XV. *A Reply to Mr. Tytler's "Historical Remarks on the Death of Richard the Second:"* by THOMAS AMYOT, Esq. F.R.S., Treasurer, in a Letter addressed to HENRY ELLIS, Esq. F.R.S., Secretary.

Read 9th December, 1830.

James Street, Westminster, 29 Nov. 1830.

MY DEAR SIR,

IN an Enquiry which I addressed to you some years ago, concerning the death of Richard the Second, I took occasion to advert to the rumours prevalent after the date usually assigned to that event, relative to his supposed escape into Scotland, and his death and burial at Stirling.^a The story on which these rumours were founded, and to which no credit had been given by any English historian of established reputation, has lately been revived, and its truth defended with much plausibility and ingenuity, by Mr. Fraser Tytler, in an elaborate Dissertation subjoined to the third volume of his valuable History of Scotland. The name and authority of the writer would be sufficient to excite attention to his statements, even if they had not already attracted the notice of two of the most distinguished of his countrymen, though with different results as to the impression produced on them. Sir Walter Scott, on the one hand, has fully avowed his belief in the relation,^b while on the other, Sir James Mackintosh has, with equal decision, expressed his dissent from it.^c Had it fallen within the plan of the latter

^a Archæologia, vol. xx. p. 426, note.

^b Hist. of Scotland, vol. i. p. 250.

^c Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 381, note.

eminent person to state the reasons for his adherence to the common narrative more in detail, and with reference to the authorities on which they were grounded, any further attempt on my part to investigate the subject would have been superfluous. But, as the case now stands, I may be permitted to offer a more circumstantial reply to Mr. Tytler's arguments, bearing in mind the courtesy he has uniformly shown in his references to my former observations.

Mr. Tytler's belief in the statement of which he is the able and zealous advocate, is founded on the contemporary narratives of Bower and Winton, corroborated and confirmed, as he conceives, by an ancient manuscript Chronicle in the Advocates' Library, and more particularly by the printed, but yet unpublished, Accounts of the Great Chamberlain of Scotland.

Of the published relations, that of Bower, Abbot of Inchcolm, the Continuator of Fordun's Chronicle, and who was living at the period in question, appears to be the most relied on by Mr. Tytler, as being the most positive and precise. It states that Richard, having escaped from Pontefract Castle, travelled in disguise to the Scottish Isles, where, in the kitchen of Donald, Lord of those Isles, he was discovered by a jester, who had been educated in his own Court at London: that he was then sent by Donald, under Lord Montgomery's charge, to King Robert the Third, with whom he lived honourably, and after whose death he was delivered over to the Regent Albany: that he at length died at the Castle of Stirling, and was buried in the church of the Preaching Friars.^d In a subsequent passage Bower states that many English fugitives came to Richard in Scotland; but that when the Earl of Northumberland fled thither, Richard could not be persuaded to have an interview with him.^e

This story, or the greater part of it, is corroborated, as Mr. Tytler maintains, by Winton, Prior of Lochleven, whose metrical Chronicle he conceives to have been composed before Bower's History was begun. As Bower does not mention Winton's work, Mr. Tytler infers that he

^d Hearne's edition of Fordun and Bower, vol. iv. p. 1133. Goodal's ditto, vol. ii. p. 427.

^e Hearne's ed. iv. p. 1166. Goodal's, ii. p. 441.

had never seen it, and that the two relations therefore proceeded from unconnected, yet concurring witnesses. This perhaps might seem doubtful, when we recollect the frequent and abundant proofs given by our own early Chroniclers, of their obligations to the labours of their contemporaries which were extant in neighbouring monasteries, although even their literal transcriptions are uniformly made without acknowledgment. In the present case, however, it may be admitted, that the two stories vary sufficiently from each other to induce a belief that each was separately derived from one common source, namely, the vague uncertain rumours of the day. Winton tells us, that Richard, after his confinement in the Tower, had been delivered at Pontefract to "tow wele trowit famous men," Swinburne and Waterton, who took great pity on him, and spread the news of his death: that afterwards there was a rumour that he was living, upon which Winton, without professing to know how he escaped, proceeds to relate, that a poor man travelling in the Scottish Isles, was recognized by an Irish lady, Donald's sister-in-law, to be the King Richard she had formerly seen in Ireland: that the stranger denied himself to be Richard, but was nevertheless sent to the Lord Montgomery, who conveyed him to King Robert: that he was afterwards in the charge of the Lord of Cumbernald and the Duke of Albany, who held him a long time after: but that

" Quhethir he had bene King or nane,
'Thare wes bot few that wyst certane."

