

“ALASSE, WHATTE TRUSTE YS IN THIS WORLDE?”:
LANCASTRIAN AND YORKIST HISTORY WRITING
IN AN ENGLISH CHRONICLE

A Master’s Thesis

by
İLKNUR GÜZEL

Department of History
Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2005

To my family

“ALASSE, WHATTE TRUSTE YS IN THIS WORLDE?”:
LANCASTRIAN AND YORKIST HISTORY WRITNG
IN AN *ENGLISH CHRONICLE*

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

İLKNUR GÜZEL

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
HISTORY
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2005

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History

Asst. Prof. David Thornton
Thesis Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History

Asst. Prof. Paul Latimer
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History

Asst. Prof. Julian Bennett
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

“ALASSE, WHATTE TRUSTE YS IN THIS WORLDE?”: LANCASTRIAN AND YORKIST HISTORY WRITING IN AN *ENGLISH CHRONICLE*

Güzel, İlknur

M.A., Department of History

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. David E. Thornton

September 2005

At the National Library of Wales a manuscript (MS 21608) has been found recently which contains a text that is identical with what John S. Davies published in 1856 under the title of the *Davies Chronicle* and *Davies's Chronicle*. Davies made use of the text that he had found in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34, which was damaged for the reigns Richard II and Henry IV. *An English Chronicle 1377-1461*, which is based on the recently found text, covers the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI and for the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV the text has not been damaged. As a crucial source for the vernacular history writing and the *Brut* tradition in the late Middle Ages, *the Chronicle* contains two different parts: the first part of *the Chronicle*, that is 1377-1422/37 version was written by a Lancastrian compiler and the second part, that is the Continuation 1440-1461, was written by a Yorkist author. Undoubtedly, they had contrasting approaches to the politics of the late medieval period and *the Chronicle* offers its readers an opportunity to explore Lancastrian and Yorkist history writing.

This dissertation discusses both contrasting approaches to the politics of the period in the *Chronicle*. While doing this, history writing in the late medieval period, and especially Lancastrian and Yorkist history writing has been analyzed. Broadly, the general structure of the *Chronicle* has been examined. In each subsequent chapter, the Lancastrian and Yorkist perspectives about the politics and how these viewpoints were reflected in their writings have been explored. Accordingly, this dissertation investigates the *Chronicle*, which offers both an insight to the politics and history writing of the late medieval period.

Keywords: *An English Chronicle*, *the Davies Chronicle*, late medieval politics, Lancastrian and Yorkist history writing.

ÖZET

BİR İNGİLİZ KRONİĞİ'NDE LANCASTER VE YORK TARİH YAZIMI

Güzel, İlkur

Master, Tarih Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. David E. Thornton

Eylül 2005

Yakın bir dönemde Galler Ulusal Kütüphanesi'nde (MS 21608), John S. Davies'in 1856 yılında yayımladığı *Davies Kroniği* veya *Davies'in Kroniği* başlıklı metinle özdeş bir el yazması bulundu. Davies, Oxford Bodleian Kütüphanesi MS Lyell 34'te bulduğu, II. Richard ve IV. Henry dönemlerinde hasara uğramış olan metni kullanmıştır. Yakın zamanda bulunan metni temel alan *Bir İngiliz Kroniği 1377-1461*, II. Richard, IV. Henry, V. Henry ve VI. Henry dönemlerini kapsamaktadır. Kronik, bölgesel tarih yazımına ve geç Ortaçağ dönemi *Brut* geleneğine ait önemli bir kaynak olarak iki farklı bölümden oluşmaktadır: *Kronik*'in 1377-1422/37 yıllarını kapsayan birinci bölümü Lancasterlı bir derleyici tarafından yazılmış iken, The Continuation 1440-1461 kısmı Yorklu bir yazar tarafından kaleme alınmıştır. Bu iki yazar şüphesiz, geç Ortaçağ dönemi politikası hakkında birbiriyle çelişen bakış açılarına sahiptiler ve *Kronik* bu yolla okuyucusuna, Lancaster ve York tarih yazımlarını keşfetme olanağı sunmaktadır.

Bu tez, *Kronik*'te bahsi geçen dönemin politikasına getirilen iki farklı bakış açısını tartışmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Ortaçağ dönemi tarih yazımının ve özellikle Lancaster ve York tarih yazımlarının analizi yapıldı. Bu tezde, *Kronik*'in genel yapısı üzerine çalışıldı. Her bir alt bölümde, politikaya dair geliştirilen Lancasterlı ve Yorklu perspektifler ve bu bakış açılarının tarih yazımlarına nasıl yansıdığı araştırıldı. Buna bağlı olarak, bu tez, hem geç Ortaçağ dönemine ait tarih yazımı hem de politika hakkında bir anlayış sunan *Kronik*'i değerlendiriyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Bir İngiliz Kroniği*, *Davies Kroniği*, geç Ortaçağ dönemi politikası, Lancaster ve York tarih yazımı.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to William C. Marx who showed a great effort by editing *An English Chronicle* 1377-1461 from the manuscripts at the National Library of Wales. I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Assistant Professor David Thornton for his unceasing professional and personal support throughout the process of writing this dissertation and my experience in the Department of History. I would also like to thank Assistant Professor Paul Latimer, who has contributed to my training as a medieval Europeanist by the various courses he has given.

My special thanks are for my family, who always love, support and encourage me. During this three years period, I have had the chance to know very unique people, who have shared their lives and invaluable friendships with me. I owe thanks to Berna Akkıyal for her extraordinarily enlightening comments and ideas without which I could not be the person I am now. I thank Çağla Güdenoğlu for the amusing times we have had. I would like to thank Damla Erlevent for her inspiration and enthusiasm she has shown at hard times. I am grateful to Ezgi Korkmaz for being such a patient and supportive friend and roommate especially during the last years. I would like to express my thanks to Sanem Şimşek not only for the friendship we have shared for seven years but also for offering me her house unconditionally. I am grateful to Zeynep Kocabıyıkoglu Çeçen for her love, support and friendship, which enables me to feel that I am not alone both in and outside the department.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ÖZET	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
A. TEXT AND ORIGINS	2
B. SOURCES AND COMPILATION	7
C. LANCASTRIAN AND YORKIST HISTORY WRITING	18
CHAPTER 2: THE 1377-1422/37 TEXT: A LANCASTRIAN NARRATIVE?	26
CHAPTER 3: CONTINUATION 1440-1461 AND THE YORKIST PERSPECTIVE	60
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION	88
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: The letter written by the earl of Warwick and Richard Duke of York to Henry VI after the battle of Blore Heath (1459)	93
APPENDIX B: The articles written by Richard Duke of York, Edward Earl of March, the Earl of Warwick and Salisbury to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Commons of England (1460)	95
APPENDIX C: Balat set vpon the yatis of Canterbury	98

APPENDIX D: The articles betwyx King Harry and the Duk of York	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105

ABBREVIATIONS

The Chronicle: An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34.

The Continuation: Eulogium Continuum.

The Brut: *The Brut or the Chronicles of England.*

LALME: *The Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval England*

LP: Language Profile

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine a late Middle English chronicle, which is in the *Brut* tradition, by its recent editor William C. Marx, entitled *An English Chronicle*¹. I will try to sketch the *Chronicle*'s main features such as the author, date of composition, language, style, and content and its position in Middle English history writing. The *Chronicle* is worth studying because it encompasses a very long history of medieval England. There are two compilers/authors of the *Chronicle*: the first wrote from a Lancastrian perspective for the period from 1377 to 1437; and the other is from a Yorkist environment who wrote from 1440 to 1461.² Therefore, many major events in this period are told by two different perspectives and we witness two different readings of history.

In this introductory chapter, I intend to present the *Chronicle* in terms of its general structure. While doing this, it is necessary to study the two parts of the *Chronicle* separately since they were written by different compilers at different dates and for different purposes. I will talk about the main sources the compilers made use of while constructing their narratives. Especially, the compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle* made use of two chronicle sources which have different points of view about the events they narrate. In this sense, I will try to point out how the compiler of the first part edited these texts and how he constructed a narrative out of two sources

¹ William C. Marx, ed. *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003.

² Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xiv.

which have different styles and perspectives. Furthermore, bearing in mind that the two distinctive parts of the *Chronicle* were written by different compilers who represented the Lancastrian history writing and Yorkist history writing respectively, I will discuss the common features of both sorts of history writing.

Since the *Chronicle* has two contrasting characters, I will attempt to sketch out these exclusive properties in the following two chapters. The *Chronicle* is primarily concerned with the political events of the period from 1377 to 1461. I will mainly focus on the compilers and their attitudes towards the major political events which basically revolve around the kings and the noble lords. I will not give a very detailed account of each event, but rather I will concentrate on the major political events where the compilers' attitude towards the politics of the period is clearly seen. I will compare and contrast what the compilers thought about certain events with the secondary sources and thus, determine on whether the compilers distorted the events, how the compilers perceived the events and I will try to come to a decision about their aims while narrating the events in the way they did.

Text and Origins

First of all, I want to begin why the recent publication of this *Chronicle* is subtitled 'a new edition'. In 1856, J.S. Davies edited the continuation of the Middle English prose *Brut*, from a manuscript in the Bodleian (MS Lyell 34), that subsequently became known as *The Davies Chronicle* or *Davies's Chronicle*. As it is indicated, *Davies's Chronicle* makes use of only one manuscript which encompasses the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI. However, the manuscript is damaged for the reign of Richard II. William Marx, the editor of this new edition, discovered a manuscript of the same chronicle in the Aberystwyth, National Library

of Wales for which the reign of Richard II is not damaged. Therefore, this recently discovered manuscript contains episodes concerning the reign of Richard II that are not included in *Davies's Chronicle*.³ Thus, he makes use of two manuscripts that is from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21608,⁴ ff. 149v-189v (henceforth MS A) and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34,⁵ ff. 145v-214v (henceforth MS L).

When we discuss the *Chronicle* in terms of language, we see that the language of the *Chronicle* is late Middle English. Yet, it is hardly possible to determine the exact provenance of MS A, and thus the dialect of the manuscript, since words are not exclusive to one dialect/provenance. Although MS A contains “a sixteenth-century inscription referring to a London merchant”, the language profile of MS A indicates that it has no connection either with London or the south east of England.⁶ Dialectically MS A bears the features of south-west Midlands, west Midlands, south Midlands, north and north-west Midlands along the Welsh border. Although there are diverse words that are characteristic of those regions and many of them were used in all of those regions, the scribal language is thought to belong to Shropshire, which is a north-west dialect.⁷ William Marx declares his ideas about the linguistic feature of MS A:

The evidence of the inscriptions in the manuscript indicates Welsh ownership in Ruthin (Denbig shire) in the sixteenth century and raises the possibility that the manuscript was compiled in north Wales for a Welsh patron. Unfortunately, the *LALME* provides little information about the varieties of written English used in Wales; there are only nine linguistic profiles for Wales based on material drawn from

³ The missing parts concerning the reign of Richard II in *Davies's Chronicle* are the miracle of the hallowing of Westminster Abbey, the Peasants' Revolt, Henry Despensers' campaign in Flanders, the marriage of Richard and Anne, the 'Wonderful Parliament' (1386), the battle of Radcot Bridge, the 'Merciless Parliament' (1388), John of Gaunt's Spanish expedition, Richard's dispute with London, the arrests of three of the Appellant lords, and the 'Revenge Parliament' (1397-8).

⁴ See Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xv, and the sources cited there.

⁵ See Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xxiii, and the sources cited there.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xxii.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

different parts of the country. The linguistic profile of A shares some features with these profiles, particularly those in Denbig shire. Two are localized to Ruthin, and a third in Denbig shire, south and slightly west of Ruthin near the Merioneth border. These linguistic profiles do not provide enough evidence to localize the language of MS A decisively to this area; at the same time they do not rule out Welsh provenance.⁸

The *LALME* includes the language profile of MS L, which positions the dialect of the scribe to Surrey.⁹ However, Marx has two concerns about the language profile of MS L:

First, it is clear that it was compiled not from the manuscript but from Davies's edition. Davies did not reproduce þ and he extended abbreviations silently and in some eccentric ways. The second problem is that MS L is in two hands, which is not noted by the *LALME*, and LP 5800 is therefore a conflation of the forms used by the two scribes...However; the variations in the two hands are not such that they argue for a different localization for the manuscript.¹⁰

The ownership of MS L is known better than MS A. The first known owner of MS L was John Stow who used MS L for his *Annales of England* written in the late sixteenth century.¹¹ Afterwards, it was owned by John Speed who used it for the *Historie of Great Britanie* in the early years of the seventeenth century.¹² John Speed Davies, the father of John Silvester Davies, owned it and then in 1926 it was sold in a sale by an anonymous female owner.¹³ James Lyell acquired the manuscripts in December 1942 from Maggs, and it came to the Bodleian Library as part of Lyell's bequest on his death in 1948.¹⁴

MS A and MS L are associated very strongly in terms of textual organization. However, MS A has two English language verse epitaphs concerning the death of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd in 1282, which was added to chapter 163 (f. 88v) by Welsh

⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xx.

⁹ Angus McIntosh. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, vol. 3. [Aberdeen]; New York, U.S.A.: Aberdeen University Press, 1986, p. 499.

¹⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, pp. xxvi-xxviii.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. xxv.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. xxv.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. xxv.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xxvi.

and English clerks.¹⁵ Thus, the additions of the epitaphs on Llywelyn ap Gruffydd to the *Brut* text and the epitaph on Matthew Goch to f. 181v mark a very close Welsh interest, which was also indicated by the evidence of ownership in the sixteenth century.¹⁶ MS A must have been written by one main hand, which is secretary, and the handwriting suggests that it was written in the fourth quarter of the fifteenth century.¹⁷ Daniel Huws, who has been preparing a catalogue of medieval manuscripts in the National Library of Wales, indicated that there may have been two other scribes contributing to the writing of the manuscript, and yet their work is hardly distinguishable from that of the main hand.¹⁸ Whereas, MS L was written by two secretaries and the style of the two hands suggests that the text was written in the third quarter of the fifteenth century, which is in accordance with the date of the composition of the text.¹⁹ However, there is no clue about when each secretary started writing the text.

It is hard to talk about an author in the *Chronicle*, and thus it is wise to talk about compilers. In order to do so, I, firstly, have to mention the date of composition of the *Chronicle*. It covers the period from 1377 to 1461. As the *Chronicle* finishes at 1461, it can be thought that it was written with a Yorkist perspective since Edward IV reigned after 1461. Yet, there are two separated continuations with an interval from 1437 to 1440. It is believed that the style of the continuation 1377-1422/37 reflects a Lancastrian perspective rather than a Yorkist one because the eleven manuscripts to which Lister M. Matheson links MSS A and L show that the narratives derived from the text witnessed in these two manuscripts ending in 1422 or 1437 moved separately and the narrative for 1440-61 is unique to MSS A and L

¹⁵ Ibid., p. xvi.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. xvii-xviii.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. xvi.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. xvi.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. xxiii.

among thirteen manuscripts.²⁰ Another evidence that proves the Lancastrian perspective of the continuation 1377-1422/37 can be given from the narrative of the reign of Henry IV which has a close relationship to the Latin *Vita Henrici Quinti* by Titus Livius which dates to 1437-38. Titus Livius used the Latin *Brut* as one of his sources, and the Latin *Brut* was a translation of the English language compilation that ‘underlies PV-1437/61’, namely, the *Chronicle* to 1437.²¹ And thus, the *Chronicle*’s narrative to 1437 is proved to be written before 1438.

On the other hand, the second continuation 1440-1461 is apparently written under Yorkist influence. It must have been written between 1461 when Edward IV came to the throne and 1470 when Henry VI regained the throne. When Richard Duke of York made his claim to the throne, the compiler mentioned about Henry VI as the usurper king who “now ys into thys tyme” which means that he was still living.²² In order to understand that the Continuation 1440-1461 was written separately from the Continuation 1377-1422/37, the same evidence applies to the Continuation 1440-1461. First of all, there is a gap between the two continuations, and secondly the style of the Continuation 1440-1461 is completely different from the first part of the *Chronicle*.

One can deduce that the two continuations of the *Chronicle* have different compilers since the compilation dates of the two continuations different. In addition, the styles and purposes of these two continuations are entirely different from each other which also prove that they were written by two distinct compilers. The first compiler was a Lancastrian compiler who made use of the common features of the Lancastrian history writing. He tried to discredit the rule of Richard II and justify the cause and claim of Henry IV, and thus the house of Lancaster. Although he was a

²⁰ Ibid., p. xiv.

²¹ Ibid., p. xiv.

²² Ibid., p. 92.

member of the Lancastrian history writing tradition, his text has some distinctions which will be discussed in the second chapter. Whereas, the compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 is definitely a Yorkist historian. He constructed his text in order to justify the Yorkist cause and he made use of different techniques in order to reinforce the Yorkist cause and claim to the throne which will be discussed in the third chapter in detail.

Sources and Compilation

There are two main sources used by the first part of the *Chronicle* makes use of: the prose *Brut* and *Eulogium Continuation*. The *Brut* provides the skeleton of the first part of the *Chronicle* and the compiler then used the *Continuation* to incorporate materials to the narrative. In fact, the *Chronicle*, in general, can be regarded as a continuation of the *Brut*. Lister M. Matheson has divided the Middle English *Brut* into four major categories: the Common Version (CV), the Extended Version (EV), the Abbreviated Version (AV), and a looser grouping of Peculiar Texts and Versions (PV).²³ The *Chronicle* belongs to the Peculiar Texts and Versions category. This category is often of historical and literary importance, consisting of individual reworkings of the *Brut* texts, these works were based on or adapted from the *Brut*, and combinations of the *Brut* with adaptations of other works.²⁴ Yet, there are also some subcategories of the PV category: *The Peculiar Version to 1422: Group A (PV-1422:A)*, *The Peculiar Version to 1437: Group A (PV-1437:A)* and *The Peculiar*

²³ Lister M. Matheson. *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 180. Tempe, Arizona 1998, p. 6-7. The Common version is based on the Anglo-Norman long version ending in 1333 with the battle of Halidon Hill. The initial identification of texts of the Extended and Abbreviated versions depends on three primary features: (1) the presence of an added exordium, of one or another particular type, describing the historical origins of the *Brut* itself; (2) the words "Some time . . ." at the beginning of the Albina prologue; (3) the inclusion in the prologue and early parts of the narrative of details borrowed from the *Short English Metrical Chronicle*. The exordium is of particular interest in that it reflects contemporary understanding of the genesis of English Chronicle writing.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

*Version to 1437, with a continuation to 1461 (PV-1437/1461).*²⁵ Matheson thinks that the *Brut* texts in MSS A and L as forming The Peculiar Version to 1437, with a continuation to 1461 (PV-1437/1461).²⁶ There are eleven other manuscripts whose narratives end at 1422 and 1437 respectively. However, it will become clear that of the thirteenth manuscripts containing the narrative 1377-1422/37, MS A is witness to the earliest surviving form of this continuation of the *Brut*, and that MS L is closely related to the NLW (National Library of Wales Aberystwyth) manuscript. All of the other versions contain in different ways texts that are derivative, and they signify later recensions and separate versions of the narrative.²⁷

The prose *Brut* occurs in over 240 manuscripts, written in the three major literary languages of medieval England; it was the first *Chronicle* of England to be printed, going through thirteen early printed editions, and in both the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance it served as the standard account of English history.²⁸ The *Brut* to 1333 is the earliest known work beginning with the Brutus legend to be written in Anglo-Norman prose—its predecessors such as the works of Gaimar, Wace and Peter of Langtoft, were in verse.²⁹ The narrative continues with the reigns of subsequent kings, including legendary pre-Conquest kings such as Leir and King Arthur and the reigns of the Norman and Plantagenet kings. The Anglo-Norman text ended with the death of Henry III in 1272 and the *Brut* was written some time in the reign of Edward I (1272-1307). The original text was continued to the death of Edward I in 1307 and then to 1333 in later versions. The text was translated into English between 1350 and 1380 and it was continued in English to the death of

²⁵ Although the *Brut* has a continuation to 1461, the compiler of Continuation 1440-1461 did not make use of the *Brut*. This text is unique to MSS A and L.

