the question my readers may be inclined to adopt, an extraordinary fact, or rather series of facts, are established, which have hitherto been overlooked by preceding historians. If disposed to embrace the opinion which I have formed after a careful, and, I trust, impartial examination of the evidence, the circumstance of Richard's escape, and subsequent death in Scotland, is a new and interesting event in the history of both countries. If, on the other hand, they are inclined still to believe the ordinary accounts of the death of this monarch in 1399, it must be admitted, for it is proved by good evidence, that a mysterious person appeared suddenly in the dominions of Donald of the Isles ; that he was challenged by one who knew Richard, as being the king in disguise ; that he denied it steadily, and yet was kept in Scotland in an honourable captivity for eighteen years, at great expense ; that it was believed in England by those best calculated to have accurate information on the subject, that he was the true King Richard ; and

that, although his being detained and recognised in Scotland was the cause of repeated conspiracies for his restoration, which shook the government both of Henry the Fourth and Henry the Fifth, neither of these monarchs ever attempted to get this impostor into their hands, or to expose the cheat, by insisting upon his being delivered up, in those various negotiations as to peace or truce, which took place between the two kingdoms. This last hypothesis presents to me difficulties, which appear at present insurmountable; and I believe, therefore, that the chapel at Stirling contained the ashes of the true Richard.

I entertain too much respect, however, for the opinion of the many learned writers who have preceded me, and for the public judgment which has sanctioned an opposite belief for now nearly six hundred years, to venture, without farther discussion, to transplant this romantic sequel to the story of Richard the Second into the sacred field of history. And it is for this reason that, whilst I have acknowledged the royal title in the appendix, I have expressed myself more cautiously and hypothetically in the body of the work.