Winton adds, that he had no devotion, and seldom was disposed to hear mass, but seemed half mad or wild.^f

On a comparison of these two statements, it will readily be seen how much the direct unqualified assertions of Bower are weakened by the doubting, though more circumstantial narrative of Winton, who professes merely to "say the tale as 'twas said" to him; though like the last Border Minstrel, he "he cannot tell how the truth may be." The circumstantiality, however, of Winton's story, is held by Mr. Tytler to be

^f Winton's Chronicle, by M'Pherson, vol. ii. p. 387, 388, 389.

a great point in favour of its credit. The names of Swinburne and Waterton being first noticed in this passage as the keepers of Richard at Pontefract, appear to him, little as that fact is connected with the subsequent tale, to be an important discovery, more especially as it is corroborated by a family tradition, that Sir Robert Waterton had been so employed, though no such information is extant with respect to Sir Thomas Swinburne. He, it is true, is found at a later period to have been sent by Henry the Fourth on a mission to Bruges, while Waterton was often similarly employed, besides being Henry's Master of the Horse. But does it not at once forcibly occur to us, that, if Henry had been aware (as he surely must have been, if the story were true) that these men had been accessory to Richard's escape, or at least had concealed that fact, by spreading false rumours of his death, a very different reward than places and embassies would have instantly awaited them? The discovery, in order to be useful to Mr. Tytler's hypothesis, should have shown that the false keepers had been disgraced and punished, not elevated to posts of trust and honour.^g

^g It may here be noticed that I am assured by my respected friend Sir John Swinburne, Bart. of Capheaton (the President of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle, and a descendant of Sir Thomas Swinburne above named) that he entirely concurs with me in the opinion I have expressed on this point of the controversy. He has also obligingly confirmed to me the communication which he made to Mr. Tytler, upon the information of his friend Mr. Waterton, who appears to have good reason to believe that his ancestor, Sir Robert Waterton, was Constable of Pontefract Castle at the period of Richard's confinement. How long Sir Richard held that office does not appear, but it is certain that he continued to enjoy the sunshine of royal favour during the reign of his master, Henry the Fourth, by whom, in an instrument in Rymer's *Fœdera* (vol. viii. p. 190) dated the 20th April 1401, he is called "*Domicellum nostrum*." While adverting to this subject, I will take the opportunity of referring to an extract, furnished to me by Mr. Ellis, from a MS. in the British Museum, (Lansd. 213, fol. 319) containing the relation of a journey through a part of England in 1634, by "a Captain, a Lieutenant, and an Ancient" of a military company in Norwich. Among other places, this odd travelling triumvirate visited Pontefract Castle, which had then seven famous towers of amplitude, the highest of them, called the Round Tower, in which Richard the Second was "enforc'd to flee round a poste till his barbarous butchers inhumanly depriv'd him of life." They add that "upon that poste,

The next novelty in Winton's relation is, that Bower's court jester is transformed into an Irish lady; a variation which, though whimsical enough, is certainly not very material, further than as it serves to show that the rumours in circulation were loose and indefinite. One of them, as related by Hector Boece, was, that Richard escaped from prison in woman's clothes.^h But upon Winton's statement of the denial of the poor stranger that he was King Richard, a great stress is laid by Mr. Tytler, as he deems it an extraordinary step to be taken by an impostor, but a natural one to be adopted by the fugitive King himself, Donald of the Isles being at that time in close alliance with Henry the Fourth.ⁱ Now, in the first place, had Donald then been so allied, it is difficult to conceive why the real Richard should have chosen to resort to his dominions; but having done so, it is perfectly unaccountable that Donald did not at once send the detected Prince to Henry, to whom he would have been a most welcome prize, instead of committing him to the dangerous custody of his Scottish adversary. And next, it really does not appear by any means extraordinary, that a poor miserable wanderer, such as the stranger is described to have been, should have rejected, in the first instance, a title which did not belong to

the cruel hackings and fierce blows doe still remaine." It thus appears that the Exton battle-axe story, now generally and justly discredited, was the received tradition at Pontefract two centuries ago, and that, at all events, no doubt was entertained of that Castle having been the place of Richard's death.

^h Boethii Scot. Hist. lib. xvi. p. 339, ed. 1574.

ⁱ To prove this alliance Mr. Tytler refers to the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, vol. ii. p. 156. But on turning to the License for the safe conduct of Donald and his brother John, contained in that page, it would seem that *John*, and not Donald, was at that date (5 Feb. 1400-1) Lord of the Isles; Donald being merely described as the brother of John, who is called "*Johannes de Insulis, Dominus de Dunwage et de Glynns.*" It is right however to state that in a preceding treaty in Rymer's *Fœdera* (viii. p. 146) not reprinted in *Rot. Scotiæ*, and not referred to by Mr. Tytler, the relative position of these brothers is reversed. The date of this treaty is 2 June 1400, about four months after Richard's reputed death at Pontefract. The first document, I believe, in which the rumours of Richard's being alive in Scotland are noticed, is Henry's Proclamation "*Super Fabricatoribus Mendaciorum,*" in Rymer, viii. p. 261, which is dated 5 June 1402.

him, and which might subject him to the most fatal consequences; or that afterwards, when he found himself unexpectedly removed to safe and comfortable quarters, he should have ceased to persist in a denial that would have forfeited his only claim to their continuance. It matters not whether his conviction that he was a king was effected in the mode by which Shakespeare's Tinker was cajoled into the belief that he was a lord, or was produced by the more coercive measures which "feelingly persuaded" Moliere's Woodcutter that he was a learned physician. Like each of those worthies, he might have found it convenient and agreeable to acquiesce in the arguments of those who sought to "thrust greatness upon him." Winton, indeed, has subsequently supplied us with an admirable apology for the captive's ultimate assumption of royalty, namely, by stating that he was a maniac; it being a well-known delusion affecting persons in that unfortunate state to fancy themselves monarchs. A more unkind imputation, however, is fixed on him by Winton, who tells us he was without devotional feelings, and would seldom be induced to attend mass. This account differs at least from that of Hector Boece, who describes him as having passed a strictly religious life in his retirement at Stirling.^k

It should be here noticed, that Winton's cautious doubts respecting the identity of the captive Richard are supposed by Mr. Tytler to have proceeded from a tender feeling towards the memory of Albany, of whom he was the apologist and admirer. But this belief is founded on a conjecture that Henry and Albany maintained a secret understanding relative to the detention of their respective prisoners, James of Scotland and Richard of England. Whether such an understanding ever existed, is a question that will be considered hereafter; but, if it did exist, it was not likely to have been known to the Prior of Lochleven, who would probably have been far more ready to commend Albany for affording a safe and honourable asylum to a dethroned monarch, than to expose him to censure for knowingly harbouring an impostor. The doubts he has expressed therefore were probably grounded in honest incredulity.