²⁶ Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, p. 271.

²⁷ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xiii.

²⁸ Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, p. 1.

²⁹ Antonia Grandsen. *Historical Writing in England ii: c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982, p. 73.

Edward III in 1377. Many subsequent texts end with the siege of Rouen in 1419 and some continuations go on to the death of Henry V in 1422 with a further continuation to 1437 and to 1430. William Caxton's *Chronicles of England* ended with the death of Henry VI in 1461.³⁰

Apart from the Anglo-Norman *Brut*, Latin and Middle English *Bruts* are also available. However, the Anglo-Norman form was popular until the end of the fourteenth century. Afterwards, both Latin and Middle English texts as well as Anglo-Norman one were in widespread use. The style, content, and chivalric tone of the Anglo-Norman work suggest that it was originally aimed at an upper-class, lay audience.³¹ As might be expected in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Latin prose *Brut* appealed to the more educated segment of the potential reading public, primarily to a monastic audience, though there is some evidence of lay interest.³² Yet, the Middle English translation of the *Brut* was more popular than the Anglo-Norman version. It retained the audience that had already been established and expanded it among the merchant class in the fifteenth century.³³ The continuations in the fifteenth century were highly influenced by the *London Chronicles*. Antonia Grandsen states the similarities of the *Brut Chronicles* and the *London Chronicles* written in the fifteenth century:

The fifteenth century *Brut* and *London Chronicles* have features common with each other, and are in fact directly related, because the *Brut Chronicles* were partly derived from the London ones. They survive in many versions but their complete textual history can never be known because of the loss of numerous copies. Their authors, nearly all of whom are anonymous, lived in London, and their *Chronicles* express their civic pride. In politics they were, as one would expect of Londoners, Yorkist. They favoured the French war, which brought lucrative business to the merchants, whether victualling the troops or financing the king, and supported the Yorkist

³⁰ Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, p. 3; Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 222.

³¹ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 76.

³² Matheson, *The Prose Brut*, p. 15.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

interest partly because it promoted the war. It is notable that although ultimately all the *Brut* and *London Chronicles* are based on excellent contemporary sources of evidence, a number were written up in their present form at one sitting, so to speak, in 1461 or soon after; they emphasize the Yorkist claim throughout, and had clearly provided an incentive for their composition.³⁴

In addition, Professor Kingsford agreed with the common idea that the *Brut Chronicles* and the *London Chronicles* had common traits.³⁵ Since his book was titled *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*, he was less concerned with the earlier versions of the *Brut*. According to Kingsford, the continuation which began its narrative in 1377 basically ended in 1419, and yet this date must be extended to 1430 since there had been some continuous extensions until 1430.³⁶ He indicated that the 1377-1422/37 Continuation must have been written immediately after that date; whereas, the Continuation 1440-1461 must have been written “probably at all time”.³⁷

The other source employed by the *Chronicle* is the *Eulogium Continuation*. It is believed to be a continuation of the *Eulogium Historiarum* although in terms of origin and character it does not share anything common with the *Eulogium Historiarum* and it is not certain whether it is intended to be written as a continuation of that text. It starts with the year 1361 and continues to 1413 and it might be written in the early fifteenth century.³⁸ Its author is unknown and yet, it has been argued that it was written by a monk at Malmesbury.³⁹ The Franciscan interest and the connection with Canterbury reveal that the Continuation was written by a Franciscan

³⁴ Gradsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 222.

³⁵ For Kingsford's comments on the *Brut* tradition, see C.L. Kingsford. *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1913, pp. 114-125.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 118-20.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

³⁹ Chris Given-Wilson. *Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400: The Reign of Richard II*, Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1993, p. 6.

friar who was possibly a member of the convent of Grey Friars in Canterbury.⁴⁰ Chris Given-Wilson has stated that it is a Lancastrian Chronicle.⁴¹ The *Continuation* is very central to the period of 1390-1400 and that is why he deduces certain facts about the *Continuation*. However, F.R. Haydon, the editor of the *Continuation*, deduced from the internal evidence that it must have been written at Canterbury, and Kingsford thought that since the *Continuation* in its present form is undoubtedly a composite and not an original work; it would be dangerous to draw any positive conclusion as to the place in which the existing compilation was made.⁴² According to Given-Wilson, the friar writing the *Continuation* acquired his information from Archbishop Thomas Arundel of Canterbury, the younger brother of the Earl of Arundel executed in 1397. Since the archbishop played a leading part in the events of 1397-1400, this is can be regarded as a considerable interest.⁴³ Thus, it explains why the *Chronicle* is hostile to Richard II.

The *Continuation* covers the period from the foundation history of Britain to 1366. *Eulogium Historiarum* is composed of five books and the fifth book, that is the *Continuation*, is the history of England, from starting with the *Brut* and continuing to 1366. From about 1354 the continuation of the *Brut* and the fifth book of the *Eulogium Historiarum* were written more or less contemporaneously with the events narrated.⁴⁴ Yet, the *Continuation* is not interested in contemporary politics. Antonia Grandsen notes that the author's most immediate response to his own times was extracted by moral indignation at certain aspects of social life.⁴⁵ He was especially annoyed by the fashionable clothes worn by some of his fellow countrymen and that

⁴⁰ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 158.

⁴¹ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles of the Revolution*, p. 6.

⁴² Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 28.

⁴³ Given-Wilson, *Chronicles of the Revolution*, p. 6.

⁴⁴ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 104.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

is why the *Continuation* might be seen as a source of the history of English language since it gives the names of some clothes that people wore in the fourteenth century.⁴⁶ According to Kingsford, the *Continuation* is valuable in the sense that it enables us textual comparison with other chronicles, and in particular it throws light on the early history of the *Chronicles of London* and the *Brut*.⁴⁷

Kingsford drew some parallels between the *Continuation* and the *Davies Chronicle*, especially for the period between 1377 and 1413 when the narrative of the *Continuation* ends:

In the matter common to the two chronicles the *Continuation* occasionally preserves some small details not found in *Davies's Chronicle*, whilst the latter in its turn has also something peculiar. The more independent part of the *Continuation* from 1407 to 1411 is concerned chiefly with papal history; besides some things found in *Davies's Chronicle* it also includes a little which is not found there but appears in other versions of the *Brut*. With the events of 1411-12 the more precise resemblance of the two Chronicles is resumed, though as before they supplement one another.⁴⁸

The *Brut* and the *Continuation* are the main sources of the compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle*. The compiler made use of the *Brut* as a frame: he introduced each event with the *Brut* and he generally followed the pattern of the *Brut*. However, he made extensive borrowings from the *Continuation*: he narrated the important elements of each event borrowings from the *Continuation*, and he gave details using the *Continuation*. Although the *Brut* and the *Continuation* have different perspectives about the same events, the compiler of the *Continuation* 1377-1422/37 did not avoid juxtaposing their statements in his own narrative. This might be the reason why the first part of the *Chronicle*, which is believed to be written by a Lancastrian compiler, has some peculiarities of its own. As the compiler mingled both the Lancastrian and

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 104.

⁴⁷ Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 31.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 29-30.

Yorkist points of view into his text, the text displays both Lancastrian and Yorkist traits.

As it is indicated, the sources the *Chronicle* is mainly derived from are in a conflict about their perspectives. The *Brut* and its continuations in the fifteenth century were written with a Yorkist point of view and the *Continuation* was written with the Lancastrian one.⁴⁹ In the *Chronicle* this conflict especially aggravates for the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV because both of these sources are intensively used for the reigns of the two kings. The first continuation of the *Chronicle* (1377-1437) is believed to have been written in a Lancastrian environment. That is why it does not favour Richard II. The reign of Henry IV is supposed to be praised. However, the author tried to justify the accession of Henry IV and to narrate how a worthy king Henry IV was for the first few years of his reign. Surprisingly enough, he changed his mind all of a sudden and he changed sides. He was apparently on the side of those who opposed the succession and authority of Henry IV. It may even be argued that the continuation 1377-1422/37 may be written over several stages. However, we do not have the sufficient grounds to argue this at the moment. This distinction between the two parts of the *Chronicle* is crucial in the light of current arguments that the Lancastrians operated a 'propaganda machine' and contrived to suppress expressions of dissent.⁵⁰ This interesting section of the narrative will be examined later in the second chapter.

For the reigns of Henry V and Henry VI to 1437 the *Chronicle* used different versions of the *Brut* tradition. In addition to this, as I have said before, the *Chronicle* makes use of *Vita Henrici Quinti* by Titus Livius written in 1438. The Latin *Brut* is also important for the narrative of the *Chronicle*. It is derived from an English

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 43.

⁵⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. lv.

version that is at the basis of Matheson's 'Peculiar Version-1437/61', which places before 1438 the compilation of its narrative to the death of Henry V (1422).⁵¹ It is a fact that Titus Livius used the Latin *Brut* as a source for his *Vita Henrici Quinti*. Thus, it can be deduced that the Latin *Brut* must have been written before 1438. Also, the *London Chronicles* might contribute to the texts although they do not clearly appear, the compiler did not mention them as sources, and there has not been any researches done on the similarities between the two texts. Yet, both Grandsen and Kingsford argue that the *London Chronicles* have the direct influence upon the *Brut* and the indirect influence upon the *Continuation*.⁵²

The *Brut* and its variations, however, remain the main source of the *Chronicle* for this phase of the compilation. For this part of the narrative the main concern must be the text in MSS A and L and their relationship to other texts of the *Brut*-tradition insofar as they can be discovered. This period, from the succession of Henry V in 1413 to the death of Henry VI in 1461, can be examined in several stages because of certain differences in narrative. The first stage is from the succession of Henry V in 1413 to the surrender of Rouen in 1419, the second stage is from the surrender of Rouen to 1437 and then the third stage is from 1440 to 1461. It is appropriate to state that the narrative in MS A from the beginning of the reign of Richard II to the surrender of Rouen in 1419 is in the category of Common Version to 1419. The text is central to the *Brut* tradition, and Brie printed a representative text from Cambridge University Library MS Kk.1.12 as 'Continuation C', which provides a useful point of reference for investigating the texts in MSS A and L.⁵³ Yet, MS A and MS L continues to the narrative with a 'changeover' and thus, the

⁵¹ Ibid., p. lxi.

⁵² For the similarities between the *London Chronicles* and the *Brut* and the *Continuation*, see Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, pp. 101-104, 222-30; Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, pp. 28-31, 115-19.

⁵³ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. lvi.

continuations to 1422, 1437, and to 1437 to 1461 are classified as belonging to the Peculiar Texts and Versions category. For the period of 1377-1419, MS A and MS L are parallel to Continuation C but there are abbreviations and paraphrases in both manuscripts, in MS L these changes are seen densely. Through comparing the manuscripts with each other and the Common Version, it is possible to get the textual importance of the manuscripts. Another feature of the narrative of 1377-1419 is its relation with the Latin *Brut*.⁵⁴ In comparison with the *Chronicle*, the Latin versions are selective in terms of the events covered, but some individual episodes before 1419 in the fuller Latin *Brut* are more detailed than those in the *Chronicle*.⁵⁵ For the period from the surrender of Rouen in 1419 to 1437, the Latin *Brut* is a mere translation of the Peculiar Version to 1437/1461.

As I have said above, the first continuation ends in 1437 and there is a three-year gap before the second continuation begins at 1440. The second continuation is obviously written under Yorkist perspective and it is believed that it was written after 1461, that is the succession of Yorkist king Edward IV. This text is a propagandist or myth-making narrative, and thus narratives such as this are commonly concerned with the rightness of their interpretation of events and a need to persuade not only contemporary but more importantly future audiences of the justice of the actions taken for some larger purposes.⁵⁶ The main argument of the Yorkist propaganda is that Henry VI was usurped by his counsellors and the Yorkists claimed to take action for the common good by removing the king for both his sake and the sake of the country and re-establishing a powerful government. Richard, Duke of York, claimed

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. lxi. 'For the purposes of the present edition, the Latin text of the *Brut* is especially important for the light it sheds on the development of the narrative of Henry V in the *Chronicle*. Kingsford printed two versions of the Latin *Brut* covering the period 1399 to 1437 which are distinguished in that one is 'briefer' and the other contains a fuller version of the reign of Henry V.'

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. lxiii.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. lxxxix.

the throne in the autumn of 1460 and this caused the Yorkist opponents a wholly new perspective. The Yorkists were afraid of being accused of replacing a living king and usurping the crown. However, the solution is found in the text itself, they managed to justify their action by linking their narratives to the narrative 1377-1437 whose major event is the deposition of Richard II and the accession of Henry IV. When Richard Duke of York claimed the throne in 1460, he stated that the house of Lancaster, and especially Henry IV, usurped the throne which had belonged to Richard II. As Richard Duke of York had a connection with the Plantagenet line he should have been the one to rule England.

The Continuation 1440-1461 is a compact text: throughout the text, the compiler aimed at justifying the Yorkist cause. The narrative starts at 1440, that is the nineteenth year of Henry VI's reign. The compiler aimed at discrediting the house of Lancaster by stating that the Lancastrian King, Henry VI, was incapable of ruling the country, and he left the government of the country to "evil counsellors" and the Queen. The compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 did not directly attack Henry VI; rather, he indicated his impotence throughout his text. While doing this, in every occasion, he tried to justify the Yorkist cause and the actions of the Yorkist lords. He made use of different techniques in order to prove his point. There is no clue whether he made use of any sources or not; the Continuation 1440-1461 is unique to MS A and MS L among the thirteen manuscripts of the *Brut* continuations to 1461. Accordingly, the compiler of the Continuation had a clear purpose and he made use of every means to reach his goal.

We can say that the audience of both compilers was not only their contemporaries but also the future ones. Both compilers tried to narrate what they thought actually happened in political terms to their audience. They narrated what

was true according to them. Although the compiler of the first part made use of two sources which have different points of view, he omitted and added some parts according to his choice. He did not include every word his sources used; he had a sort of editorial policy while approaching his sources. That is why it can be stated that the compiler did not believe that his texts narrated the events as how they happened and that is why he interfered and constructed a text of his own. He wished to convey what he thought true to his audience. The compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 made it more strongly felt that he addressed his audience. As the Continuation 1440-1461 is actually a Yorkist propaganda text, the compiler had to have a target audience. The compiler's primary aim must have been to affect the contemporary audience who were living under the Yorkist rule. The contemporary audience was supposed to know that the Yorkists did not usurp the throne, the compiler was supposed to persuade them that the Yorkists had a just cause. Besides, the compiler was also supposed to convince the future audience for the same reasons. This written document might have been the only extant source for the future audience to know the *relative* facts about the past.

As there are two distinct parts in the *Chronicle*, one can question if they really compose one chronicle. The answer must be yes since both the *Davies Chronicle* and the *Chronicle* have the Continuation 1440-1461. This cannot be a mere coincidence. The final compiler of the *Chronicle*, probably the compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461, combined them together since this situation served for his purpose. That is, the first part of the *Chronicle* narrates the deposition of Richard II although it was told from a Lancastrian point of view. In the aftermath of the deposition, the reign of Henry IV was not reported in favourable terms; the common people, the ecclesiastical people, the nobles, etc. wished to have Richard II as the

king again although he was dead. As a consequence of the misdeeds of Henry IV, he was damned to leprosy; and the so-called Lancastrian compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle* did tell this situation with no sympathy. In this aspect, the compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 must have wished his audience to compare and contrast the events in full. In line with his aim, the first part of the *Chronicle* proves that the Lancastrians usurped the throne and as a consequence of their usurpation, they were doomed and God and his justice punished them.

At this point, one can suppose that the compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 was the one who narrated the reign of Henry IV and that is why the section of the rule of Henry IV demonstrates abnormalities since he was the first Lancastrian king and this part is considered to be written by a Lancastrian compiler. However, this cannot be realized by the compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 due to the fact that neither MS A nor MS L is unique: they belong to the *Brut* tradition and as I have discussed above there are other *Brut* versions which have similarities with these manuscripts.

Lancastrian and Yorkist History Writing

The concepts of 'Lancastrian' and 'Yorkist' were not in use until the second half of the fifteenth century. The reason why these concepts emerged all of a sudden can be explained by referring to the turmoil England was in in 1450s. It is a fact that Henry VI was an incapable king who was governed by his favourites and his wife and the misgovernment of the favourites caused a great trouble in the country.⁵⁷ This trouble reminded people the problematic legacy issue of Henry VI's grandfather's, Henry IV's, succession. In fact, both the Lancastrians and the Yorkist were

⁵⁷ A. J. Pollard. *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*. Harlow: Longman, 1995, p. 256.

descended from a count of Anjou who had married William the Conqueror's granddaughter and the house of Plantagenet ruled England since 1154.⁵⁸ When Henry IV usurped the throne from Richard II in 1399, the dispute between the two branches of the family emerged.

Henry IV was the first Lancastrian king to rule, however this did not mean that his position as a king was assured since he had to face a series of rebellions and conspiracies in the first six years of his reign.⁵⁹ Henry V and Henry VI was crowned as kings without the question of legitimacy. Henry V was such a brilliant monarch that the Lancastrian succession was never questioned.⁶⁰ On the other hand, Henry VI failure as a king and the existence of other possible heirs to the throne like Richard Duke of York might be seen as the first steps of the distinction between the 'Yorkists' and the 'Lancastrians'.

The Yorkists emphasized the illegitimacy of the Lancastrian succession to the throne when they were campaigning against the Lancastrian rule; and Richard Duke of York claimed the throne on the basis of his genealogy. Besides the hereditary disputes between the two houses, recently it has been argued that the dispute leading to the Wars of the Roses was a mere fight between some great lords for control over the king.⁶¹ That is why the Yorkist lords were in conflict with the favourites of Henry VI.