^k Lib. xvi. p. 339, ed. 1574.

Of Mr. Tytler's unpublished authorities, the manuscript Chronicle in the Advocates' Library, which he conjectures to have been written posterior to the time of Fordun, and prior to the date of Bower's Continuation, serves to confirm the by no means improbable fact of the English fugitives having flocked to the supposed Richard. It also adds, to the account of his death, a copy of the epitaph which was inscribed on his monument. Of the erection of that monument, which was still visible in the time of Hector Boece,¹ no reasonable doubt can be entertained. It was quite consistent with that course of policy which continued to furnish to the real or supposed Richard the honourable asylum due to an exiled monarch, that the place of his burial should have been distinguished by a suitable and respectful memorial. Not a single step, however, is here advanced towards the proof of his identity.^m

With respect to the lately printed, but hitherto unpublished, Accounts of the Great Chamberlain of Scotland, of which an interesting notice is given by Mr. Tytler in the Illustrations at the end of his second volume, their value as authentic historical records is indisputable. But with reference to the question now before us, the extracts which have been furnished by Mr. Tytler, relating to the expenses incurred by Albany, and not reimbursed to him, for the custody of the supposed king, appear to me to supply no additional evidence whatever as to his identity. The proofs that some person, whoever he may have been, was so detained in custody, required no such confirmation; and it is equally clear that considerable charges must have been incurred in maintaining him suitably to his supposed rank. No claim could decently have been advanced, or even adverted to, for the maintenance of an acknowledged impostor. It may indeed admit of a question whether the fact established by these records, that the Regent neither

¹ Lib. xvi. p. 339, ed. 1574.

^m The fragment of a Chronicle printed from Asloan's MS. at the Auchinlech press by the late Sir Alexander Boswell, and adverted to in the *Archæologia*, xx. p. 427 (note) has not been cited by Mr. Tytler in support of his theory. It adds nothing, indeed, in point of authority, to the other works referred to.

asked nor received from the public treasury any reimbursement of these expenses, may not afford an inference that he had retained his captive for objects of private and personal policy, and that the doubts which we collect from Winton to have existed in Scotland, as to the real rank of the captive, might have induced him to refrain from enforcing a demand which otherwise could not, on public grounds, have been refused. I hazard this conjecture, however, without having an opportunity of consulting the whole of the unpublished Accounts. Be this as it may, the position that the harboured stranger was not an impostor appears to me to be no more established by evidence of charges incurred in his maintenance, than the opposite fact of the interment of the real king at Langley would be allowed by Mr. Tytler to be proved by a production of the Exchequer accounts of the funeral expenses. The Richard in England was buried—the Richard in Scotland was clothed and fed—and no historical documents can be required to prove that expenses were incurred in both these services.

So complete, nevertheless, is Mr. Tytler's reliance on the evidence of the Chamberlain Rolls, that he considers the supposition that a poor maniac impostor could have been supported at great expense, and detained more than eleven years at the Scottish Court, to be so extravagant, that he does not envy the task of any one who may undertake to support it.ⁿ To this I unhesitatingly answer, that, under the circumstances in which Albany was placed, I conceive his detention of the real king to be a supposition far more improbable and indefensible. The contrary hypothesis (as I have before noticed) is founded on a supposed secret understanding between Albany and Henry, as to the safe custody of their respective prisoners, Richard and James. But besides that there was another captive in Henry's power, whose release Albany was most anxious to obtain, namely his own son Murdoch, the existence of any such compact, either expressed or implied, seems completely negatived by the very frequent but abortive attempts at

ⁿ Vol. iii. p. 340.

negociation which continued to take place between the two contending powers throughout the whole remainder of Henry's reign.^o Mr. Tytler's supposition that it was never proposed in any of these negociations to get the impostor into Henry's hands, or to expose the cheat by insisting on his being delivered up, is erroneous, as I shall show by the transcript of a letter in the Cotton Library, addressed to Henry by Archbishop Arundel, which will appear in an Appendix to this Paper. That the attempt was not persisted in, seems likely to have been owing to the indifference which Henry felt towards the accomplishment of such an object, after the public sensation produced by the rumour had in a great measure subsided. Would this have been his feeling, had the real Richard been the subject of his negociation? Or for such a golden prize, would the detention of the young Duke Murdoch have been deemed by him a reasonable equivalent? The supposition is too improbable for belief, and it is only to Henry's actual knowledge of the imposture that we can ascribe his unwillingness to release Murdoch on any other terms than those of a large pecuniary ransom. His successor, Henry the Fifth, however, agreed to exchange the Regent's son for a prisoner at the Scottish Court. But who was the prisoner selected by Henry for this exchange? Not the real or supposed Richard, but Henry Percy, the proscribed Earl of Northumberland, son and grandson of the two bitterest foes of the house of Lancaster! Can we for a moment believe that Albany, on the one hand, who manifested a constant restless anxiety for his son's release, would have hesitated to proffer the exchange of the supposed royal captive, had Henry been willing to accept it? Or that Henry, on his part, would not have been eager to gain possession of the real King's person, however slightly he might have estimated that of an impostor? Yet Mr. Tytler, on the contrary, would induce a belief that the two English Monarchs had been always afraid to risk the consequences of Richard's enlargement. To this I answer, that, if such a secret understanding subsisted between Albany