Speaking about the history writing in the fifteenth century in general, it is true that history writing at the beginning of the century is similar to the past: chroniclers and contemporary historians made use of the style and characteristics of the previous

⁵⁸ Desmond Seward. *The Wars of the Roses: and the Lives of five Men and Women in the Fifteenth Century*. London: Constable, 1995,

⁵⁹ R. L. Storey. *The End of the House of Lancaster*. Stroud: Sutton, 1999, p. 4.

⁶⁰ Seward, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 3.

⁶¹ Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster*, p. 5.

traditions of history writing, although this trend was apparently in decline.⁶² For the fifteenth century historical writing in general, the historians were modernizing themselves: even though sometimes they wrote with prejudice, the purpose of their writing was from a broader and more national standpoint; the language was mostly English rather than Latin, and most important of all they appealed to a popular audience intentionally.⁶³ The reason for the appeal to popular audience is that the fifteenth century is the epoch of the conflict between different political factions and social groups. According to Grandsen, the chroniclers were liable not only to government propaganda but also to propaganda from the opposing factions.⁶⁴ Both the Lancastrians and Yorkists realized that they should have used all means to gather popular support since the situations of both houses were subjected to change.⁶⁵ The urge for propaganda was very necessary in order to appeal to the commoners and the ever-increasing literacy facilitated the spread of propaganda.⁶⁶ In this sense, bills and specifically historical sources were of a special importance in order to justify their acts, explain their intentions and, announce their victories.⁶⁷

In this propaganda rivalry, the chroniclers had a very significant role since they were the ones who would persuade and inform the commoners about the activities of the factions they belonged to. On the other hand, the chroniclers were subjected to change sides. For example, Sir John Fortescue defended the Lancastrian claim to the throne by his polemical writings when he was in exile with Henry VI in Scotland from 1461 to 1464. Again, it was Fortescue who aligned with Edward IV's restoration in 1471 and wrote as a Yorkist propagandist. "He again used the evidence

⁶² Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 7.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁶⁴ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 251.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 251.

⁶⁶ Kingsford, *English Historical Literature*, p. 7; Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 251.

⁶⁷ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 251.

of history (he asserted that he now had access to more accurate chronicles and documents than previously) as one means of refuting the arguments he had put forward in the Lancastrian interest”.⁶⁸ John Hardyng is another case to study the changes in political outlook.⁶⁹ He firstly wrote his chronicle for Henry VI and then he changed sides and rewrote it for Richard Duke of York and then Edward IV.⁷⁰ He praised the victories of Henry V as the king of England and France. As a result of his disapproval of Henry VI, who did not keep Henry V’s promise to give him Geddington, he changed sides and, discredited Henry VI and the succession of Lancastrians in general.⁷¹

The discussion of Lancastrian history writing should be started from the deposition of Richard II because it is the key argument of the Lancastrians, that Richard voluntarily renounced the throne and that the Lancastrians were the rightful successors. The Lancastrians themselves composed the official history by including the so-called ‘Record and Process’ in the rolls of parliament. The main purpose of the Lancastrian historians was to justify the new government by stressing the genealogical line of Henry IV.⁷² The Lancastrians not only composed the history, they also distributed copies to the chroniclers such as Thomas Walsingham, the compiler of the *Continuation*, the Evesham chronicler, Adam of Usk and so forth.⁷³ Propaganda was the main reason of the biographies of Henry V. in the chronicles, which praised Henry V such as the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*, Titus Livius’ *Vita Henrici Quinti*, and its English translation the theme of the propaganda shifted from the

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 252, n. 24.

⁶⁹ John Hardyng. *The Chronicle of John Hardyng*, ed. by Henry Ellis. London: 1812, reprinted 1974.

⁷⁰ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 277. For a detailed analysis of John Hardyng’s Chronicle, see *ibid.*, pp. 276-87.

⁷¹ Ibid., pp. 277-8.

⁷² For the argument of Lancastrian propaganda, see Paul Strohm. *England’s Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation 1399-1422*. New Have; London: Yale University Press, 1998.

⁷³ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 187.

justification of the succession of the Lancastrian line to the promotion of the policy of the central government.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, the Lancastrian rule was praised through the victories of Henry V and, at this point there was no need to discuss the rightfulness of the Lancastrian succession.

While discussing Yorkist history writing, the *Brut* and the *London Chronicles* should be taken as exemplars since they were written with a Yorkist perspective.⁷⁵ Since I have dealt with them, I wish to give examples from other chronicles and documents, which were written under the Yorkist bias during the Wars of the Roses. As a result of this exemplification of Yorkist propaganda, I wish to deduce some general characteristics of Yorkist history writing.

John Benet's Chronicle for the Years 1400 to 1462 is a Yorkist one.⁷⁶ The chronicle criticized the counsellors of Henry VI: Suffolk is 'the wicked duke' and Somerset is also wicked because of his negligence in the loss of Normandy.⁷⁷ In contrast, the Duke of Gloucester was the 'most faithful prince' and also Richard Duke of York is favoured.⁷⁸ The *History of the Arrival in England of Edward IV*⁷⁹ is an official chronicle and its purpose is to "record Edward's readeption in terms most flattering to the king".⁸⁰ The chronicler emphasized the reappearance of Edward IV's right to rule as opposed to the illegal claim of Henry VI and, he frequently referred to Henry VI as 'usurper'.⁸¹

In the case of the *Chronicle*, I have indicated that 1377-1422/37 version was written in the Lancastrian perspective since its date of composition is roughly 1437

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 197.

⁷⁵ For the discussion of the *Brut* and the London chronicles, see pp. 9-10 above.

⁷⁶ G. L. Harriss, M. A. Harriss, eds. *John Benet's Chronicle for the Years 1400 to 1462*. Camden Miscellany, xxiv: 1972.

⁷⁷ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 257.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 257.

⁷⁹ John Bruce, ed. *Historie of the Arrival of Edward IV in England and the Finall Recouerye of his Kingdomes from Henry VI*, A. D. M.CCCC.LXXI. Camden Society, Original Seres, i: 1838.

⁸⁰ Grandsen, *Historical Writing*, p. 261. For a detailed analysis of this chronicle, see *ibid.*, pp. 261-5.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 262.

and, this is the period of the Lancastrian rule.⁸² However, the problem is that although it is Lancastrian propaganda, it makes use of the *Brut*, which is Yorkist in tone. Also, it can be argued that the Lancastrian compiler used the *Continuation*, which is Lancastrian in tone. Furthermore, due to the textual evidence, it can be stated that the Lancastrian compiler made use of the *Continuation* more than the *Brut*. Besides, it does not avoid discrediting Henry IV, the first Lancastrian king. It should be stressed that the Lancastrian compiler borrowed the extracts where Henry IV was discredited from the *Continuation*. Therefore; it is hard to decide whether the compiler changed sides or not.

Undoubtedly, the *Continuation* 1440-1461 is a Yorkist text. It has all the features of the Yorkist history writing and it reinforces its purpose, which is to justify the Yorkist succession and to discredit the Lancastrian rule, with the use of both official and popular documents. It appeals to the commoners by stressing that the Yorkists were fighting for the ‘common weal’ and, they were fighting against Henry VI’s ‘evil counsellors’, who had no regard for the ‘common weal’.

While discussing the content of the *Chronicle*, I do not want to examine the each reign with detail. I just want to focus on specific excerpts from the narrative that seem crucial for understanding the main features of the content and the style of the *Chronicle*. In this sense, I will look at the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV and Henry VI because these reigns are pivotal for the differences that occur in the style and perspective of the *Chronicle*. The reason why I do not prefer to study the reign of Henry V is that this reign was narrated by the Lancastrian compiler. Therefore, there is no unexpected discourse about this reign. Although the Lancastrian compiler was very critical about Henry IV, he was quiet neutral for the reign of Henry V.

⁸² For other details that indicate that the first part of the *Chronicle* was written with a Lancastrian perspective, see p. 6 above.

Therefore; this period cannot offer us any clues about the style of the 1377-1422.1437 text and its compiler's intention.

In conclusion, in this chapter I have introduced *An English Chronicle: 1377-1461*. I have examined the basic features of the *Chronicle* and tried to demonstrate why it must be considered a significant text for the history writing in the late Middle Ages. The *Chronicle* is worth studying since it is in a sense unique, although it is a part of the *Brut* tradition. It is unique because it is different from the rest of the tradition with its narrative. It is unique because it reflects the historical aspect of both the Lancastrians and the Yorkists and their strife to justify their perspectives and historical views. The *Chronicle* promises a very interesting reading of the late Middle Ages and it is worth examining this period from its point of view.

The dissertation will continue with two chapters: "The 1377-1422/1437 Text: A Lancastrian Narrative?" and "The Continuation 1440-1461 and the Yorkist Perspective". In Chapter 2, I will essentially focus on the structure of the 1377-1422/1437 text in terms of its author, date of composition, aim and style. My method will be to analyze the major events of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV and the first nineteen years of Henry VI's reign; I will not analyze each reign in detail. My aim is to display the crucial points where we can clearly witness the compiler's style and his aim. I will conclude that the 1377-1422/37 text has common traits with the Lancastrian history writing. Nevertheless, there are some points where the text seemed to have had no connection to the Lancastrian history writing tradition. Since the first part of the *Chronicle* has some irregularities of its own when it is discussed in terms of the Lancastrian history writing, it is hard to understand what the compiler had in mind while transforming his seemingly Lancastrian text into something else.

In Chapter 3, my method will be the same: I will examine the Continuation 1440-1461 and its basic features such as the compiler's aim and his style. I will try to discuss why the Continuation 1440-1461 should be considered as one of the best examples of the Yorkist history writing and Yorkist propaganda machine. I will sketch out the compiler's use of different stylistic techniques throughout the narrative in order to prove his point which was to justify the Yorkist cause.

CHAPTER 2

THE 1377-1422/37 TEXT: A LANCASTRIAN NARRATIVE?

In this chapter, I will mainly focus on the first part of the *Chronicle*, which encompasses the period of 1377-1437 and which reflects the Lancastrian point of view. I aim at demonstrating the main stylistic features of this particular part of the *Chronicle* concerning this period. In addition, it should be wise to state that the similarities and differences between this particular part of the *Chronicle* and the common trends of the Lancastrian history writing will be analyzed. By comparing the *Chronicle*'s first part to other exemplars of the Lancastrian history writing, I intend to confirm that the first part of the *Chronicle*, as well as having common properties with the other Lancastrian historical writings, has some distinct features of itself.

As I have said in the introduction, the first part of the *Chronicle* covers the years from 1377, that is the accession of Richard II to the throne to 1437, that is the sixteenth year of Henry VI's reign. The reason why it is thought that the first part of the *Chronicle* is written by a Lancastrian compiler is that this part has some common properties of the Lancastrian historical writing. As a general structure, the first part can be considered as a piece of historical writing which attempts to justify the Lancastrian succession and to justify their succession by the acts of the Lancastrian kings. As it has been discussed and proved in the introduction, the *Chronicle* was

originated from the *Brut* tradition. As the *Chronicle*'s first part conforms the general approach of the *Brut* tradition, it is believed that this part must have been written by a Lancastrian compiler. We do not know either the exact date of the composition nor the compiler of the text. Yet, by analyzing the textual clues it is inferred by Marx that it must have been written before 1438. Following a lacuna of three years, the second part of the *Chronicle*, that is 1440-1461, begins and the internal evidence proves that this part was written by a Yorkist compiler. The second part of the *Chronicle* has some sharp contrasts to the first part of the *Chronicle*. In this chapter, by examining the first part of the *Chronicle*, I will try to argue why this part of the *Chronicle* should be considered to be an example of the Lancastrian historical writing. Furthermore, I will discuss the first part in terms of the parts that it is disconnected from the Lancastrian history writing. And thus, my ultimate aim is to confer whether the first part can be seen as an example of the Lancastrian history writing.

While discussing the first part's stylistic features, I should mention the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV and Henry VI. I will not go in details about each reign: I will pick some examples from each period in order to illustrate my point, that is whether this text is a piece of Lancastrian history writing. My criteria while selecting these parts of the narrative is that I will mainly concentrate on the points of political conflict, because I think that these points are crucial for understanding the attitude of the compiler to the political events which can help reveal his point of view. Besides, I will mention other parts, which were not such big political matters, that expose the compiler's perspective and style.

My method while dealing with the *Chronicle* will be to analyze the text in detail in the light of its sources, namely the *Eulogium Continuation* and the *Brut*. Also, as I have said in the introduction, the narratives of the reigns of Richard II and

Henry IV are especially crucial since these parts are damaged in the *Davies's Chronicle*. That is why the first part of the *Chronicle* which makes use of MS A is, in a sense, unique. And I will try to compare and contrast the *Chronicle* to the *Davies's Chronicle* in terms of these damaged parts as well as the rest of its narrative. Accordingly, I will refer to the political history of the period since I intend to make use of the political history in order to understand the compiler's method. In the light of the generally accepted political history of the period, I think, it will be thoroughly comprehended that the compiler had a perspective of his own and that is why he omitted and added passages to his text by breaking up from his main sources. In general, the aim of this chapter is to discuss the stylistic features of the first part of the *Chronicle* and the *Chronicle's* relation to its main sources, the version of the *Davies's Chronicle* and the generally accepted political history of the period.

One can suppose that the compiler had a hostile approach to Richard II for the whole of his narrative. Yet, this is not entirely true, since the narrative starts with a neutral tone. The compiler was called critical of Richard II's deeds, but he did not blame him. He was critical of Richard II's counsellors but, he did not impose any guilt on the king. Gradually, this approach changes in the text and with the deposition of Richard II, we see that the compiler tried to justify the deposition of the king. I will point out the transformation of the compiler's attitude to Richard II by giving examples from the text such as, the Peasants Revolt of 1381, the Wonderful Parliament, Merciless Parliament, etc. According to the compiler, the accession of Henry IV was just and thus, he justified the Lancastrian accession. Yet, his attitude towards the king also gradually changed, especially in three cases: Henry IV's dispute with the Franciscan friars; the Battle of Shrewsbury; and, Archbishop Scrope's rebellion, which finally caused Henry's death as a divine punishment

according to the compiler. The first part of the *Chronicle* also encompasses the first nineteen years of Henry VI's reign. However, the compiler did not make any important comments about this period: he just mentioned the events without placing any emphasis on them. Therefore, as there is nothing to argue about the compiler's attitude for this period, I will not examine this part of the *Chronicle*.

For the reign of Richard II, the compiler's general method was to juxtapose passages from the *Brut* and the *Continuation*. As a matter of fact, the compiler used the *Brut* as a framework for constructing his narrative, and he added extensively from the *Continuation*. While doing this, he omitted and sometimes added some parts of his own choice from his sources or in some cases he just narrated the events according to himself, and that is why the narrative of each incident shows indigenoussness of its own. By pursuing what he had omitted and added can help us to understand his attitude towards the events. By tracing them, we can understand how this transformation - how his approach towards Richard changed gradually, took place.

The narrative of Richard II's reign, thus the *Chronicle*, starts with the violation of the sanctuary of Westminster Abbey.¹ However, the first notable event of Richard II's reign is the Peasants' Revolt of 1381.² For the Peasants' Revolt, the *Brut*³ and the *Continuation* have different approaches to the event: the *Brut*

¹ William C. Marx, ed. *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003, pp. 3-4; May McKisack. *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991, p. 404; Anthony Tuck. *Richard II and the English Nobility*. London: Edward Arnold, 1973, p. 41.

² Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, pp. 5-7; Rodney Hilton. *Bond Men Made Free: Medieval Peasant Movements and the English Rising of 1381*. London: Meyhuen, 1973; R. B. Dobson, ed. *The Peasants' Revolt of 1381*, 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1983, pp. 37-8, 103-18; Nigel Saul. *Richard II*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999, pp. 56-82.

³ For the account of the Peasants' Revolt in the *Brut*, see W.D. Brie, ed. *The Brut or the Chronicles of England*, vol. 2. London: Kegan Paul, for the Early English Text Society, 1906-1908, pp. 336-8.

condemns the rebels, whereas the *Continuation*⁴ finds the rebels' cause just. The *Chronicle* starts its narration of the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 with an introductory sentence from the *Brut*. The compiler began and ended his narrative with the *Brut*, and where the *Continuation* did not include some details he incorporated into his text details which are generally hostile and *Brutal* remarks of the rebels. Thus, it can be said that it makes use of the *Brut* for the general construction of the narrative. The compiler borrowed the introductory statement of the Peasants' Revolt from the *Brut*:

The iij yere off Kynge Richard wasse a parlemente holden at Westmynster wheryn it wasse ordeyned þat euery mon, woman, and childe þat wasse atte þe age of xiiij yere and aboue throughoute all þe reame, poore folke and riche, shulde paye to the taluge iiij*d*. Wherfor afterwarde camme grete myscheeffe and mucche diseases to all the communez off the reame.⁵

As an introduction, the compiler introduced the event by stating its due reason which is taken from the *Brut*. As a general pattern, the compiler began narrating events with an introductory sentence taken from the *Brut* and then he went on with the *Continuation* while narrating the main body of events. This pattern also applies to the account of the Peasants' Revolt. The compiler mentioned about the poll tax of 1380 and he indicated that it would cause great problems, implying the Peasants' Revolt.⁶ For the account of 1381 and thus the Peasants' Revolt he made use of the *Brut* in order to introduce the event. Except the introductory sentence, the compiler went on with the *Continuation*.

⁴ For the account of the Peasants' Revolt of the *Continuation*, see Frank S. Haydon, ed. *Eulogium Continuation*, in *Eulogium Historiarum*, vol. 3., Rolls Series. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858-63, pp. 352-4.

⁵ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 5; Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 336.

⁶ For the reasons of the revolt, see McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, p. 406-07; Dobson, *The Peasants' Revolt of 1381*, pp. 37-8, 103-18. Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 56-82; Bryan Bevan. *King Richard II*. London: Rubicon Press: 1996, pp. 18-30.

In the *Continuation*, and thus in the *Chronicle*, Wat Tyler is depicted as an ‘eloquent’ man who openly expressed the complaints of people.⁷ The *Chronicle*, by making use of the sentence in which the rebels had a just cause for revoking against an oppressive government, in a sense establishes its stance. It can be assumed that the *Chronicle* is also sympathetic with the rebels’ cause since it openly depicts the leader of the rebellion and the cause of the rebellion in this sentence: [their] “chieftayn & principalle was a tyler of Exex called Watte Tiler, an eloquente mon, and expressed and tolde to the bishoppe [of Rochester] the greuuauunce of þe poore peple, how they were oppressed be taskes and talagez”.⁸

According to the *Brut*, the rebels were against the law; they were destructive. Although the compiler did not appear sympathetic to the rebels, he borrowed passages from the *Brut* in which the rebels were harshly condemned for their deeds:

And þanne come vnto þe Temple, and all oper ynnez of men of lawe, & displayed ham and rebbed ham of her godez, and also tare hir bokis of law; and þai come to London, and brake vp the prison of Newgate, & droff out alle þe prisoners, felons, & opir of bothe countres, and alle þe peple þat was with-ynne ham, & destroyed alle þe bokis of bothe countres; and þus þay continued forth, both Saturday and Sonday, vnto þe Monday next folowyng, yn alle hir malice & wickydnese.⁹

While narrating the events from the *Continuation*’s perspective, the compiler did not hesitate to add this passage from the *Brut*. In fact, the main body of the narration starts with the *Continuation*, and then it goes on with the *Brut* where the violence the rebels did was narrated. Lastly, the *Continuation* is represented into the narrative in order to depict how the rebels were deceived and how Wat Tyler was murdered. Once more, the compiler tried to generate sympathy for the rebels. The reason why the compiler did so might be to present the more radical view of the *Continuation* in

⁷ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 352; Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 5.

⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 5.

⁹ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 337.

English to a broader social spectrum rather than rewriting or reconstructing the events.¹⁰

As a Lancastrian compiler, what was the attitude of the compiler to the king and his counsellors? When the rebels were moving to London, the king was told by the Archbishop of Canterbury not to speak to the rebels.¹¹ When they came to the Tower of London to speak to the king, he sent them envoys who were killed by the rebels.¹² When the rebels “desired off be kynge þat he shulde make all the bounde men off Englonde fre”, he “graunted thaym vndir his lettres patentez”.¹³ When the mob was directed to Smithfield hoping that “the kynge wolde comme”, they were entrapped and deceived by the king and his counsellors.¹⁴ As it is apparent, the king had no contact with the rebels and he was either stopped by his counsellors or he was too frightened to take an action to stop the rebellion. Therefore it can be said that the compiler tried to show that Richard was also deceived by his counsellors and that is why he was inactive.

In the case of the Wonderful Parliament of 1386,¹⁵ the compiler combined the parliaments of 1385 and 1386 because he again followed the *Brut* sequence of events. Although the *Continuation* reported both parliaments in the correct chronological order,¹⁶ the compiler made use of the *Brut* which reported the parliament of 1385 as if it occurred in the ninth year of Richard’s reign.¹⁷ Having read the *Continuation*, the compiler could have comprehended that the two

¹⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xxxv.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

¹⁵ McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 442-6; Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 157-64; Anthony Tuck. *Crown and Nobility: England 1272-1461*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999, pp. 161-3; Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility*, p. 99; Bevan, *King Richard II*, pp. 53-4.

¹⁶ For the account of the 1385 parliament, see Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 360, for the account of the 1386 parliament, see Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 359.

¹⁷ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 340-1.

parliaments were different cases, he nevertheless preferred incorporating them. The compiler carried on with the account of the *Continuation*, and thus he portrayed Richard on defence against the lords.¹⁸ The passage in which the Wonderful Parliament is narrated in the *Chronicle* is certainly significant since it shows both the tension between the king and the parliament and also the compiler's sentiments towards the king and his 'evil counsellors'. The *Chronicle* reflects the arguments of the lords and the compiler called the false counsellors as "þe enemyes inwarde".¹⁹ He also justified the lords' action by mentioning the reason of their gathering: "they wolde trete off þe nedes off þe reame, þe whiche stode in grete perell."²⁰ In the case of the account of the Wonderful Parliament, the compiler's attitude toward the king and his counsellors is more visible. The compiler is not hostile to Richard who did not wish to agree with the parliamentary decision. He was forced to do things; he was threatened with the deposition statute of Edward II to come to the parliament and he was forced to grant the commission.²¹ Although the compiler did not openly blame Richard, he explicitly called the counsellors "þe enemyes inwarde"²² and his main target seems to be the counsellors rather than Richard II.²³

The general method of the narrative, that is the juxtaposition of selections from the *Continuation* and the *Brut*, is also valid for the subsequent events, the Battle of Radcot Bridge (1387)²⁴ and the Merciless Parliament of 1388.²⁵ The compiler

¹⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 9.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²³ For the study of the Wonderful Parliament of 1386 and its consequences, see J. S. Roskell. *The Impeachment of Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, in 1386, in the Context of the Reign of Richard II*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

²⁴ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 11; for the battle of Radcot Bridge, see Bevan, *King Richard II*, pp. 61-2; Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 169-91; McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 447-54.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12, for the background of the battle of Radcot Bridge and the Merciless Parliament, see Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, pp. 163-70; McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 447-61; Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 176-96.

used the *Brut* in order to give a general picture of the events and made use of the *Continuation*²⁶ in order to present the events fully. Yet, the same problem emerges here: the *Brut* is very brief and it hardly gives information about the major events. Therefore, the narrative of the *Chronicle* is to some extent confusing and contradictory. The narrative starts by naming the five appellants and the false counsellors and this introduction was taken from the *Brut*.²⁷ Subsequently, the narrative carries on with the *Continuation* and the introductory sentence is out of context in the sense that it reads as follows: “Then sende the kynge for the seide Duke of Gloucestre and for the Erle off Warwicke and off Arundell, and layed men in wayte forto haue taken ham ...”.²⁸ The compiler did not introduce the background of this sentence; in the *Continuation* this sentence is introduced after a complete account of Richard’s council with the judges at Nottingham (25 August 1387).²⁹ The *Chronicle*’s account of the Battle of Radcot Bridge is in agreement with the *Continuation*; by omitting some details the *Chronicle* directly makes use of the account of the *Continuation* which focuses on the political tension between the king and the appellant lords leading up to the battle. The compiler was interested in the political conflict as we have observed in the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 and the Wonderful Parliament of 1386.

The account of the battle’s conclusion is worth mentioning since the compiler introduced another peculiarity into the narrative. The *Brut*’s account of the Battle of Radcot Bridge, also the introduction of the events in the *Continuation*, is short and it gives very briefly the reason for the lords’ rising, the names of the lords and the counsellors; and it concludes the account by stating that “and þese iij lordez

²⁶ For the account of the Battle of Radcot Bridge, see Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 364-7.

²⁷ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 342.

²⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 10.

²⁹ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 361-4.

[Alexander Neville, Robert de Vere and Michael de la Pole] went ouyr see, and cam nevir ayen, for there þay deied”.³⁰ The compiler changed this sentence in this way: “And they fledde to the see, & came agayne as yt shall be rehersed afterwerde”.³¹ Followed by the account of the *Brut*, the compiler introduced the account of the *Continuation* which concludes the account in this way: “Michael de la Pole evasit. Item Alexander Nevyle archiepiscopus Eborum ad partes ivit transmarinas, et numquam reverse sunt”.³² The *Continuation* did not mention about the flight of Robert de Vere, nor did the *Chronicle*. However, the point I want to draw attention is the compiler’s possible awareness; he must have understood that the *Brut* and the *Continuation* refer to the same event. He did not choose to narrate the event from one source; by attaching the two different passages, he created his own narrative in which the false counsellors of the king returned from exile and were defeated again.³³ As I have indicated above, the compiler constructed one event from the two different parliaments of 1385 and 1386. In this case, he obtained two events out of one. This might be either an error or the compiler’s method.

The compiler borrowed the account of the Merciless Parliament of 1388 from the *Continuation* which narrates the events in a brief and detached manner.³⁴ The *Continuation*, nevertheless, gives a hint about what its judgement was concerning the actions of this parliament and the Appellant lords:

Et ne aliqui eorum adversarii se excusaer possent per hoc quod nihil fecissent dignum mortis secundum legem Anglia vel per mandatum Regis statuerunt legem de assensu parliamenti pro tempore ejusdem parliamenti tantummodo valituram; videlicet si parliamentum aliquem appellaret de crimine quia cum parlamento pugnare non posset sine ratione damnaretur.³⁵

³⁰ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 342.

³¹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 10.

³² Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 365.

³³ Marx, ed. *The Continuation*, p. xli.

³⁴ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 366-7.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 366.

The *Continuation*, in some sense, accuses the lords of murdering many innocent men. It is to be remembered that the *Chronicle* does not make use here of the *Brut* which has a longer passage of the Merciless Parliament.³⁶ In this respect, it can be said that the compiler of the *Chronicle* is in accordance with the *Continuation*. However, it is peculiar for a Lancastrian chronicle such as the *Continuation* and the *Chronicle* which was apparently written under the Lancastrian rule, not to be neutral. It is clear that these two *Chronicles* are not supporting the Lords in their actions.

The Revenge Parliament of 1397/98³⁷ (the first session was held between 17 September 1397 and 30 September 1397; the second session was held on 28 January 1398) is another significant event that we can trace the compiler's method and his perspective on major political events and groups. As a general method, the compiler combined the *Brut* and the *Continuation* for creating his narrative in the *Chronicle*³⁸ and he made use of the *Brut*³⁹ in order to introduce the events. Yet, he made use of the *Continuation* for the details of the events.⁴⁰ The compiler especially made use of the dialogues, which are highly dramatized, between the accused lords, namely Earl of Arundel and Earl of Warwick and the king which he borrowed from the *Continuation*.⁴¹

The *Chronicle*'s account of the Revenge Parliament acts as the climax of the narrative which began with the Wonderful Parliament. It is the longest episode in the *Chronicle*'s narrative of the reign of Richard II. The compiler was concerned to give every aspect of the parliament and trials. Richard did not intervene in the trials of the

³⁶ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 342.

³⁷ McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 479-84; Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 375-84; Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility*, pp. 187-91 and *Crown and Nobility*, pp. 180-6.

³⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, pp. 17-20.

³⁹ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 352-3.

⁴⁰ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 373-9.

⁴¹ For the dialogue between John of Gaunt and Earl of Arundel see, Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, pp. 18-19; Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 374-5; for the dialogue between the lords in the parliament and Earl of Warwick see Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 19; Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 375.

lords, but his duplicity is apparently depicted in the case of Archbishop Arundel who was accused of procuring and labouring “forto be in the foreside commission, ant it executed and seled when he wasse chaunseler”.⁴² While the speaker of the parliament was reading his charges, “the kynge bade hym holde his peasse and sey no more agaynes his cosyn, and bade the archebishoppe go his way safly”.⁴³ Then Richard sent a messenger after him commanding “hym comme no more in the parlemente”.⁴⁴ Yet, the archbishop returned to the parliament and said that “I woll not goo oute off this londe; here I wasse born and here I woll dye”.⁴⁵ “The kynge and the duke of Lancastre wente þen vnto hym, and the kynge seide vnto hym in this wise, ‘Fadur, be not sory forto goo oute off this londe, for I ensure yow be my trothe þat ye shall comme agayne within shorte tyme, and their shall non be Archebishoppe off Caunturbury while ye and I lyve’”.⁴⁶ Richard was not a man to be trusted and, after the “archebishoppe toke his leve, and on Mychaelmasse even atte Dover he wente ouer the se and so furthe to Rome”.⁴⁷

The rest of the narrative leading up to the deposition of Richard proves the point of the compiler. While narrating the events leading up to the deposition he generally made use of the *Continuation*, which is also hostile to Richard and his misdeeds. The *Chronicle* portrays a disturbed, scared and vengeful king with the events leading up to his deposition. The *Chronicle*’s narrative of the events starting with Richard’s expedition to Ireland, the return of Henry and other events leading up to the deposition of Richard is a very complex one. Henry was depicted as a liberator and a triumphant hero who returned to regain his rightful inheritance by the compiler

⁴² Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 19.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 19.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 19.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 20.

who borrowed the material concerning Henry's return from the *Continuation*,⁴⁸ while the *Brut* is neutral in its tone about the return of Henry.⁴⁹ The *Chronicle* justifies the reason why Henry returned to England in similar terms to the *Continuation* in Henry's writing "to the citesones of London & called hymselfe Duke off Lancastre and Stiwarde off Engelande, and seide þat he wolde refourme and amende all þat wasse amisse."⁵⁰ As Henry had been treated unjustly by a king who had also done harm to the country, he gained the support of the people. His writing promised the citizens of London to amend the misgovernance of the country, and in fact he implicitly *stated* that he could achieve this goal by deposing Richard and being the new king. He could not achieve his final aim by being the steward of England and it is very clear from what he wrote to the Londoners that he planned to be a king from the beginning.

Richard's lack of support is illustrated in the *Chronicle* by this sentence: "Kynge Richarde came in haste oute of Irelande into Wales, and aboode in the castell off Flynte to take counsell whatte wasse beste to do, but no counsell came to hym, and his hoste landed in diuerse parties and wold not folowe hym."⁵¹ Although the *Chronicle* states that Richard returned swiftly to England, the *Continuation*, however, declares that the king landed in North Wales on 25th of July.⁵² The reason why the compiler of the *Chronicle* did not use this information must have been to construct his own narrative according to what he thought best to suit his aim. He generally relied on the *Continuation* when giving details about the events,⁵³ but he here preferred to use the *Brut* in order to state where Richard landed at North Wales.

⁴⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xlvi; Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 381.

⁴⁹ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 357.

⁵⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 22.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁵² Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 381.

⁵³ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 381-3.

On the one hand, the *Continuation* declared that Richard landed at Conway; on the other hand, the *Brut* placed Richard at Flint Castle. The compiler continued borrowing from the *Brut* in order to reflect Richard's isolation and hopelessness. Indeed, it is hard to say that the *Brut* is neutral in its tone. The compiler of the *Brut* seemingly did not relate this scene in order to intensify the dramatic situation Richard was in and to degrade him by representing him in such a situation, but he seemed to be sympathetic with Richard:

and þanne Ser Thomas Percy, Erle of Worcestre, þat was þe Kingis Steward, when he wist and knew is, anon he com ynto the halle among alle þe pepil, and þere he brake þe yerd of þe Rial Kingishouseholde; and euery man went his way, and forsoke his maistir & souereyne lorde, and lefte hym alone: and us was King Richard brouzt adoun and destroyed, and stode alle alone, without counsel, confort & socour of eny man. Allas! For pite of þis ryal King.⁵⁴

Although in general, the *Brut* can be criticized for narrating the events leading up to the deposition of Richard in general and neutral terms and for merely listing the events, at this very incident it certainly creates sympathy for Richard and it is intimate in its narration. The *Chronicle* depicts the same scene in this manner:

Then Ser Thomas Percy, stiwarde off þe kynges house, brakke a rodde off his office in the hall befor all men and seide, 'The kyng wolde no lenger kepe 'householde'. And anon all the kynges men forsoke hym and lefte 'hym' allon. Then cursed the kyng the vntrute of Engelande and seide, 'Alasse, whatte truste ys in this worlde?'.⁵⁵

The *Continuation*, and thus the *Chronicle*, depicts a negative picture of Richard which is a result of a hostile perspective; he cursed the country over which he was the king, and that is why he did not deserve to be the king. Whether the Earl of Northumberland, Henry Percy, or both Percy and the deposed Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Arundel, met Richard at Conway is hard to determine because

⁵⁴ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 358.

⁵⁵ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 23.

the extant sources' accounts of the meeting narrated it differently.⁵⁶ According to the *Dieulacres Chronicle*, Richard was deceived by Archbishop Arundel and he was persuaded to go to Flint Castle in order to meet Henry Bolingbroke there.⁵⁷ The *Continuation* and thus the *Chronicle* combine these two meetings: Thomas Arundel and Henry Bolingbroke met Richard at Conway according to the *Eulogium Continuation* and at Flint according to the *Chronicle*; Richard submitted to Henry and agreed to abandon his rights as a king. Thomas Arundel was the one who made a lengthy speech⁵⁸ about Richard's treachery, lies, and misjudgements that can be connected to details of the narrative.⁵⁹ Instead of Henry, who did not openly accuse Richard, Archbishop Arundel was the one who said that he [Richard] could not reign any more. And 'then Maister Thomas Arundell seide to hym thies wordes':

'Thow are a feyre mon, but thow arte falseeste of all men. Thou promised me and ensured me, swerynge be Goddes body, þat thow woldeste do my brother no harme. And when I hadde broght hym to the into thi presence, I myghte neuer see hym after. Thou promised me also to calle me in haste agayne fro my exile and þat ther shulde be non other archbishophe off Caunturbury but I while I lived, and nowe thou haste made anoþer archbishoope and also procured my dethe.'⁶⁰

Thomas Arundel had personal problems with the king and at that time when the king was deposed he explicitly accused Richard for executing his brother Earl Arundel and assigning another archbishop. The *Chronicle* borrows the passage of Arundel's

⁵⁶ Saul, *Richard II*, p. 413. "According to Creton Kirkstall and John Hardyng, who wrote later, Northumberland was the only spokesman for the duke; Dieulacres, Walsingham and the official account on the parliament roll, on the other hand, all have Archbishop Arundel present as well."

⁵⁷ Chris Given-Wilson. *The Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400: The Reign of Richard II*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1993, pp. 5, 155; A. J. Pollard. *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*. Harlow: Longman, 1995, p. 23. Pollard indicates that on more than one occasion, Henry swore on oath that he did not seek the throne; in particular, four years later the rebellious Percys are supposed to have claimed that he had sworn such an oath in their presence at Doncaster.

⁵⁸ See Antonia Grandsen. *English Historical Writing, v. 2, c. 1307 to the Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974-1982, p. 187, n. 180. She believes that the highly coloured passages relating to Archbishop Thomas Arundel in the *Continuation* of the *Eulogium* derived from a propaganda tract written in Richard's reign and shortly after his deposition.

⁵⁹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xlvi.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

speech from the *Continuation*.⁶¹ Thomas Arundel, after finishing relating his personal matters, continued by telling how bad a king Richard was:

Thou haste not reuled þi reame and thi peple, but haste spoiled thayme with false reysyngez off taxes and tallagez, not to the profette of thi reame bit forto fulfil and satisfie thi cursed covetise and pride. Thow haste allwey be reuled be false flateres, folowyng their counsell, and ham avaunsede befor all oþer true men, refusynge þe counsell off thi true lordes. And because thei wolde haue withstond thi malice as reson wolde, thow haste ham slayne vnrightfully & disherited theire heires for euermore, after thyne ordenaunce and thi statutez, but thei shall not longe stoned, be Goddez grace. Thow haste lived vnconuenyenteli and licherousli, and ‘with’ thi foulle and cursed ensauple, thow haste enfecte thi courte and thi reame.’⁶²

These accusations might be true but the attitude of Thomas Arundel was certainly harsh. Henry, who did not take part in accusing Richard, might have agreed with Thomas Arundel’s ideas but he stopped Arundel by saying that “Nomor ye haue seide ynogh”.⁶³ His impartiality might have been due to either his agreement with the accusations or perhaps Henry might have been afraid of the anger and severity of the subjects to whom he would be the king. However, the compiler of the *Chronicle*’s aim was to depict him not as an invader and usurper but as an unquestionable successor to an incapable king. Henry was still referred as ‘the duke’ and he was the one who told Richard that he “wolde resigne and renovnce his right”.⁶⁴ Then, Richard was sent to the Tower of London.

In order to justify the legality of Henry’s succession to the throne, the *Continuation* and thus the *Chronicle* continue with the events and in fact, the evidence to prove that Richard’s resignation was usual and the legality of Henry’s accession was correct. When Richard was in the Tower, “bishoppes, erles, barones, knyghtes, and notares” came to the Tower in order to “enquire and wytte off hym

⁶¹ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 382.