^o See the very numerous documents connected with these negociations, which have been published in Rymer's *Fœdera* and the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, hereafter referred to.

and the Henries as Mr. Tytler supposes (an assumption however which I think myself entitled to treat as gratuitous, it being contradicted, as I conceive, by the tenor of all official documents and private correspondence now extant,) there would not have been wanting means to dispose of the captive sovereign without a public disclosure of his identity. But even if there had ever been a compact between Henry the Fourth and Albany for the mutual detention of their prisoners, James and Richard, it is quite clear that Henry the Fifth, on his accession to the throne, had not become a party to it, since he offered the release of James for the ransom of a hundred thousand marks,^p without any stipulation whatever respecting the captive at Stirling, whose situation he seems to have treated as a matter of perfect indifference, when placed in competition with a sum of money, useful to him in the prosecution of his designs against France. This negociation Mr. Tytler supposes to have been frustrated by Albany, whose power would have terminated on the return of his lawful sovereign. Whatever was the cause of failure, the case of the prisoner at Stirling was never brought into the scale in this or any other negociation during Henry the Fifth's reign. To adopt a vulgar illustration, it would appear that Albany had kept his commodity till it had become no longer marketable. Whatever excitement might have been created by the early rumours that Richard was living, the English people had generally ceased to credit them. The supposed king therefore was quietly suffered to remain an useless rent-charge on the Regent's private purse, for it appears by the Chamberlain Accounts before referred to, that he either judged it inexpedient or found it impracticable, to enforce its reimbursement from the public revenues.

It is here proper to notice another supposed source of evidence to which Mr. Tytler has referred, though certainly in very loose and

^p Rymer, ix. p. 417. Rot. Scotiæ, ii. p. 219. It was intended in effect to be a ransom of that amount, as James was to be allowed to visit Scotland for a limited period, and the sum in question was to be paid in the event of his not returning to England at its expiration.

general terms. He says, (page 373) "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, as it is given in the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, will not find it difficult to discover and arrange the proofs for himself." In conformity with this suggestion, I have bestowed some attention on an examination of the documents published in the *Rotuli Scotiæ*, connected with the period to which Mr. Tytler refers, but certainly without finding a single expression in any one of them which appears to me either directly or indirectly to notice or allude to Albany's possession of the real or supposed Richard. Without meaning to undervalue the collection of Records in question, which, in its present form, is undoubtedly a safe and useful guide to the Scottish historian, as far as the facts and dates which it supplies are material to his purpose, I cannot yet help remarking that nearly all the important State papers it contains, relating to the period of our inquiries, had already been printed in Rymer's *Fœdera*,^q and had, therefore, for a full century before their re-publication by the Record Commission, been open to the perusal of former writers. In so large a mass of Records, the total absence of any allusions whatever to the point under our

^q Compare the principal documents in pp. 166, 167, 168, 169, 173, 174, 177, 183, 192, 193, 194, 199, 206, 213, 214, 215, and 219 of vol. ii. of the *Rot. Scotiæ*, with the corresponding articles in pp. 345, 362, 368, 371, 385, 388, 430, 479, 609, 630, 631, and 704, of vol. viii. and pp. 40, 240, 302, 303, 323, 324, and 417, of vol. ix. of Rymer's *Fœdera*. These references will be found to comprize nearly all that is important in the *Rot. Scotiæ*, during the period in question, viz. from 1404 to 1419. The other documents belonging to that period will be seen to be chiefly Licences for safe conduct, and Commissions for the custody of the Marches.

discussion, must surely be considered as a very strong additional proof of the truth of the position I have been endeavouring to establish, namely, that after the early rumours of Richard's preservation and captivity had subsided, both Henry the Fourth and his successor had become wholly indifferent to the subject of them; an indifference which can only be accounted for by their thorough conviction of the fraud which had been attempted to be practised on them. Had it been otherwise, we should surely have found (as Mr. Tytler expected we should find) some covert allusions at least to the prisoner at Stirling Castle, in the "never-ending, still beginning" negotiations between the English Monarchs and the Scottish Regent.