⁶² Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 23.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[Richard's] yff he wolde resigne as he hadde promised".⁶⁵ Richard refused to resign but "thei [those who came to witness Richard's resignation] seide vnto hym þat he moste nedes resigne withoute eny condicion, and delievered hym a cedula conteynynge the fourme off his resignacion."⁶⁶ Richard read out his renunciation document⁶⁷ before witnesses, including Henry Bolingbroke who is still referred as the 'duke', and then the parliament on Tuesday 30 September was held in which Richard's resignation was accepted and his faults were proclaimed, and the parliament concluded with Richard's imprisonment.⁶⁸

Especially the accounts of the events from 29 September to 1 October have been extensively debated. The official account of deposition and resignation, 'The Record and Process' was, of course, written from the Lancastrian perspective. There are sources from a different point of view which relate the events from an independent or probably a *realistic* aspect, but since I discuss the *Chronicle*, deriving its material largely from the Lancastrian *Continuation*, it is wise to explain the significance of the official and also non-official but still Lancastrian accounts. I have to turn to Professor Given-Wilson in order to discuss the accounts of the deposition and resignation.

Mainly, the 'Manner of King Richard's Renunciation' and 'The Record and Process' are two basic documents that need to be considered carefully. It is worth beginning with the official document of the deposition that is 'The Record and Process'. This is the 'official' version, copied in the rolls of parliament, of what occurred in the Tower of London and at Westminster Abbey between 29 September

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 24.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 24.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 24. 'I, Richard, Kynge of Engelande, renounce & resigne all the right þat I haue in the crowne of Engelande with the purtenaunce, that ys to sey, in the reames of Engelande and off Fraunce, Scottelond, Eirelond, and in the ducherries of Gye and of Normandy, and in the counte of Pountise and in Wales, Caleyse, and all oþer castelles & fortalicez þat I haue or may afterwarde be right beyonde þe see and this side or in eny parte of thayme, for me & myn heires for euermore.'

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. xlviii.

and 1 October 1399. It is a version of events whose aim is to justify the usurpation above the demands of truth: in 'Record and Process' version of the events Richard voluntarily abdicated at Conway, and he cheerfully accepted his fate in the Tower, but this version is completely different from what other sources tell us that it makes it difficult to use the descriptive passages of the 'Record and Process' with any real degree of confidence.⁶⁹ According to Grandsen "this account illustrates the worst aspect of official history, deliberate falsification: comparison with other sources shows that it gives an erroneous impression of events".⁷⁰ It contains the 39 charges against Richard and at least one of them (the 33rd) shows that it has been added at a latter date and this situation naturally raises the question of how much more the 'Record and Process' was altered with before the Lancastrians considered it fit.⁷¹ It is not inaccurate to think that the document was written several months after the deposition of Richard and thus, the Lancastrians had sufficient time to convey their own accounts of the events.

The other document is the 'Manner or King Richard's Renunciation' which describes the deposition proceedings in the Tower of London and at Westminster abbey between 28 and 30 September 1399, was first printed in 1981 by Professor Sayles who described it as a 'Lancastrian narrative': in other words, he thought it to be a deliberately propagandist piece written by one of Bolingbroke's supporters and circulated by the Lancastrian regime with the intention of justifying Henry's usurpation.⁷² However, Given-Wilson believes that in fact there is much to indicate that this is not a Lancastrian propagandist tract but an "independent memorandum compiled by one of those who witnessed the proceedings which it describes, possible

⁶⁹ Given-Wilson, *The Chronicles of the Revolution*, p. 168.

⁷⁰ Grandsen, *English Historical Writing*, p. 186.

⁷¹ Given-Wilson, *The Chronicles of the Revolution*, p. 168.

⁷² G. O. Sayles, 'The Deposition of Richard II: Three Lancastrian Narratives'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 54 (1981), 257-70. Given-Wilson, *The Chronicles of the Revolution*, p. 162.

Thomas Chillenden, prior of Canterbury Cathedral”.⁷³ The transcript of the document is in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and until Professor Sayles found it, its existence was not known. However, a brief summary of the document can be found in the *Continuation*⁷⁴ and this was the only known contemporary copy of the ‘Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation’. This is an external evidence that the ‘Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation’ was written away from the Lancastrian influence and, as Professor Given-Wilson puts it, the manuscript which contains the ‘Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation’ appears to come from the Premonstratensian abbey of West Langdon, twelve miles east of Canterbury.⁷⁵ Therefore, the compiler of the *Continuation*, as a local historian, had access to the document. Besides the external evidence, there is much internal evidence that make it unlikely that the document was a Lancastrian narrative. For instance, on 29 September, when the witnesses came to the Tower Richard completely refused to resign; he then agreed to do so, but he would resign only on certain conditions and in the presence of Henry who came lately only to inform Richard that it was not possible for him to attach conditions to his resignation.⁷⁶ It is obvious that Richard’s first refusal could not be received by the Lancastrian narratives. It completely distorts the picture of ‘cheerful’ subversion of Richard. A king forced to resign cannot be thought to be the picture Henry wanted to convey to the people.

In the light of these two important documents, one considers that the compiler of the *Continuation* should have used ‘The Record and Process’ as his source. However, he used openly the version in the ‘Manner of King Richard’s

⁷³ Chris Given-Wilson. ‘The Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation: A Lancastrian Narrative?’. *The English Historical Review*, 138 (1993), 365-70.

⁷⁴ Ibid., see n. 2 for the main common properties between the text of the ‘Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation’ and the version of events leading up to the deposition in the *Continuation*.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 367.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 365.

Renunciation'. As I have said above, he did not use it word for word, but summarized it. However, he did not avoid making use of the most important distinction between the two texts, that is Richard's refusal to resign. As the *Continuation* is considered to be a Lancastrian narrative, it is hard to grasp why the compiler of the *Chronicle* chose to use the sources with an anti-Lancastrian aspect. It cannot be explained by the fact that the compiler's method was to extract the parts necessary to construct his own narrative. If so, he would not have added Richard's refusal of resignation. Thus, through the *Continuation*, the *Chronicle* also gives the same account, so the hypothesis that the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV were narrated by a Lancastrian compiler is inaccurate. The narrative of Henry IV's reign by the same compiler also contributed to the idea that the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV could hardly be written by a Lancastrian compiler. I will try to prove the inconsistencies between the Lancastrian history writing and the *Chronicle* while discussing the reign of Henry IV below.

For the reign of Henry IV, the compiler's method is the same, that is he continued to make use of the *Brut* and the *Continuation* interchangeably. As we can understand from the deposition of Richard II, the compiler thought that Henry's succession to the throne was just. However, in the *Chronicle* Henry's reign did not start peacefully although his figure was embodied with order and justice at his coronation. Richard was still alive at the Tower, and his existence created unrest among the people due to conspiracies, namely the Epiphany Conspiracies, against the new king.⁷⁷ The compiler of the *Chronicle* introduced the conspiracies before

⁷⁷ E. F. Jacob. *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 24-7; Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 424-5; Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, p. 199; For the consequence of the rising and the trials of the Epiphany Conspirators see; J.L. Leland, 'The Oxford Trial of 1400: Royal Politics and the County Gentry' pp. 139-65 in J.L. Gillespie, ed. *The Age of Richard II*. Stroud: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Richard's death.⁷⁸ Surprisingly enough, although Richard was in jail, the *Chronicle* defines Richard, not his supporters, as the one responsible for the conspiracies against Henry. Likewise, in the *Brut* the restoration of order under Henry is followed immediately by Richard's death.⁷⁹ In the *Chronicle*, Richard's death was described as a result of his jailor's cruelty; he was starved to death by the jailor,⁸⁰ thus suggesting that Richard was the cause of his own death and the Lancastrian party had nothing to do with Richard's demise.⁸¹

So far, the *Chronicle* represents Henry in good terms; he was the powerful king of England who brought order and stability to England. The compiler did not question the legitimacy of his kingship and he seemed to be corroborating the legacy. I agree with Marx that the compiler, it would seem quite self-consciously, next took the narrative in a different direction in order to raise doubts about the way in which Henry came to the throne and to contradict what has gone before.⁸² The subsequent events were designed to reveal the illegitimacy of Henry's kingship. The compiler began introducing portents to his narrative. Surprisingly enough, the subsequent text does not sound like a Lancastrian narrative. It is hard to say that the compiler tried to be neutral about the deficiencies of Henry's reign and kingship; he depicted Henry in such a way to disgrace him as a king.

The *Chronicle's* narrative concerning the rebellion of Owen Glendower⁸³ follows the same method as before, with the compiler extracting material from both the *Continuation* and the *Brut*. The first appearance of Glendower is in parliament where he complained "how þat the Lorde Grey off the Ruthyn hadde take fro hym

⁷⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, pp. 27-8.

⁷⁹ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 359-60.

⁸⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 28.

⁸¹ For the account of Richard's death, see Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 425-9.

⁸² Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. li.

⁸³ For the rebellion of Owen Glendower, see Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, pp. 37-66; Tuck, *Crown and Nobility*, p. 200, Christopher T. Allmand. *Henry V*. London: Methuen London, 1992, pp. 18-34.

wrongefulli a parte off his londe".⁸⁴ The lords in parliament did not take any action although the bishop of St Asaph warned them that Glendower might make the Welshmen arise, but they 'sette no3t be hym'. The compiler might have suggested that the lords were careless and ineffective. Although it would be an exaggeration to compare them to the courtiers of Richard II, Henry's advisers also indulged in their ambitions and thus because of self-ambition they were incapable of perceiving how big a threat Glendower could be. As Bevan indicated, Glendower might have been a rebel from necessity; he had been deprived of his lands and if they had been returned to him he might have sought a peaceful settlement.⁸⁵

The compiler took his account of Glendower's coming to the parliament from the *Continuation*.⁸⁶ On the other hand, he described the rising of Glendower and Henry's failure to suppress it from the *Brut*.⁸⁷ The compiler also erroneously brought from the *Brut* that Lord Grey was married one of Glendower's daughters. Surely, the *Brut* is confusing Grey with Sir Edmund Mortimer, younger brother of Roger, Earl of Mortimer, killed at Kells in Ireland and uncle of the boy Edmund, the rightful heir to the throne by the strict laws of heredity, and detained by the king at Windsor.⁸⁸ As I have said above, Glendower firstly took Lord Grey as captive in April 1402 and then in June Edmund Mortimer was taken captive. The *Chronicle* only relates the captivity of Lord Grey in 1402. Afterwards, it mentions the quarrel between the friars and Henry in 1403, and then the captivity of Edmund Mortimer is narrated in 1403. The *Chronicle* narrates the account of the friars and the captivity of Edmund Mortimer in the third year of King Henry. Therefore, it cannot be explained by the fact that the compiler tried to *narrate* the events of the third year of King Henry's

⁸⁴ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 28.

⁸⁵ Bryan Bevan. *Henry IV*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994, p. 82.

⁸⁶ Haydon., ed. *The Continuation*, p. 388; Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 28.

⁸⁷ Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 362-3; Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 29.

⁸⁸ Bevan, *Henry IV*, p. 90.

reign since Henry was crowned in October of 1399. The compiler really meant 1403. The *Continuation* also narrates the quarrel between the friars and Henry; but this event takes place in 1402, and the captivity of Edmund Mortimer also realizes in 1402. In this sense, it is true to say that the *Chronicle* follows the *Brut* as a structural basis which causes the *Chronicle* to borrow the errors of the *Brut* as well.

It may not be wrong to say that the first phase of the Glendower rebellion resulted in the failure of Henry IV. The *Chronicle* aggravates its criticism of Henry immediately after this failure. It cannot be called a portent but the very sentence following the Glendower episode is “This same yere wasse so grete de[r]the and scarcite off [corn] that a quarter off wheete wasse solde for xvjs.”⁸⁹ The compiler used such portents to foresee subsequent events that would happen. Immediately after this sentence, the narrative continues with a knight being accused of treason, and a friar saying ‘certeyn wordez’ against the king.

According to Marx, the compiler’s most extensive borrowings from the *Continuation* and his most strategic revisions to the narrative occur in three principal episodes which give voice to dissenting and have the effect of systematically discrediting Henry.⁹⁰ The first instance of contradiction came in the third year of Henry’s reign. The narrative started with a portent: a star called *stella commata*⁹¹ was seen. Immediately after, the dissenting voices of people were heard: “And aboute this tyme the peple off þis londe began forto groche agaynes Kynge Henry and bere hym hevye because he toke þeire godez and payed not therfor, and desired to haue agayne Kynge Richard”.⁹² These people were those who had lynched and beheaded the

⁸⁹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 29.

⁹⁰ Ibid., li. These three episodes are Henry’s dispute with the friars, pp. 30-2; the battle of Shrewsbury, pp. 32-4; the rising of Archbishop Scrope, pp. 35-7.

⁹¹ The *Continuation* and the *Brut* place the *stella commata* legend after the battle of Shrewsbury that is July 1403.

⁹² Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 29.

Epiphany rebels who had wanted to restore Richard II in 1400. Henry promised to live of his own at the beginning of his kingship,⁹³ yet economically he was no better off than Richard. After a brief pause following his accession, Henry IV had restored the practice of demanding high yearly subsidies almost; his household and grants (of annuities) were significantly more costly than those of Richard.⁹⁴ Henry had to give out many gifts and pensions to his supporters which caused him to be criticized for being excessively extravagant. He wanted to have supporters with himself, and he thought that he could maintain the loyalty of people by giving them concessions. However, his scale of the generosity, the status of recipients, and the results—in terms of the Scottish expedition of 1400—suggest that it was not a prudent policy of building up support but rather a combination of necessity, insecurity, generosity and extravagance.⁹⁵ The *Chronicle* borrows this incident from the *Continuation*⁹⁶ since it has no counterpart in the *Brut*. When letters came to some friends of Richard, as if they had been written by Richard himself, “moche peple wasse gladde and desired to haue hym kynge agayne”.⁹⁷

The second account to disgrace Henry is the quarrel between Franciscan friars, who denied Henry’s kingship, and Henry which resulted in the execution of the friars. The principal arguments of the friars against Henry were that he had gained the throne by force and was ultimately responsible for the death of Richard; no amount of justification on Henry’s part is allowed to obscure the fact that he held the throne illegally.⁹⁸ According to Jacobs, sentiment in favour of Richard kept on

⁹³ Henry was accused of not ‘living of his own’ by the Percys in their manifesto of 1403 rebellion.

⁹⁴ Edmund Wright, ‘Henry IV, the Commons, and the Recovery of Royal Finance in 1407,’ in Rowena Archer and Simon Walker, eds., *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England*. London: Rio Grande; Ohio: Hambledon Press, 1995, pp. 65-81.

⁹⁵ S. B. Chrimes, C. Ross, eds. *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509: Studies in Politics and Society*. Stroud, Glos.: Sutton Publishing, 1997 p. 20.

⁹⁶ Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 389.

⁹⁷ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 32.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. li.

cropping up, particularly in the north and in the midlands, well into the reign of Henry V.⁹⁹ Henry IV was in trouble with the Franciscan friars because they perceived Richard as the benefactor of the order, which is clearly described in the *Chronicle* by the words of one of the friars. When Henry asked the friar “Thou haste herde that Kynge Richard ys alive & art gladde therooff?”, the friar answered that “I am gladde as a mon ys gladde off the life off his frende, for I am holden to hym and all my kynn, for he wasse oure fortherer and promoter”.¹⁰⁰ The conversation between the master of the friars and Henry plainly reveals what the friars thought about the kingship of Henry:

Then seid the [k]ynge to the maister, ‘Thies been lewed men and not vndurston[d]ynge; thou shuldeste be a wise mon. sayst thou þat Kynge Richarde liveth?’. The maistre answered, ‘I say not þat he liveth, [b]ut I say yf he be live, he ys verrey kynge of Engeland’. The [k]ynge seide, ‘He resigned’. The maister answered, ‘He resigned a[g]aynez his wyll in prison, the wheche ys not off no value’. [T]he kynge answered, ‘He resigned with a goode wyll’. ‘He wolde [n]ot haue resyngned’, seide the maister, ‘yff he hadde be atte his liberte [a]nd fredome. And resignacion made in prison ys not free.’ Then seide [t]he kynge, ‘He wasse deposed’. The maister ansuered, ‘When he wasse kyn[g]le he wasse take be force and put into prison and spoiled off his [r]eame, and ye haue vsurped the crowne’. The kynge seid, ‘I haue [n]ot vsurped the crowne but I wasse chosen therto be eleccion’. The maistre answered, ‘The eleccion ys no3t, levying þe true and lawefull possessor. And yff he be deide [he ys deide] be yowe, [and yff he be derde be yowe] ye haue loste all the right and titull þat ye myght haue to the crowne’. Then seide þe kynge to hym, ‘Be myn hede, thou shalte lese thyne hede’. The maister seid to the kynge, ‘Ye loued neuer the churche but allway disclaundered yt or ye were kynge, & now ye shall destroye yt’. ‘Thou lieste’, seid the kynge, and bayed hym voide. And he and his felawes were ladde agayne to the Toure.¹⁰¹

The master of the friars outlined his views on the kingship of Henry clearly and boldly. It is surprising that such an open threat could occur in a Lancastrian narrative.

⁹⁹ For the opposition of the Franciscan friars towards Henry see, Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, pp. 27-9.

¹⁰⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 30.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-1.

The narrative of the *Continuation* concerning the account of the quarrel between the friars and Henry is very lengthy;¹⁰² but it has been already pointed out above that the *Continuation* has Franciscan connections. The *Chronicle* borrows its material from the *Continuation*, and it gives the whole account. Bearing in mind that the compiler of the *Chronicle* wrote the text under the Lancastrian regime, it is hard to understand why he chose to use such an anti-Lancastrian perspective in his account. In addition, it is worth noting that this can be perceived as a quarrel between the government and the church; and the church openly gave voice to its discontent with the new king accusing him of usurping the throne. This tension must have affected the common people, and it probably must have encouraged those who were uncomfortable with Henry's kingship.

This account is pivotal in the sense that it discloses the connection between the friars and the Glendower rebellion. Claire Valente has argued that, although it was an exaggeration of royal agents to suspect foreign links for the oppositions against the king, the friars apparently had some connection with Owen Glendower.¹⁰³ The *Chronicle* gave voice to one of the allegations against the friars while they were tried in at Westminster: 'Ye with your flatteryng and ypocrise haue gedred a grete sum off money with beggyng and sende yt to Owen Glyndore, a traytour, þat he shulde come and destroye Engelande.'¹⁰⁴ When one considers the aims of Glendower and the friars, it may be easily supposed that the friars might have gathered money and sent it to Owen Glendower. After their trial was over, they were executed; but the last words of one of the friars were very interesting: 'Yt wasse not oure [en]tente as our enemyes seide to sle the kynge and his [so]nnes, but forto make

¹⁰² Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 390-2.

¹⁰³ Claire Valente. *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, c2003, p. 210.