As it is clear, however, that some person, whoever he may have been, was actually detained in Scotland, in the manner before described, Mr. Tytler appears to think, that those who deny that he was the real Richard, are bound to show who was the mysterious personage by whom that monarch was represented. This seems to me to be neither necessary nor practicable. Whether the *Mammet* of Scotland, as he is called in a remarkable passage in a letter of Henry the Fifth,^r of which Mr. Tytler has given a satisfactory explanation, was Thomas Warde, of Trumpington, who had been encouraged in his imposture by Serle and the Countess of Oxford; or was some forlorn wanderer, casually pressed into the service from his personal resemblance to Richard, it seems now quite hopeless to inquire. But it is proper to notice, that there is no such discrepancy as Mr. Tytler has represented, between the description given of Warde in Henry the Fourth's Proclamation, preserved in Rymer's *Fœdera*,^s and that which appears in the proceedings recorded in the Rolls of Parliament against the Earl of Cambridge and Sir Thomas Grey.^t It is not stated in the former, that he was "in his sound senses," nor in the latter, that he was a Scotchman. The words

^r Ellis's *Original Letters*, vol. i. p. 2.

^s Vol. viii. p. 353. The description in the Proclamation is simply "Thomas Warde de Trumpington, qui se pretende et feigne d'estre Roy Richard."

^t Vol. iv. p. 65.

de Scotia in the latter record, perhaps misled Mr. Tytler, as appearing to refer to the country to which he belonged, instead of that from which he was to be brought by the conspirators. With respect to Warde, indeed, his very existence seems to be denied by Mr. Tytler, who treats the whole story as the fabrication of Henry the Fourth, apparently considering the impostor of Trumpington to have been purely a creature of the King's poetical fancy; just as the "proud Miller" of the same well-known village, "there dwelling many a day," had been of Chaucer's. It is hardly possible to reply seriously to such an objection, made in the face of an historical document like the Proclamation in Rymer; yet it may be observed, that Henry would hardly have located his imaginary impostor on a spot so popularly known from its immediate vicinity to the University of Cambridge. But whoever, to use Mr. Tytler's words, was "the portentous person who was to enact King Richard the Second," I must admit that it is no proof of his idiocy that he refused to see Northumberland, whose intimate knowledge of his late master would, as Buchanan has justly remarked, have enabled him at once to detect the imposture. It is worthy of notice, that Northumberland's journey into Scotland appears, from Bower's account of it, to have been made about the time of King Robert's death, which occurred in April 1406, while the date of June 1405 is assigned by Mr. Tytler to the letter addressed by Northumberland to the Duke of Orleans, in which a doubt was equivocally expressed, whether Richard was not still living.^x The journey therefore did not suggest the doubt; which, if it were ever seriously entertained by Northumberland's party, certainly did not exist when they issued their Letter of Defiance at Shrewsbury in 1403,^y neither did it continue till the period when the second manifesto was put forth by Archbishop Scrope. I must here remark, that, in quoting

^x In this Letter, which is preserved in the Rolls of Parliament (vol. iii. p. 6), Northumberland says it is his purpose "de sustener le droit querelle de mon Souverain S'r le Roy Richard, *s'il est vif*, et si mort est, de venger sa mort." No language could be more cautiously hypothetical.

^y Archæologia, xvi. p. 140. Hardyng's Chronicle by Ellis, p. 353.

my observations on the latter document, Mr. Tytler seems to infer, that the addition of the words "*ut vulgariter dicitur*," implied a doubt whether Richard was actually dead. But on turning to the manifesto itself, as it is printed in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, it most plainly appears that these words had reference only to the *manner* of his death, it being abundantly clear from the context, that no doubt whatever was meant to be suggested as to the certainty of the event itself, by whatever means it might have been occasioned.^z

Having thus endeavoured to show that the particular authorities adduced by Mr. Tytler, do not furnish him even with an *ex parte* case, I shall now state more briefly the reasons which further induce me to believe the fact received and transmitted by all our English historians of reputation, and by most of those of the Northern kingdom, that Richard died in the first year of Henry the Fourth's reign.

1. *The public exposure of the corpse brought to London from Pontefract, and its interment at Langley.* For these facts we have the testimony of at least four contemporary writers of acknowledged credit, Otterbourne, Walsingham, Froissart, and Hardyng. Otterbourne says, the body was conveyed through public places, and shown uncovered, in order that it might be known, from the lower part of the forehead down to the throat.^a Walsingham confirms the account of the journey of the corpse, and the masses said over it at St. Paul's, in the presence of the King and the citizens of London.^b Froissart tells us, that more than twenty thousand persons came to see King Richard, who lay in the litter at Cheapside full two hours, his head on a black cushion, and his face uncovered.^c But Hardyng's testimony (which is the more valuable from his being a retainer and partizan of the Percies) goes still further; for he informs us, that he saw the corpse when it lay

^z *Anglia Sacra*, ii. p. 362. In this eloquent philippic against Henry, great stress is laid on Richard's death, though the mode of its occurrence is admitted to be uncertain.

^a "Ea pars saltem corporis, per quod cognosci poterat, facies scil. ab ima parte frontis usque ad guttur." Otterb. p. 222.

^b P. 405, edit. 1574.

^c "Le chef sur un oreillier noir, e visage decouvert," vol. iv. chap. 119.

in state at St. Paul's.^d All these authors notice the funeral at Langley, which is more particularly described by Otterbourne and Walsingham. It should here be mentioned, that Creton, the French contemporary writer, whose metrical History has been so ably edited by Mr. Webb, believed the body to have been, not Richard's, but that of Maudelain, his chaplain, who resembled him.^e Such a fraud seems to have been impracticable, as Maudelain had been beheaded,^f nor is it likely that this resemblance, whatever effect it might have produced during the march of the rebel army through the country, could have deceived the citizens of London, to whom (as well as most probably to Hardyng) their late monarch's person must have been well known, and in the very place too, as described by Shakspeare,

"Where rude misgovern'd hands from window's tops
Threw dust and rubbish on King Richard's head."