¹⁰⁴ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 31.

hym Duke off Lancastre, as [h]e shulde be'.¹⁰⁵ The effect of this part of the *Chronicle* is to suggest that justice rests with those opposed to the king, and that those who support treason against him have the high moral ground.¹⁰⁶

The narrative of the *Chronicle* concerning the battle of Shrewsbury, its background and aftermath was designed to discredit Henry and his kingship. The compiler's method did not change for the narrative of the battle of Shrewsbury, he used the *Brut* in order to introduce the event, and then he brought in the *Continuation* which was more extensive and detailed than the *Brut*. The first sentence uses the *Brut* but the compiler has rewritten the passage in order to introduce the account of the battle that has pieced together from passages in the *Continuation*.¹⁰⁷

Prior to the *Chronicle*'s narrative of the battle of Shrewsbury, the compiler told that Edmund Mortimer was captured by Glendower and then he started giving information about the birth and the miracles of his birth.¹⁰⁸ Undoubtedly, the dating of Edmund's capture was wrong. The compiler must have planned to supplement the narrative of the Glendower rebellion which comes earlier in the *Chronicle*. This part of the narrative was taken from two different parts of the *Continuation*,¹⁰⁹ for which there is no counterpart in the *Brut*. The miracles of Edmund's birth were also narrated after the battle of Shrewsbury in the *Continuation*, but the compiler of the *Chronicle* chose to use this part before the narrative of the battle. In addition, as I have discussed above, Edmund Mortimer was captured in June 1402, not in 1403 before the battle of Shrewsbury took place.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. lii.

¹⁰⁷ See Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 122 for commentary; Brie, ed., *The Brut*, II, 363/23-8; Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, pp. 395/31-397/26, 397/33-398/4, 398/7-9, 398/28-33, 400/15-18.

¹⁰⁸ See, Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 32.

¹⁰⁹ For the capture of Sir Edmund Mortimer by Glendower see, Haydon, ed. *The Continuation* p. 394; and for the miracles of Edmund's birth see, Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 398.

The account of the battle of Shrewsbury begins by dating of the battle and listing its participants. The compiler of the *Chronicle* was right in his judgement that the battle of Shrewsbury was '[o]n Mary Maudeleyn eve', that is 21 July. Then, he went on to discuss the reasons behind the battle. What is interesting in the narrative of this sequence was that the compiler preferred to give the results of the battle in the words of the opponents, that is the earl of Northumberland told his complaints to the king and then the king tried to give answers to the earl.¹¹⁰ For the exchange of words between the king and the earl, the compiler depended upon the *Continuation*. The first complaint of the earl was their shortage of money to secure the Marches. The king's words are interesting: 'I haue no money, ne non thou shalt haue'. Then, the earl reminded him that the king promised that he would be ruled by their counsel to which, according to the earl, Henry did not conform afterwards. This complaint might stand for the unease of the Percys of the king's closeness to the Nevilles and of the departure of Thomas Percy from the government affairs.¹¹¹ When Henry Hotspur came in, he complained that the king had not agreed to ransom Edmund Mortimer. The king's answer to Hotspur was also harsh and hostile: 'the kynge seide he wolde not with the money off his reame fortifye his enemyes agaynes hym'. The conversation between Henry and Hotspur reaches its climax when Henry and Hotspur alleged each other: Hotspur accused Henry of not helping 'a man [who]

¹¹⁰ For the role of Thomas Percy in the state affairs see, Chrimes, Ross, *Fifteen Century England*, pp. 9-11.

¹¹¹ For the relation between Henry and the Percies see, chp. 5 'Magnate Rebellion and the Lancastrian Crown' in Alastair Dunn. *The Politics of Magnate Power in England and Wales, 1389-1413*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 95-109. Also see, J.M. Bean, 'Henry IV and the Percies', *History*, 44, (1959), pp. 212-27'; Peter McNiven, 'The Scottish Policy of the Percies and the Strategy of the Revolt of 1403,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 60 (1980), pp. 40-74, cited in Dunn, *The Politics of the Magnate Power*, p. 103. For the relationship between the Nevilles, Percys and the crown see R. L. Storey, 'The Wardens of the Marches of England Towards Scotland', *English Historical Review*, 72 (Oct., 1957), pp. 593-615.

spende his godes and put hymselfe in perell for you and your reame', and Henry accused Hotspur of being a traitor.

The *Chronicle* argues that before the battle took place Henry Hotspur asked Glendower to help him, but the latter, afraid of being a traitor, did not help Hotspur. The *Chronicle* borrowed this account from the *Continuation*. In fact, George Dunbar urged upon Henry the necessity of striking before the rebels could consolidate their forces, reminding the king that it was essential to cut off their army before they could unite with Glendower near Shrewsbury, or effect a juncture with Northumberland's forces in the north.¹¹² When the king and Hotspur met in the battlefield, Henry asked Hotspur the reason of his coming to which Hotspur answered that 'We broghte the yn agaynes Kynge Richard and nowe thou ruleste worse then didde he. Thou spoileste yerly the reame with taxes and talleges. Thou payeste no man, pou holdeste no house. Thou arte not heire off the reame, and þerfor as I haue hurte þe reame in bryngynge in off the, I woll helpe to refourme yt yff I may.'¹¹³

Hotspur criticized Henry of misgoverning the country, and his accusation of spoiling the country with taxes and tallages is reminiscent of the leaders of the Peasants' Revolt. Hotspur was aware of the mistake in helping Henry to become king and he would reform the country by liberating the country and people from the misgovernance of a usurper king. As Claire Valente argued, the traditional paradigm of reform remained sufficiently strong to require royal opponents to situate themselves publicly as desiring only consultation and correction of misgovernment which was also valid for the Percys who, in fact, articulated neither reforms to be discussed there nor remedies to be pursued; their purported goals, so much vaguer

¹¹² Bevan, *Henry IV*, p. 100.

¹¹³ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 33.

than those of even the late fourteenth century, thus seem primarily rhetorical cover for personal grievances.¹¹⁴

The king answered the allegations of Hotspur by saying that ‘I take talleges for nedes off the reame, and I am chose kynge be commune assente off the reame, wherfor I counsell the to put þe in my grace’. Henry’s answer portrayed him as a king who worked for the common good of the country; he did not collect taxes and tallages in order to spend it for his own household as Richard had done. He also tried to justify his becoming king: he was elected king by the common agreement of all the country. Therefore, he meant that he could not be accused of being a usurper; bearing in mind the fact that Hotspur and his family were among those who elected him king. Henry was trying to be conciliatory, he tried to avoid bloodshed but, although chroniclers portrayed Hotspur as ‘unwilling’ to fight and blamed his uncle for mispresenting the king’s offers, their desire to exculpate him probably stemmed from their difficulty in reconciling the hero of Homildon Hill with the rebel at Shrewsbury.¹¹⁵

For the account of the rebellion of Archbishop Scrope the compiler drew on from the *Brut*, which gives a brief account of the revolt, in order to introduce the event, and then the narrative is a very close translation of the *Continuation*, which also gives a brief introduction of the revolt, with some omissions.¹¹⁶ This brings into the *Chronicle* a summary of the grievances or manifesto against the king’s government; these are detailed and outspoken grievances which are politically inflammatory; nothing like them appears in the *Brut*, and that they are included in

¹¹⁴ Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt*, pp. 212-13.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

¹¹⁶ For the relation between Archbishop Scrope and Henry IV, see Dunn, *The Politics of Magnate Power*, pp. 115-16.

summary form in the *Chronicle* serves to endorse them.¹¹⁷ The *Chronicle*'s account of the revolt begins with the compiler's giving of the names of the rebels: Archbishop Scrope, Thomas Mowbray and 'a knight called Ser Willyam Plympton' whose name was not included in neither the *Continuation* nor the *Brut*. However, it can be deduced that this knight must have been the nephew of Archbishop Scrope, Sir William Plumpton.¹¹⁸ The cause of the revolt according to the compiler was: 'The Erle sonne of Notyngham & his heire, the Lorde Moubrey, compleyned vnto the Archebishophe of Yorke and seide that his auncestrez were euer wonte off right to be marshalles of Engelande, and be þat thei helde her londe, and yette notwithstandynge þat, the kyng hath geuen the seide londe with the office to þe Erle of Westmerlonde.'¹¹⁹ Disregarding the grievances that were given a voice in the manifesto of the revolt, the compiler of the *Continuation*, the conflict between Henry IV and Thomas Mowbray concerning the office of Earl Marshal of England was the basic reason behind the revolt.¹²⁰ In the *Chronicle*, it is stated that Archbishop Scrope, concerned with the grievances of Thomas Mowbray, and he made a sermon at the church of York. According to the compiler in the sermon archbishop Scrope

...exhorted and stured the peple to be assistente & helpynge off the correccion and amendement off the myscheues & mys gouernaunce off the realme, havyng in grete consideracion the grete pouerte off marchaundez in whom wasse wonte to be the substaunce off the riches off all the londe; and also þe raysynges off taxes, tallagez, and customez vnder colour of boroeynge; and also þat due paymente myghte be made for the kynges vitailles; and that þe cleregye and commyn peple were not vexed ne charged with inportable charges off taxes and tallagez as they hadde longetyme; and [þ]atte the heires off noble men and off lordes off the londe myghte be restored to their enheritaunce hoolly, euery mon after his degree and byrthe; and also

¹¹⁷ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. liii.

¹¹⁸ Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, p. 59.

¹¹⁹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 35; Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 405.

¹²⁰ For the relationship between Thomas Mowbray and Henry IV, see Dunn, *The Politics of Magnate Power*, pp. 113-15.

that suche covetousse men as were off the kynges counsell, that toke away and turned to her ovn use suche godes as were ordeyned to the commyn helpe off the londe and make hamselfe riche withal, be removed and put away fro the kyng.¹²¹

The compiler did not include all of the articles published by Archbishop Scrope and used by the *Continuation*.¹²² He might have not used this sentence due to the fact that the realization of other articles was preliminary and this article's realization depended on the realization of the precedent ones. Therefore, he might have thought that this could not be called an article and preferred to omit it. The omission cannot be due to the fact that the compiler avoided criticizing Henry and his kingship.

According to the version of the *Chronicle*, the archbishop "made these articules & mony other to be writon yn Englessh, and were sette on þe yates of Yorke and sende to curatez off the tounes abovte forto be preched openly".¹²³ Then, the *Chronicle* keeps on with the facing of Archbishop Scrope's and Mowbray's army with Westmorland. The compiler reflected the cunning of Westmorland and how he deceived the archbishop. In the *Continuation*, the dialogue between Scrope and Westmorland is given,¹²⁴ but the compiler of the *Chronicle* omitted this part and he gave a summary of the event. Instead, he chose to give a full and unnecessary account of the dialogue between Westmorland and the knight he sent to the Scrope's army and the confusion of the soldiers of Scrope's army. The arrival of the king at York and citizens' cry for mercy is an interesting scene which is also given in the *Continuation*. Another remarkable incident was Archbishop Arundel's begging the king to let Scrope be judged by the Pope and "yff ye woll not do so, I counsel yow lette hym be reserued to the iugmente off the parlemente and kepe your hondes

¹²¹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 36.

¹²² Haydon, ed. *The Continuation*, p. 406. 'Quae si correcta sint, habemus firmam spem quod Wallia erit subjecta Angliae, sicut fuit temporibus Edwardi et Ricardi'.

¹²³ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 36.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 406-7.

vndefouled off his bloode”.¹²⁵ The king’s answer demonstrated his resolutness: ‘I may not for rumour off the peple.’ Although Henry is known for his piety and mercy, and the revolt turned out to be a failure, Henry did not change his mind about the execution of Scrope and Mowbray. According to Valente, recent events had persuaded the king to view armed demonstration as first-instance revolt and treason and had hardened royal attitudes towards any criticism of the king.¹²⁶ The rebels were judged and sentenced to death. Archbishop’s last words were noting: ‘Loo, I shall dye for the lawe and the goode rule off Engelonde.’ The execution of the rebels was immediately followed by the king’s illness¹²⁷ which was named as leprosy in the *Chronicle* which is also named in both the *Brut* and the *Continuation*. His illness was perceived as a punishment of God which may be proved with the very subsequent sentence in which ‘Almyghty Godde wrought miracles as yt appereth in þe place where he ys buried’. The popular veneration at Scrope’s tomb was immediate and, initially, carried on in the face of royal prohibition.¹²⁸ Scrope, like Simon de Montfort and Thomas of Lancaster, made claims for the justness of his cause in the eyes of God and was revered and portrayed as a martyr who worked miracles for his faithful supporters at his tomb in York Minster.¹²⁹ The archbishop’s subsequent miracles were widely reported and the offerings at his shrine were soon yielding very substantial sums, and that it did so was certainly due to the continuing regard in which the ‘martyr of York’ was held, but it also came to owe something to the

¹²⁵ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 37.

¹²⁶ Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt*, p. 219.

¹²⁷ For Henry’s Illness, see Peter McNiven. ‘The Problem of Henry’s Health, 1405-13, *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 100 (Oct., 1987), 747-72.

¹²⁸ Walker, ‘Political Saints in Later Medieval England’, in R. H. Britnell and A. J. Pollard, eds., *The MacFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society*. Stroud, Glos.: Alan Sutton Publishing; New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995, p. 85.

¹²⁹ Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt*, p. 219.

encouragement of the Yorkist kings, who saw in the archbishop's execution one of the chief demonstrations of the injustice and illegitimacy of Lancastrian rule.¹³⁰

In this chapter, the first part of the *Chronicle* which encompasses the period between 1377 and 1430 was examined. The exact compilation date of the first part of the *Chronicle* cannot be predicted but it must have been written in the Lancastrian period. Therefore, this part of the Chronicle must have been written by a Lancastrian compiler. I tried to illustrate how the Lancastrian compiler constructed his narrative by giving examples from the text. While analyzing the examples, I attempted to find out the compiler's aim of writing this text. By doing so, I have endeavoured to demonstrate the basic similarities and differences between this text and the Lancastrian history writing.

¹³⁰ Simon Walker, 'Political Saints in Later Medieval England', p. 85. Also for the veneration of Scrope, see J. W. McKenna, 'Popular Canonization as Political Propaganda: The Cult of Archbishop Scrope', *Speculum*, 45 (1970), 608-23.

CHAPTER 3

CONTINUATION 1440-1461 AND THE YORKIST PERSPECTIVE

In this chapter I will discuss the *Chronicle* in terms of the 1440-1461 Continuation, and thus the period from the nineteenth year to the thirty-ninth year of Henry VI will be examined. The Continuation 1440-1461 is completely different from the first part of the *Chronicle* since it was written under Yorkist rule. Because it is a document of Yorkist history writing, I intend to analyze the common features of the Yorkist history writing as well. The Continuation 1440-1461 bears the stamp of the Yorkist bias against the Lancastrian rule and that is why it is different from the first part of the *Chronicle*. I will try to demonstrate in what ways the Continuation 1440-1461 differs from the first part of the *Chronicle* and what makes the Continuation 1440-1461 unique.

In this respect, it is wise to begin with the compilation date of the Continuation 1440-1461. There is no obvious clue about the compilation date of the Continuation 1440-1461. However, it can be inferred through tracing the textual clues that the compilation date must have been sometime after the coronation of Edward IV in 1461. The text implicitly refers to the battle of Towton by narrating that the Earl of Warwick and Edward, the Earl of March went to the north “to venge the dethe of the noble Duke Richard, hys fadre”.¹ After this implicit statement the author abruptly ended his narrative without making any explanation about the war;

¹ William C. Marx, ed. *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003, p. 100.

he just informed his audience that Edward IV was chosen king.² In the *Chronicle*, when Richard Duke of York was about to make his claim to the throne Henry VI is referred as the usurping king who “now ys into thys tyme”³ which implies that Henry VI was still alive.⁴ This means that this part of the *Chronicle* must have been written before Henry VI ‘usurped’ the throne in 1470. In this sense, it is strongly true that the Continuation 1440-1461 was written between 1461 and 1470 for the Yorkist propaganda. The 1377-1422/37 version is regarded as a piece of Lancastrian history writing, although sometimes it has some peculiarities of its own, and it is believed to be written by a Lancastrian compiler. Since the Continuation 1440-1461 was written for the Yorkist propaganda its author must have been someone else. There is no clue about the identity of the author in the text. Yet, it is certain that he was very close to the Yorkist rule since he had access to the official documents. I will try to display the author’s attitude towards events and accordingly reveal his aim by writing this text.

It is hard to talk about the sources the author made use of since the narrative of the Continuation 1440-1461 is unique in both MS A and MS L. At this point the question whether the Continuation 1440-1461 is a ‘continuation’ of the first part of the *Chronicle* can be answered through a detailed analysis of the text. This question brings us to the issue of the style of the Continuation 1440-1461. As I have stated, the Continuation 1440-1461 was written as Yorkist propaganda. How the text achieves its aim and what means were used in order to reach this goal will be discussed in order to argue the style of the text. My method will be to examine specific examples from the text where we can pursue the traits of the author’s, and thus the text’s, aim and style and the Yorkist history writing as well.

² Ibid., p. 100.

³ Ibid., p. 92.

⁴ Ibid., p. ciii.

The account of the Continuation 1440-1461 concerning Henry VI starts with the nineteenth year of Henry VI's reign. For this year, there is a long narrative for the heresy case of Dame Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester and those associated with her.⁵ The reason why this heresy trial is narrated in the *Chronicle* is that it is generally used in other fifteenth-century chronicles such as the *Chronicles of London* and the *Brut*.⁶ However, this cannot be the whole reason why this account takes place in the *Chronicle*. In fact, Humphrey Duke of Gloucester was the protector of the king and heir to the throne and there was an ongoing conflict between the king and his counsellors and Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. In this sense, the king and his counsellors might have thought that the trial of Gloucester's wife would reduce the support of the Duke.⁷ When the author's aim is considered, this narrative creates a contrasting situation. Bearing in mind that the author attempted to discredit Lancastrian rule, what the author tried to achieve in this detailed narrative becomes much clearer. The author intended to suggest the social malaise that extended from the common people to the highest levels in Lancastrian society.⁸

Before the trial of Eleanor Cobham, the author had narrated two other cases of heresy. One of the cases was a heretical priest called Richard 'Wyche' who was burnt and whose grave was visited by common people. In the second case the vicar of 'Barkynchirche' deceived people by "medled [medling] þe askes of the seide heretike with powdur of spices, and streved [ham] in þe place where the seide

⁵ Ibid., pp. 61-4.

⁶ C.L. Kingsford. *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, p. 156. For the trial of Eleanor Cobham, see C.L. Kingsford, ed. *Chronicles of London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905, pp. 148-9; *English Historical Literature*, pp.156, 340; Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Trail of Eleanor Cobham: An Episode in the Fall of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester', *Bulletin of The John Rylands Library*, 51 (1968-9); W.D. Brie, ed. *The Brut or the Chronicles of England*, vol. 2. London: Kegan Paul, for the Early English Text Society, 1906-1908, pp. 477-82, cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 138.