Mr. Tytler, however, is not satisfied with the mode in which the corpse was exposed, because the yellow hair of Richard is not said to have been shown, and because it is not expressed that any person was permitted to uncover the head and face. Now, in the first place, the hair might have been, and probably was, partially exposed on the sides of that part of the face which was left uncovered;—while the second objection would have been more cogent, if the authorities had stated, that a minute examination of the body had been actually demanded and refused—a fact which nothing contained in them can lead us to infer. It is surely no impeachment of the truth of the general accounts of the exposure of the corpse that they do not descend to such minute particulars. As well might I object to the Scottish authorities relied on by Mr. Tytler, because they do not describe the yellow hair, the lisping speech, and the other peculiarities of the real Richard, as proofs of identity apparent in the captive at Stirling. Mr. Tytler adds his suspicion, that the non-interment of the corpse at Westminster was occasioned by Henry's fear

^d "In herse rial *his corse lay there I se.*" Lansdowne MS. of Hardyng's Chronicle.

^e Archæologia, vol. xx. pp. 221, 409.

^f Otterbourne, 228. Walsingham, 404.

of the further exposure to which it would be subjected, in removing it from the litter, arraying it for the grave, and placing it in the coffin. But he forgets that all these ceremonies must have been performed at Langley, in the presence of many discontented witnesses—for discontented they could not fail to have been, since Walsingham gravely tells us they were not invited to dinner when the ceremony was concluded;^g—an indignity admirably calculated to loosen their tongues, had they discovered any attempt to practise deception.

2. *The subsequent removal of the body from Langley, and its re-interment in Westminster Abbey, by the order of Henry the Fifth.* This, which has always been represented as an act of grateful respect on Henry's part towards the memory of his early patron (for whom, at his re-interment, he mourned as for a father^h) proves that no doubt was entertained by him of the reality of Richard's death. Had the new monarch, who could not fail to be well informed of the fact, or even had any considerable portion of his subjects, supposed Richard to be still living, it is not to be credited that he would have sanctioned a solemn mockery, the certain effect of which would have been to revive the compassion of the people for their captive sovereign.

3. *The conduct of the Percies and of Archbishop Scrope, in spreading by their manifestoes the reports of Richard's death.* This point has been already touched upon, in adverting to the argument which Mr. Tytler has founded on Northumberland's letter to Orleans, and his visit to Scotland. But I must here further remark, that, had the Percys believed the true Richard to be really alive in Scotland, they would not have failed, in hoisting the flag of insurrection, to use the King's name as a "tower of strength," for, by reinstating him, they would have best promoted the interests, not only of the infant Mortimer,ⁱ whose father

^g "Nec erat qui eos invitaret ad prandium post laborem." Walsingham, 405. See also the Ypodigma Neustriæ of the same author, p. 158, edit. 1574.

^h Otterb. 274. Walsing. 430.

ⁱ Edmond Mortimer, the heir to the Crown, was but eleven years old when the battle of Shrewsbury took place. See his Life by my late friend Dr. Sayers, in his *Collective Works*, edited by Mr. W. Taylor, vol. ii. p. 308; Norwich, 1823, and Mr. Malone's

had formerly been proclaimed by Richard as his heir ; but of themselves also, by insuring, as their certain reward from the restored King, the dominion of the Northern Counties, which they now aspired to obtain by a title of far less security. It could not but occur to them, that by dethroning Henry, while his predecessor was actually alive, and not in their power, they would have "scotched the snake, not killed it," and the lawful monarch would have remained a rallying standard for the adversaries of these new usurpers.

4. *The marriage of Isabella, Richard's second Queen, to Charles of Orleans.* The argument derived from this fact, was first advanced, I believe, by Biondi, in his History of the Civil Wars,^k and lately by Sir James Mackintosh. The latter justly observes, that "this marriage, which took place in 1406, affords a tolerable presumption that her family had sufficient assurance of Richard's death twelve years before the time assigned to it by the Scottish tradition."¹ To that remark I will add, that we learn from Froissart, that Richard's death was for a considerable time prudently concealed from his Queen.^m This tempo-

Letter subjoined to it. The Edmond Mortimer who was taken prisoner by Owen Glendower, and afterwards married his daughter, was the uncle of the young Earl of March. Shakspeare's mistake was occasioned by Hall's mistranslation of the Letter of Defiance issued by the Percies before the battle of Shrewsbury.

^k Biondi's remarks on the whole question appear to me so sensible and just, that I shall not hesitate to transcribe them from Lord Monmouth's translation, the work being now little read in either language. Noticing the narrative of the Scottish Historians, he says, "But if this had been true, the English writers would have had some little light thereof, some whispering or tradition of it would have been among the common people ; Scotland would have made some advantage thereby ; France would not have been quiet ; Henry would not have demanded Richard's widow for his sonne, nor would Charles have married her into the House of Orleans ; Richard would either have retired himself to France to his wife and father-in-law, or having a minde to become one of the religious in Scotland, he would have procured, by dispensation from Rome, a nullifying of his contracted though not consummated marriage." History of the Civil Warres of England between the two Houses of Lancaster and York, p. 56.

¹ Note at the end of vol. i.

^m Vol. iv. chap. 119.

rary concealment of that event seems to have rendered satisfactory proof of its having taken place the more necessary at a subsequent period, when the second marriage was proposed to her. Nor can it be questioned, that the doubts respecting Richard's death, which had been suggested by Northumberland's letter to Orleans himself in 1405, must have been thoroughly sifted by that Prince, before his actual marriage with the Queen in the following year. Their issue would otherwise have risked the penalties of illegitimacy. But the fact adverted to by Biondi, that Henry the Fourth himself demanded Isabella for his son's bride, is still more to our purpose, as it furnishes a strong additional proof, that he, who could not be ignorant of the truth, well knew her husband to be dead. For it is impossible to believe that so prudent a Monarch would have sought an alliance which, had Richard's death been doubtful, might render the claims of his descendants to the Crown of England liable to be set aside on the ground of bastardy.

5. *The slight feeling excited in this country during the greater portion of the supposed Richard's long residence in Scotland, a period of no less than nineteen years.* The interest in fact which the rumours had created, seems hardly to have extended beyond the first four or five years of that period. We know from the Proclamations in Rymer's *Fœdera*,ⁿ and the prosecutions which followed them, that these rumours were prevalent during the early part of Henry the Fourth's reign. We know too that they had not wholly ceased when the Earl of Northumberland, in 1405, wrote to Orleans in the terms before noticed, nor at a rather later date, when Archbishop Arundel addressed to Henry the letter to which I have already referred, and which will appear in an Appendix to this Paper. But from the latter period till after the commencement of Henry the Fifth's reign, we hear nothing of the captive king. We are then told, indeed, by the Rolls of Parliament, that one

ⁿ Rymer, viii. pp. 261, 353.

of the objects of the conspiracy entered into by the Earl of Cambridge and Sir Thomas Grey in 1415 (placed by Mr. Tytler, doubtless by a typographical error, in the succeeding year) was to bring the counterfeit Richard from Scotland; ° though we learn from Cambridge's confession, preserved by Rymer, that he "wot well" that Richard was not alive. p This confession is pronounced by Mr. Tytler to be absurd and inconsistent. It appears to me, however, to be a record incontrovertibly proving the utter hopelessness of any attempt at that time to palm the imaginary king on the English people. Nor do I conceive that a contrary inference can fairly be drawn from the random assertion said by Walsingham to have been made by Sir John Oldcastle at his trial, as to his belief that Richard was still alive; an assertion which, though Mr. Tytler lays much stress on it, seems to have been casually hazarded in his extremity, as a demurrer to the authority of his Judges. From the proceedings against him, extant in the Rolls of Parliament, q and given more in detail by Fox, r it appears that his main object had been the reformation of the Church, to which the return of the abdicated monarch could not have been in any way conducive. It is, at all events, evident, that during the last thirteen years of the supposed King's life, not more than two abortive attempts were made to excite the public sympathy in his behalf; unless indeed the Regent's celebrated expedition, nicknamed the *Foul Raid*, had any such purpose as Walsingham has ascribed to it, s which Mr Tytler does not assert, having, in the body of his History, noticed that disgraceful event with unusual brevity. t

In addition to the above reasons for rejecting the Northern story, I cannot help taking into account the utter discredit thrown upon it by all the English and most of the Scottish Historians. From Hall, Stow,

° Rot. Parl. vol. iv. p. 65.

p Rymer, ix. 300. The internal evidence of the genuineness of this confession will appear strong and satisfactory, as I conceive, to those who will take the trouble of examining it.

q Vol. iv. p. 107.

r Acts and Monuments, vol. i. 726, 845, edit. 1641.

s Wals. Hist. Ang. 446.

t Vol. iii. p. 189.

and Holinshed, down to Rapin, Carte, and Lingard, no writer of English History has ever treated it otherwise than with contemptuous incredulity. Nor has any Horace Walpole of the Southern clime ever exercised his ingenuity in classing it among our Historic Doubts. Even Hume and Henry have not allowed their national feelings to influence their sober judgment. As to the professed historians of Scotland, Buchanan has strongly marked his unqualified dissent from it, while Pinkerton, who will not be accused of any reluctance to support a novel theory, has dismissed it with disdain. The latter, it may be observed, had access to the Chamberlain Accounts, from which he has given some extracts in his Appendix. He therefore may have examined and rejected the very evidence on which Mr. Tytler, in his Appendix, appears so confidently to rely ; though in justice to the latter it should be noticed, that even he (to use his own words) has not ventured "without further discussion, to transplant this romantic sequel to the story of Richard the Second into the sacred field of History."

From these considerations, with all my respect for Mr. Tytler's learned and ingenious labours, I cannot but arrive at the conclusion, that the tale thus sought to be rescued from oblivion, however circumstantial in its details, ought only to be ranked among those fables of fugitive or cloistered Princes with which the histories of all ages and countries notoriously abound. The lovers of the marvellous, at various periods, have professed their belief in Harold's escape from the battle of Hastings, to lead a life of holy seclusion at Chester ; in Sebastian's preservation from the Moorish scymitars at Alcazar, and his subsequent wanderings through Europe ; in Richard of York's transmigration into the humble guise of Perkin Warbeck ; and in James the Fourth's flight from Flodden field, to "exchange his sceptre for a Palmer's staff," in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. They have now an additional call for the exercise of their faith, in the tale of the captive at Stirling Castle.