⁷ Anthony Tuck. *Crown and Nobility, 1272-1461: Political Conflict in Late Medieval England*. Totowa, N.J.: Barnes & Noble, 1986, p. 250.

⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xcvi.

heretike wasse brente” in order to receive “þe offerynge of the simple peple”.⁹ The author gave a full account of what they had done as their art. Yet, the detailed account of Roger Bolingbroke’s necromancy is much more effective.¹⁰ Roger Bolingbroke and Thomas Southwell were accused of “labour to consume and waste the kynges person be way of nigromancie” and they were “ytake as for conspiratoures off the kynges dethe”.¹¹ During his trial Roger Bolingbroke stated that Eleanor Cobham wanted “forto knowe what shulde falle to hirre and if sho shulde comme to eny hier degree and astate then that sho wasse in”.¹² A commission was assembled to “to inquire of all maner tresones, sorcery, heresy, and of all other thynges þat myght in eny wise concerne or touché harmfully the kynges person”.¹³

Until this point in the narrative, one can consider that the author was sympathetic to the king, he was concerned about the king’s person and the Lancastrian rule in general. However, the point the author tried to make is that due to the misgovernment of the country, people were confused and they attempted to solve their problems by making use of sorcery. The point about Eleanor Cobham is revealed in a very brief statement: “And thus tyme wasse take a woman called the Wiche off Ey, whose sorcery and wichecrafte the seide Dame Alienour hadde longe tyme vsed, & be suche medisons and drynkes as the seide wiche made, the seide Alineour enforced the seide Duke of Gloucestre forto love her so moche that he wedded her”.¹⁴

In this statement the author tried to imply that Humphrey Duke of Gloucester had nothing to do with heresy and treason; indeed, he was a victim of sorcery. In

⁹ Ibid., p. 61.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 61-2.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 61.

¹² Ibid., p. 62.

¹³ Ibid., p. 63.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 63.

such a long account of heresy and treason this sentence has a small place and the author only told this sentence in-between other things about heresy. This situation very much suits the aim and method of the author: he was sympathetic with Humphrey Duke of Gloucester throughout the narrative¹⁵ and in fact his ultimate aim was to discredit the Lancastrian rule. Methodically, the narrative does not create a unity: the author juxtaposed sentences without thinking whether they have any connection among themselves. The author did not explicitly comment on the events but just implicitly told what he intended to say in a sentence. It can be thought that the author required his audience to extract the meaning and importance of the account. He made use of this technique throughout the narrative.

The author, nevertheless, had his own way of combining incidents. The Continuation 1440-1461 gives a detailed account of the negotiations for the marriage of Henry and Margaret of Anjou. However, this account served to the purpose of the author who wanted to indicate his opinion the consequence of the marriage by means of a sentence inserted in between other sentences of negotiations. The author stated his concerns in these sentences: “And then were graunted trues – meddled with treson – and abstinence of werre betvene Engelonde and Fraunce for terme of xviiiij monethes. But what treson wasse wrought vndur the trues yt appered sone afterwarde be alienacion of Angeo and Mayn, and wilful lesynge of all Normandy”.¹⁶ It is clear that the author thought that this marriage would not be for the advantage of England. This statement is like a prediction; it refers to the loss of French possessions of England.

¹⁵ According to the compiler the death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester caused political and social malaise, see *ibid.*, p. xcv. On the death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, see E. F. Jacob. *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 481-4; Christine Carpenter. *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution of England c. 1437-1509*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 87-103.

¹⁶ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 65.

The author connected the marriage of Henry VI to Margaret of Anjou with the death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. While doing this, he made use of a portent. The use of portents is very important in order to understand the author's method of constructing his narrative. In order to describe an event that had a bad result, he would include a portent at the beginning of his narrative. He did not make any comment on the portent; he made use of portent as an introductory sentence. Before talking about the arrest and death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, the author introduced the event with a portent: "In the xxv yere of Kynge Henry in the monethe of Nouembre and Decembre fell grete thondres and laytes with grete and huge wyndes".¹⁷ The account of the death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester had some similarities with the death of Earl of Arundel.

In the xxtij yere off Kynge Richarde, he ordeynet a parlemente atte Westmynster þat wasse called the Grete Parlement, and þis parlemente wasse made only forto sle the Erle off Arundell and other as ham liked atte þat tyme.

And the x day of February nexte after began þe parlemente atte Seynt Edmundes Bury in Southfolke, the wheche wasse ordeyned only forto sle the noble Duke off Gloucestre, Humfrey, the kynges vncle, whos dethe, William de la Poole, Duke off Southefolk, and Ser Iames Fynes, Lorde Say, and oþer of their assente hadde long tyme ymagyned & conspired.¹⁸

There is a certain similarity between the two events and the accounts. The author must have been aware of the fact that the death of Earl of Arundel caused a major turning point in the reign of Richard II. That is why he constructed the account of the death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester in the same manner since his death was also a blow for Henry VI's rule. The author's hostile attitude towards the ministers of Henry VI is apparent. The compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle* accused the evil

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 65.

counsellors of Richard II and the author of the Continuation 1440-1461 accused the ministers of Henry VI.

The author's hostile attitude towards the ministers and the rule of Henry VI is very obvious in the account of the death of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. In fact, this can be regarded as the first episode where the author directly criticized Henry VI's rule. He gave a detailed account of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester's death. The ministers falsely accused Humphrey Duke of Gloucester by telling the king that "[Humphrey Duke of Gloucester] wolde rayse the Welshemen to destrisse hym and destroy".¹⁹ In the parliament of 1447 at Bury St. Edmunds he was accused of treason and he was ordered not to come to the parliament until the king asked him to come. On the third day he was arrested "and the iijde day after, he died for sorowe, as sum men seide because he myght not comme to his vnsware and excuse hym of suche poyntes as were falsely put on hym".²⁰ According to the author the opposition party against Humphrey Duke of Gloucester led by Lord Suffolk was "so excited and sturid the kynge agaynes hym that he myght neuer comme to his answere, for they hade caste and ordeyned amonge thaym a prive conclusion the whiche as yette ys not comme to knowelage off the commyn peple, and they wiste well þat þei shulde neuer brynge yt aboute till he were deede". This statement implies that the ministers conspired against the Duke of Gloucester and the author here openly accused the ministers for forming a secret council in order to destroy the Duke of Gloucester. The author concluded the death of the Duke of Gloucester by making a vague statement: "But the certeyne of his dethe ys not yet openly knowe, but their ys nothyng so

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 65.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 66. For the position of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester in the government and his death see Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, pp. 481-4.

preve, as the gospel seith, but atte the laste yt shall be open”.²¹ The author implicitly meant the divine justice would punish those who committed crime against the good.

The author introduced the loss of Rouen with a portent: “The xxviiij yere of Kyng Henry on Symon day and Iude, and other dayes befor and after, þe sonne in his risynge and goynge dovne appered as redde as bloode as men saw, wherof the peple hadde grete wondur and demed þat yt shuld betokene sum harme sone afterwarde”.²² Yet he did not comment on the loss of Rouen and he passes it over. In fact, it can be understood that the author’s aim is different by looking at the subsequent events. In the year 1450 common people revoked against the officials of the government and they killed them.²³ The author briefly mentioned the murder of Adam Moleyns, the bishop of Chichester and Keeper of the Privy Seal, and William Aiscough, the bishop of Salisbury; but his final statement is important in order to understand why they were killed by the common people: “The ij bisshoppez [Adam Moleyns and William Aiscough] were holde wondur covetouse men and euel beloued amonge the commyn peple, and as þe peple sede, were willyng and assentyng to the dethe off the Duke of Gloucestre”.²⁴

The substantial event of the year 1450 was Jack Cade’s rebellion.²⁵ The author introduced the rebellion by giving an unfavourable picture of Jack Cade who is described as “an Eyrishemon, a ribaude, calles Iohn Cade, þe whiche atte his begynnyng toke on hym and vsurped þe name of a gentullmon and called hymselfe

²¹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 66.

²² Ibid., pp. 66-7.

²³ R. A. Griffiths. *The Reign of King Henry VI*, 2nd ed. Stroud: Sutton, 1998, p. 644, cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 139; Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 113-114.

²⁴ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 67.

²⁵ I. M. W. Harvey. *Jack Cade’s Rebellion of 1450*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991; Griffiths, *Henry VI*, pp. 610-65; cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 140; R. L. Storey. *The End of the House of Lancaster*. Stroud: Sutton, 1999, pp. 66-8, 78-9; John Gillingham. *The Wars of the Roses: Peace and Conflict in Fifteenth-Century England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1990, pp. 67-9; Alison Weir. *Lancaster and York: The Wars of the Roses*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1995, pp. 147-55.

Mortimer forto gete and haue þe more fauor of þe peple. And he called hymselfe also Iohn Amendeall...”.²⁶ The author was unsympathetic to the leadership of Jack Cade although he was sympathetic to the reason of the rising:

... forasmuche as then and longe tyme befor the reame of Englonde wasse oute off rule and gouernaunce and ruled be vntrue counsel, wherfor the commyn p[roffette] w[as] sore hurte and decresed so þat þe commyn peple, with sore taxes and sore talages and oper oppressiones done be lordes and other, myght not live be thaier husbondry and han[d]werke, wherfor they grutchet sore agaynes thaym that hadde the gouernaunce of the londe.²⁷

The reason of the rising was suitable to Yorkist claims and propaganda. The country was misruled by the Lancastrians and that is why people rebelled against the misgovernance of the Lancastrian counsellors and ministers. The author gave a very detailed account of the rising and he also gave voice to Jack Cade in order to make their rising heard from him:

The capteyne [Jack Cade] wasse a sotell mon and seide þat he and his company were gedred and assembled forto redresse and refourme þe wronges þat were done in the reame, and to withstonde þe malice off theym þat were destroyers off de comyn profette, and forto correcte and amende the defautez off thaym dat were the kynges chief counseleres; and shewed vnto thaym de articles of their peticiones concernynge and towchyng þe myschiefes and mys gouernance of the reame, in þe wheche articles wasse nothyng conteyned but þat wasse rightfull and reasonable, wherof a copie wasse sende to þe parlemente holde þat tyme atte Westmynstre. Wherfor the seide capteyn desired þat suche greuance shulde be amended and reformed be the parlemente, and to haue answer agayne of the same articles.²⁸

The author mentioned the cause of the rising several times in his account yet, he severally mentioned about Jack Cade in harsh terms such as “lurdeyne”, meaning a lazy rascal,²⁹ and “þe cursed capteyn”. Due to the fact that Lancastrian rule was

²⁶ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 67.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 67.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 68.

²⁹ A. L. Mayhew, Walter W. Skeat, eds. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle English from A.D. 1150 to 1580*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888, p. 139.

beyond redress due to the bad situation of the country and common people, the rising could be justified. However, Jack Cade was not the right person to lead such a true cause. In this sense, it can be said that the author tried to prepare his audience for the appearance of Richard Duke of York who had a sound political argument and reason and who would have very crucial stance for both the rest of the narrative and the subsequent years of the English history. The author attempted to demonstrate the contrast between Jack Cade and Richard Duke of York in this account in order to emphasize the leadership of the latter driven by political ideas and principles, a concern for the common good and not self-interest.³⁰

The loss of Normandy is related by additional information on the wickedness of the counselors of the king and their evil deeds. According to the author “Normandy wasse loste be negligence and vntreuthe of hym þat wasse lieutenaunte therof for his abatynge þe soudiers that were yn the garisones ther, and sende ham home vnpayed of their wagesse wherby þe strengthe off Normandy wasse loste”.³¹ The author accused the king’s lieutenant for the loss of Normandy. He also criticized William de la Pole; but he did not do so openly:

And also the commyn sayng and voyes off the peple wasse þat tyme þat the Duke off Southefolke, William de la Poolle, and oþer [o]f his assente had made delyueraunce of Angeo and [Mayn withoute assent of þis lond vnto the kyng of Cecile þe quenez fader, and hadde also aliened and sold þe duchie of Normandie to þe king of Fraunce, wherefore alle þe peple of þis lond and specialli þe communez cride ayens þe said Duke of Suff[olk], and saide he was a traitour.³²

The author’s aim is achieved in this statement: he criticized the Lancastrian government and its ministers, namely William de la Pole. By saying that “the commyn sayng and voyes off the peple”, the author wanted to imply that he was not

³⁰ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. c.

³¹ Ibid., p. 70.

³² Ibid., p. 70.

the only one who was annoyed by the acts of the Lancastrians but it was the general assent of the people that the Lancastrian government not only misruled the country but also sold its possessions to the French.

After the account of the loss of Normandy the author narrated how William de la Pole, the Duke of Suffolk died. He reported that:

Þis Duke of Suffolk hadde axed befor this tyme of on þat was an astronomer what sholde falle of him, and how he sholde ende his lif. And whanne þe said astronomer hadde laboured perfore in his said craft, he ansuerde to þe duke and saide that he sholde die a shameful deth, and counselid him alwey to bewar of þe Tour. Wherfor, be instance of lordis that were his frendis, he was sone delyuerid out of þe said Tour of London.³³

William de la Pole was killed by “a knaue of Yrlond ... vpon þe side of þe boot of þe said Nicholas of þe Tour”.³⁴ It is hard to know how the author accessed to the knowledge of the Duke of Suffolk’s meeting with the astronomer and his prophecy. However, when the author narrated the death of Edmund, Duke of Somerset, he made use of the same technique: he told his audience how Edmund met an astronomer and what the prophecy of the astronomer was.³⁵

The first appearance of Richard Duke of York takes place in the thirtieth year of Henry VI’s rule, that is 1452, with the Dartford incident. The introductory statement of the account indicates the reason for the actions of Richard Duke of York and his followers: “... þe Duke of Yorke, þe Erle of Deuenshire, and the Lorde Cobham, gadered a grete peple in destruccion of their enemyes þat were aboute þe kyng...”.³⁶ This is a very brief statement but it is very similar to the above statement: enemies are within England and they are very close to the king. The Dartford incident remained an unsuccessful attempt by Richard Duke of York and his

³³ Ibid., pp. 70-71.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 71.

³⁵ See p. 14 above.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 71.

supporters; but it is important in the sense that it is the first incident of a member of the royal family indicating his grievances concerning the governance of the country.

The next event worth mentioning is the Battle of St Albans in 1455.³⁷ The account starts with the reason of the battle:

Then was þere a mortall debate and a variaunce bitwene Richard, Duke of York, Richard, Erle of Salesbury, Richard, Erle of Warrewyk, and Edmund, Duk of Somerset, be whom at þat tyme þe kyng was principally gided and gouerned, as he had be before by þe Duk of Suthfolk. And þis saide Duk Edmond euer kept hym nygh þe kyng, and durste nat departe fer from his presence, dreding alwey þe power of þe seyde Duk of York and of þe forseyde erles, and euer excited and stered þe kyng ageynes thaim, notwithstanding þat þe comones of þis lande hated þis Duk Edmond and loued the Duk of York, because he loued þe communes and preserued þe commune profyte of þe londe.³⁸

The author revealed that the Battle of St Albans was between two opposite sides; Richard Duke of York and his followers and Edmund, Duke of Somerset who “gouerned” the king and who was afraid of the power of the Duke of York. In this case, the author improved his argument: in the Dartford incident the Duke of York wished to destroy those who were close to the king, whereas in this instance the author gave the full name of Richard Duke of York’s enemy. This introduction is very significant in order to understand the political motives of Richard Duke of York: “because he loued þe communes and preserued þe commune profyte of þe londe”. This statement will be one of the central themes of the narrative afterwards. Focusing on this statement, one can comprehend that it is highly political. If we look at the meanings of the phrases one by one, we see that “þe communes” is the commons, commonalty;³⁹ “þe londe” literally means political,⁴⁰ and the term

³⁷ Weir, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 198-205; Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 85-90, 92-3; Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster*, pp. 161-3; Desmond Seward. *The Wars of the Roses: and the Lives of Five Men and Women in the Fifteenth Century*. London: Constable, 1995, pp. 37-41.

³⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 72.

³⁹ Mayhew, *Concise Dictionary of Middle English*, p. 50.

“commune profyte” refers to ‘the common good, public benefit’, the ‘common weal’.⁴¹ Humphrey Duke of Gloucester died because of the secret plots of the king’s “vntrue” counsellors; Jack Cade and his followers revoked since “the reame of Englonde wasse oute off rule and gouernaunce and ruled be vntrue counsel”, Richard Duke of York and his followers gathered people for the “destruccion of their enemyes þat were aboute þe kyng”. The evil counselors of the king were seen as the most important problem England had been facing; they were the cause of the misgovernment of the country. Therefore, Richard Duke of York had to act on behalf of the “common weal” in order to take a role in the politics and to be a part of both the public and the government.⁴²

The theme of “commune profyte” has been prevalent since the account of the Jack Cade revolt. The author pointed out that “the commyn p[roffette] w[as] sore hurte and decresed so þat de commyn peple, with sore taxes and sore talages and oþer oppressions done be lordes and other, might not live be thair husbandry and han[d]werke”.⁴³ As stated above, however, Jack Cade was not the right person to be the one to act on behalf of the common good; he was a “lurdeyne”. Richard Duke of York was the right person since he was from the royal family and he had sound political motives and principles.⁴⁴ He was loved by the common people because he preserved the common good. Thus, he was depicted as a ‘public hero’ who would

⁴⁰ According to Mayhew’s *Concise Dictionary of Middle English* “londe” means land, p. 138. According to Kurath’s *Middle English Dictionary*, “lond” means a territory considered as a political unit, a country, a kingdom. Kurath, Hans, ed. *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954 –, cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. xcvi.

⁴¹ Mayhew, *Concise Dictionary of Middle English*, p. 176.

⁴² J. Watts, ‘Polemic and Politics in the 1450s’, in *The Politics of Fifteenth-Century England: John Vales’s Book*, ed. Margaret L., Kekewich, Stroud: A. Sutton for Richard III & Yorkist History Trust, 1995, pp. 3-42.

⁴³ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 67.

⁴⁴ For a detailed discussion of the leadership and aims of Jack Cade and Richard Duke of York, see Watts, ‘Polemic and Politics in the 1450s’, pp. 7-17.

save the common people from their grievances and the king from the “vntrue” counsellors.

The author tried to imply the wickedness of Edmund, Duke of Somerset in the next paragraph before he narrated the battle:

The seyde Duk Richard and þe erle aboue sayde, seying þat þey myght nat preuayle ne withstand þe malice of þe forseide Duk Edmond, þe whiche dayly entended and prouoked þe kyng to þeyre final destruccion, and gadered priuily a power of peple and kept þaym couertly in villages aboute the toune of Seynt Albons.⁴⁵

The author did not mention about the king and his deeds so far in the narrative as if he did not exist. The Yorkist argument made its criticism of the Lancastrian government through the ministers and counsellors of the king. The author depicted the king as a man who had no control over his counsellors, and even being controlled by his counsellors and who had nothing to do with the ruling of the country.