Ever, my dear Sir,

most faithfully yours,

THOMAS AMYOT.

TO HENRY ELLIS, Esq. F. R. S.
Secretary.

APPENDIX.

The following is a transcript, obligingly made by my friend Mr. Madden, of Archbishop Arundel's Letter to Henry IV. (MS. Cott. Vesp. F. vii. fol. 88) referred to in page 285.

Xp̃ianissime Princeps. Debita atq; humilima recōmendacione p̃missa. Receptis pridem l̃r̃is ṽre serenissime maiestatis vna cum l̃r̃is Ducis Albanie sub ṽre excellencie signeto transmissis, ip̃isq; inspectis & iuxta capacitatem meam efficaciter consideratis, ab eisdem ṽre serenitatis l̃r̃is intellexi qd voluntatis ṽre regie est & sani consilij, vt treuge alias capte cū Scotis [durature usque] ad festum Pasche, continuent^r & renouent^r p̃ vno anno p̃ximo ex tunc futuro, & interim certi Commissarij [assignentur ad] tractandum de pace p̃petua, seu saltem longis treugis, cum certis tamen condicionibz, videt̃ qd ip̃i de Scocia [inimicos] ṽre maiestatis non retineant, seu fauores eisdem impendant, & qd illum fatuum se dicentem Regem Ric̃m ad [presenciam] ṽre maiestatis transmittant, que om̃ia sano modo fienda reputo fore sana, ne sanguis innoxius xp̃ian^o [inutili]s effundat^r; & ṽram excellentem discrecōem quā ob̃uare intenditis in eisdem merito laudare oportet & [quod il]lud ydolum se dicentem Regem Ricardum ad ṽram p̃senciam transmitti affectatis, quia certe per hoc a plasmata plebis ṽre, quem merito dico ydolum, eo qd honorem & affectionem Regi debitos ip̃i saltē famulo infatuato, cui^o oc̃cōne tāta, vt expiencia docuit, pluries exorta sunt inter ligios ṽre Regie [maiestatis] contenciones, insurrecciones, & scismata, vt difficile fuisset zizānia separe q'n aliquando p̃tim eradicaret^r [triticum] & tam videbat^r, p̃t nec credo fuisse sanū vtrūq; creuisse vsq; ad messem, ne deterius inde contigisset. Sane metuendissime Princeps, quo ad plenū consiliū p̃ me ad p̃missa exhibend̃, seu l̃r̃as ad eadem p̃t mandat^r fiendas, si h̃ñ concipio, non potero absq; vlteriori informacōe eoꝝdem, qui modum formam & effectum treugaꝝ captaꝝ apud

Kelsowe pleniq̄ nouerunt, congruū dare responsum, seu scribē compe-
tenter, p̄ eo p'sertim qd l're dci Ducis Albanie ad ip̄os modū formā &
effectum se referunt, de quibz credo ven^oabilem fr̄em meū Epm Du-
nelmeñ, & alios qui sunt de consilio Londoñ, qui h̄ent forsan copias
illaꝝ treugaꝝ & alioꝝ tractatuū, fore plenius informatos. Vřam igit̄
excellentissimā maiestatē si libeat & videat̄ expediens supplico & exoro
quatin^o vsq̄ in diem martis ad septimanā premissa differre velitis, quo
die ero, Deo dante, Londoñ, & cum p'dcis cōicabo, & faciam, Dño con-
cedente, bonū finem ; qd si eidem vře serenitati non videatur expediens
tantum differre eadem, iřata p'ce vře regie excellencie supplico, qua-
tin^o p'fato veñ. fr̄i meo Dunelmeñ Epo & alijs qui p'missas treugas
nouerunt & h̄ent copias siue originalia eaꝝdem mandare velitis, vt vna
cum auisamento Clici Concilij seu eius locumtenentis, qui habent mo-
dum scribendi, & p'stim in talibz, ad magnū sigillum vřum faciant
lřas in vřis lřis regijs nōiatis in debita forma, & ad hoc suffici-
enti & apta, ipasq̄ lřas sic conceptas q'm cici^o videbit̄ expediens, sub
lřis vře maiestatis clausas michi transmittere dignemini sigillandas, hijs
meis humilimis p'cibz inclinati. Et quia iam instat festum Pasche quo
p̄iores treuge finiunt̄, ita qd impossibile sit nouas treugas expedire tam
cito, videt̄ michi sanū fore consilium, vt eiusdem vře maiestatis lře pri-
uate aliquibz dirigantr̄ cum v̄bis excusatorijs, p̄ut expedire videbit̄, qui
vnam abstinenciam guerraꝝ p̄ medio tempore inducant cum effectū.
Vřam regiā maiestatem in prosperis dirigat regat & gubernat qui cuncta
bona creauit. Script' apud Cantuar' xxii^o die Marcij.

Vře regie maiestatis humilim⁹ orator T. Cantuarieñ.

In the MS. from which the above is a transcript, the words which
are deficient are not merely illegible, but have absolute^{ly} perished.
For those which have been conjecturally supplied, and inclosed in
brackets, I am indebted to Mr. Madden, who remarks that in the reply
of Henry to Albany, which occurs on fol. 85 of the same volume, and
in which a treaty is proposed, there is not any allusion whatever to the
counterfeit King Richard.