When the Duke of York and his followers demanded the Duke of Somerset from the king, Henry VI did not deliver him. As a consequence of the battle between the two groups, Edmund, Duke of Somerset was killed. The author gave his audience a prophecy about the death of Edmund, Duke of Somerset. According to the “fantastyk prophecy that he [Duke of Somerset] shuld dy vndre a castell, wherfore inasmeche as in hym was, he lete þe kyng þat he sholde nat come in the castell of Wyndsore, dredyng þe seyde prophecy. But as Seynt Alboyns þer was an hostry hauyng þe sygne of a castel, and before þat hostry he was slayne”.⁴⁶ The author must have an aim while narrating these prophecies about the deaths of the king’s counsellors and how these prophecies realized. He did not openly explain his aim; he gave the account without saying any additional words.

⁴⁵ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 72.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

The author continued with a portent: a *stella comata* was seen in England and also in the court of Rome.⁴⁷ The author did not talk about the political events for the next year and he gave an account of a pilgrim's spiritual experience with a ghost.⁴⁸ The amount of superstition in this phase of the narrative increases. Beforehand, the author made use of portents in order to introduce the events. In this sequence of events up to the trial of Reginald Pecock, the Bishop of Chichester, the author was concerned with the superstitious matters. For the trial of Bishop Pecock the author gave a very long account. He was accused of treason in 1457 like Lady Eleanor Cobham, the wife of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester. The Bishop Reginald Pecock renounced the accusations in his own terms. The author gave a detailed account of his defence. The reason why the author gave such full accounts of the matters concerned with heresy and treason might be that he wanted to picture England in a social and spiritual disorder. Not only the common people were worried about their lives and tried to demonstrate their concerns by revoking and killing the officials of the king, but also people from the royal household like Eleanor Cobham and from the ecclesiastical world like Reginald Pecock were confused and tried to find solutions by their own terms. The overall picture of England was a country in conflict in political, religious and social terms.

Having narrated the account of the trial of Reginald Pecock, the author continued with the account of the counsel held at Westminster in 1458 for compensating the losses of the lords whose fathers had died in the Battle of St Albans from Richard Duke of York and the Earl of Salisbury.⁴⁹ The author favoured neither their fathers nor their sons. However, again he related his ideas as if they had been shared by the Londoners: "the cyte wolde nat receyue theym because they [The

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 73.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 73-5.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 76-7.

Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Northumberland and his brother Lord Egremont, and the Lord Clifford] came ageyns the pease”.⁵⁰ However, Richard Duke of York and The Earl of Salisbury came in peaceful terms to London. The author narrated the lords’ coming to the city in this sentence: “The Duk of York & the Erle of Salesbury came but onely with theyre householde men in pesyble maner, thynkyng none harme, and were loged withyn the cytee, for they abouesayd came forto dystroy vtterly þe sayde Duk of York and the Erle of Salesbury, and of Warrewyk”.⁵¹ The author revealed the nature of the two factions’ coming to London and how they were seen by the Londoners. Accordingly, the Duke of York, the Earl of Salisbury and the Earl of Warwick, who came later to London since he was the captain of Calais, agreed to the terms the young lords demanded.

The author did not cease to imply the reason of the rivalry between Richard Duke of York and Edmund, Duke of Somerset. After this account he summarized the reason of their hostility by giving different details that he had not mentioned before:

One of the causes of this trouble betwene þe Duk of York and the Duk of Somerset was thys. Duryng the kyngis syknesse þe Duk of York was made protector of Englund, wherof þe Duk of Somerset had grete indignacion and alwey malygned ayenst hym and stered the kyng ageyn hym. Natheles, meny of the lordes of the counceyl fauored more þe Duk of York þanne hym. Wherefore, for certeyne causes and articles that were leyde ayenst the seyde Duk of Somerset, he was commytted by the kyngis counsell to the Toure of London. But be instaunce and mediacione of his frendes, he was sone delyuered, vnder this condicione that he shulde neuer after entremete, ne have ado with the gouernaunce of the reame, and that he sholde nat come nygh the kyng but xx myle. And forto obserue and kepe these condicions, he was swore vpon a book.

Whenne he [Edmund Beaufort] was delyuered oute of the Toure, he took more vpon hym thenne he dyd befor, stiryng the kyng dayly and maliciously ageynes the forseyde Duke of York and erles, coniectyng and ymaginyng howe he might dystroy theym. But at Seynt Alboyns he fylle into the same snare that he had ordeyned for theym.⁵²

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 76.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 76.

⁵² Ibid., p. 77.

In fact, the author narrated the political background of the Battle of St Albans at this point. He gave a general picture of the rivalry between the two dukes before narrating the Battle of St Albans.⁵³ Here, the author's method can be defined as retrospective since he had not contained these issues in the first account which was definitely more relevant but in the latter one. Unsurprisingly enough, the author told that Edmund, Duke of Somerset was the guilty one in this challenge. According to Marx, by setting this part before the narrative's final part, which contains the years 1459-61 of the conflict, the author aimed at reinforcing that the Lancastrian party was corrupt and the Yorkist cause was highly just.⁵⁴

In the narrative for the period 1452 to 1459, the author emphasized the conflict between the two parties that is the Lancastrians and the Yorkists. The narrative will take another path afterwards: the author would narrate the last two years of the conflict in twenty pages. This can be seen as another method of the author: by narrating the last two years in twenty pages, he wanted to attract the attention of his audience to the justness of the Yorkist cause. In this phase of the narrative, the author's method is to incorporate documents, some of which are unique to the *Chronicle*. Therefore, it can be said that the author withdrew himself more and he hardly commented on the events. The documents were the spokesmen of the Yorkist propaganda vehicle and the author did not need to intervene in the narrative.

The last phase of the narrative starts with a portent and an overall picture of how England was ruled by an incapable king and a treacherous queen:

The xxxviij yere of Kyng Harry, in a lytyll toun in Bedfordshyre, there fylle a bloody rayn, whereof the rede dropys appered in sheets þe whiche a woman had honged oute forto drye.
In this same tyme, þe reame of Englonde was oute of all good gouernance, as it had be meny dayes before, for the kyng was simple

⁵³ For a detailed account of the rivalry between the Duke of Somerset and Richard Duke of York, see Watts, 'Polemic and Politics in the 1450s', pp. 17-25.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. ci.

and lad by couetous counseyll, and owed more then he was worthe. His dettes encresed dayly, but payment was there none; all þe possessions and lordeshyppes þat perteyned to the croune the kyng had yeue away, some to lordes and some to other simple persones, so þat he had almoste nought to lefe on. And suche ymposicions as were put to the peple, as taxes, tallages, and quynzymes, all þat came from theym was spende on vayn, for he helde no householde ne meyntened no warres. For these mys gouernaunces, and for many other, the hertes of the peple were turned away from thaym that had the londe in gouernance, and theyre blyssyng was turnyd into cursyng.

The queen with suche as were of her affnyte rewled the reame as her liked, gaderyng ryches innumerable. The office[r]s of the reme, and specially þe Erle of Wylshyre, tresorere of Englonde, forto enryche hymself, peled the pore peple, and disheryted ryghtfull eyres, and dede meny wronges. The queen was defamed and desclaundered that he that was called prince was nat hir sone but a bastard goten in avoutry. Wherefore, she, dreding that he shulde nat succeed hys fadre in the crowne of Englonde, allyed vnto her all the knyghtes and squyers of Chestreshyre forto haue theyre benyuolence, and helde open householde among theym, and made her sone called the prince yeue a lyuerey of swannys to alle þe gentilmen of the contre, and to make her sone kyng, making pryue menys to some of the lordes of Englonde forto styre the kyng that he shulde resyng the croune to hyr sone, but she coude nat bring her purpose aboute.⁵⁵

The author made use of his previous method: he gave a portent before introducing his point.⁵⁶ He simply mentioned the portent without making any further comment about it. He did not form a link between the portent and the succeeding part of the narrative. He was mainly concerned with the description of the king and the queen and thus he revealed how the country was affected by their negative qualities. The author rested on the economic situation of England rather than narrating other grievances. He concluded that the reason why the economic situation was too miserable was the impotent and 'simple' king and the concessions he gave to his favourites. The queen was ruling the country and she was busy enriching herself and

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 78.

⁵⁶ This same portent is also available in the *Registrum Abbatiae Johannis Whethamstede*, in *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani*. Ed. by H. T. Riley. Rolls Series: 1872-73, I, 386, cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 144.

those who were close to her. The author claimed that the prince was not her son and she tried her best to make him king by persuading Henry VI to resign the crown.

The situation would get more severe in the ensuing events. The author tried to justify the Yorkist cause by giving such a pessimistic picture of the king, the queen and accordingly the misgovernance of the country. Subsequently, the author narrated the events leading up to the Battle of Blore Heath in Staffordshire in 1459. The Earl of Salisbury intended to go to Ludlow to meet the Duke of York there and then they would have gone to Staffordshire to see the king “forto haue excused theym of certayne articles and fals accusacions touching thair ligeaunce layde agayns theym maliciously by their enemies”.⁵⁷ The counsellors of the king did not stop acting against the Yorkist lords; they tried to provoke the king against them. When the king heard that the Earl of Salisbury and his men were coming “þey that were aboute hym [the king] counseyled hym to gadre a power forto withstand theym, and enformed hym that they came forto destroy hym”.⁵⁸ The battle was fought between the Earl of Salisbury and Lord Audley; the royal powers were defeated.

After the account of the battle, the author introduced his first documentary source.⁵⁹ Indeed, it is a letter written by the Earl of Salisbury, Richard Duke of York and the Earl of Warwick on 10 October 1459 at Worcester cathedral after the battle of Blore Heath.⁶⁰ The lords aimed at explaining their grievances to the king personally. They emphasized extensively their loyalty to the king and they tried to convince the king that they had nothing to do with the claims put against them. This documentary source is unique to the *Chronicle*. Although the *Registrum Abbatiae Johannis Whethamstede* in *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani* contains a letter written in

⁵⁷ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 79.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.

⁶⁰ See Appendix I below.

Latin by the same lords, neither of the two letters is the translation of each other, and they have some conventional formulation and good intent in common.⁶¹ Afterwards, the lords went in different places; the Duke of York went to Ireland, and the Earl of Warwick went to Calais.

Although in the letter written by the lords, they expressed their loyalty to the king, the letter seemingly had no influence upon the king. A parliament was held at Coventry and this parliament was assembled in order to destroy the Yorkist lords:

In the whiche parlement, the sayde Duk of York and iij erles and other whos names shall be rehersed afterward, withoute any answere, as traytours and rebelles to the kyng were atteynt of treson, and theyre goodes, lordshyppys and possessions escheted into the kyngis hande, and they and theyre heyres dysheryted vnto the ixth degree, and by the kyngis commysion in euery cyte, burgh, and toune cryed opynly and proclamed as for rebelles and traytours, and theyre tenautes and theyre men spoyled of theyre goodes, maymed, bete, and slayne withoute eny pyte. The toune of Ludlow, longyng thane to the Duk of York, was robbed to the bare walles, and the noble Duchess of York vnmanly and cruelly was entreted and spoyled.⁶²

The lords were present not in the parliament or in the country, and thus they could not say or do anything to answer these false accusations. The parliament at Coventry made use of the lords' absence and tried to ruin them and those who were close to them. The author introduced his second documentary source after he pointed out the conflict between the Duke of Somerset and the Earl of Warwick about the captainship of Calais.⁶³ This document was also written by the Yorkist lords from Calais to the king and the lords again gave voice to their concerns about the government of the country without accusing the king for the misrule.⁶⁴ The lords complained about the current political, social and economical situation of the country. The lords criticized the ministers of the king for the current problems

⁶¹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 145.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 81-2.

⁶⁴ See Appendix II below.

England suffered. In this sense, this document can be seen as another means of Yorkist propaganda. The author conveyed the ideas of the Yorkist lords without making any comment on the current political situation himself.

The narrative became more intensified with the use of another document: it is a popular ballad which is also unique to the *Chronicle*.⁶⁵ The author of the ballad is unknown, and in the *Chronicle* it is said that it was posted on the gates of Canterbury.⁶⁶ The author introduced this ballad before the landing of the Duke of York and the Earl of Warwick to England. The tyranny of the Earl of Wiltshire frightened the people of Kent and they sent letters and messengers to the Yorkist lords asking them to return.⁶⁷ The ballad is also a piece of Yorkist propaganda: its author complains about the falsehoods and he clearly refers to Richard the Duke of York as a 'saviour'. The ballad makes use of Latinate vocabulary, phrases and references and thus it is argued that due to its sophisticated properties this ballad could not be written by a common man and it could not be understood by common people.⁶⁸ According to Marx, the author of the *Chronicle* might have composed this ballad in order to use it in a rhetorical context by implying that the Yorkist cause was strongly supported by the popular opinion.⁶⁹

The Yorkist lords, namely the Earl of Warwick, the Earls March and Salisbury landed at Sandwich on 26 June 1460 and they entered into the city of London on 2 July. The reason of their coming was told by the Earl of Warwick to the convocation of the clergy held at St Paul's cathedral:

And the Erle of Warewyk there purposed and recited before all the conuocation, and innumerable peple standyng aboute, the causes of

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 86-8. Also, see Appendix III below.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 86.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 86.

⁶⁸ V.J. Scattergood. *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century*. London: Blandford, 1971, pp. 182-4, cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 147.

⁶⁹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. cii.

thayre commyng into thys lond, and mysrewle and myscheues therof, and how with grete vylonce thay had be repeled and put from the kyngis presence, that they myght nat come to hys hyghnes forto excuse thaym of suche fals accusacions as were layde ayens thaym, and now were come ayene, by Goddys mercy, accompanied with peple forto come to hys presens, there to declare and excuse thayre innocence, or ellys to dy in the felde, and there made an open othe vppon the cros of Caunterbury that thay had euer bore trew feythe and lygeaunce to the kyngis persone, wylling no more hurt to hym than to thayre oven personnes, wherof they took God and hys moder and all the sayntis of heuen to wytnesse.⁷⁰

This discourse is not different from the former discourses of the Yorkist lords. The reaction of the king is also similar to his previous reactions: he ignored the Yorkist lords and went to Northampton.⁷¹ Although the Earl of Warwick said that they were well-intended, the Yorkist lords came to London with a vast number of men and they left London with an army of 40,000 men.⁷² The negotiations appeared to be futile and the armies of the king and the Yorkist lords met at Northampton on 10 July 1460.

The Battle of Northampton lasted only half an hour.⁷³ It was a victory for the Yorkist lords, and the Earl of Warwick told the king after the battle that:

‘Most noble prince, displease yow nat, though it haue pleased God of His grace to graunt vs the vycictory of oure mortall enemyes, the whyche by theyre venymous malyce haue vntrewly stered and moued youre hyghnesse to exile vs oute of youre londe, and wolde vs haue put to fynall shame and confusyone. We come nat to that entent forto inquyete ne greue your sayde hyghnesse, but forto please your moste noble persone, desiryng moste tenderly the high welfare and prosperyte therof, and of all youre reame, and forto be youre trew lyegemen, whyle oure lyfes shall endure’.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 89.

⁷¹ For the events leading up to the Battle of Northampton, see Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, pp. 516-20.

⁷² Weir, Alison. *Lancaster and York: The Wars of the Roses*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1995, p. 241.

⁷³ Geoffrey Richardson. *The Hollow Crowns: A History of the Battles of the Wars of the Roses*. Shipley: Baildon, 1996, pp. 39-41; Anthony Goodman. *The Wars of the Roses: Military Activity and English Society, 1452-1497*. London: Routledge, 1990, pp. 37-9; J. R. Lander. *The Wars of the Roses*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990, pp. 75-7; Paul Murray Kendall. *Warwick The Kingmaker*. London: Phoenix, 2002, pp. 72-3.

⁷⁴ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 91.

The Yorkist lords finally expressed themselves before the king who was content with their intentions and their words. The king returned to London a few days later and Richard the Duke of York returned from Ireland in order to attend the parliament held at Westminster and to assert openly his claim to the throne.⁷⁵ The climax of the narrative comes at this point. The Duke of York claimed the throne and he presented some articles indicating why he claimed the throne and why he was supposed to be the heir. This is the author's fourth and longest documentary source,⁷⁶ called the articles betwix King Harry and the Duk of York' in the *Chronicle*. According to Marx, the author's extensive use of these documentary sources shows that he must have been aware of the fact that they would have a more persuasive influence upon readers than the sheer editorial interventions and clear Yorkist propaganda.⁷⁷

The author reported the Duke of York's speech in the parliament. He did not convey the speech word by word; he intervened and commented on the falsehoods done to the lord:

Then the seyde Duk Richard – remembryng the grete and manyfolde wrongys, exyls, and vylonyes that he had suffred and be put vnto by thys seyde Kyng Harry, and by hys, and also how wrongfully and vniustly he had be, and was, displeases and diseased of hys right enheritaunce of the reame and croune of Englund, by vyolent intrusyonne of Kyng Harry iiijth, whyche vnryghtfully, wrongfully, and tyrannously vsurped the crowne after the deth of Kyng Rychard his cosyn, verray and ryghtfull heyre therof, and so wrongfully holdyn from hym, and occupied and holde by the sayde Kyng Harry the IIIth, the Vth, and Kyng Harry the VIth, þat now ys into thys tyme – he, as ryght heyre by lyneall descens from the sayde Kyng Richard, chaulunged and claymed þe sayd reame and croune of Englund, purposyng withoute any more delay to haue be crowned on All Halow day thane next folowyng, and hereopon sent to the lordes and comones of the parlement in wrytyng, hys sayde clayme, title, and pedegre, and nat wold come into the parlement tyll he had aunswere therof.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, p. 520; Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster*, pp. 188-90, 192-3; Weir, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 249-53.

⁷⁶ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, pp. 93-6. Also, see Appendix IV below.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. cii.

⁷⁸ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 92.

The aim of the Yorkist propaganda is achieved at this point of the narrative. The Yorkist cause openly reveals that the Lancastrian line was usurper and as Richard Duke of York was the successor of Richard II he had the right to claim the throne. Richard Duke of York openly accused Henry IV and especially the first Lancastrian king, namely Henry IV of usurping the crown. In the articles Richard Duke of York presented to the king and the parliament the reasons why he should be the heir to the throne. The Duke emphasized this point by giving his genealogy starting from Henry III. It was concluded between Henry VI and Richard Duke of York on 25 October that the king would reign until the end of his life and the Duke would be the heir to the throne. The accord was also accepted by the parliament on 31 October 1460 and this document was extensively published.⁷⁹ This document is available in the Rolls of Parliament and the author must have found this document either from the Rolls of Parliament or by the way of extensive publishing.⁸⁰

The Battle of Wakefield⁸¹ was told immediately after the account of the accord between the king and the Duke of York. The Lancastrian lords, namely the Duke of Somerset and Earl of Devon went to York in order to build a force there.⁸² Richard Duke of York and the Earl of Salisbury also went to the north with a small force.⁸³ However, the problematic issue about the ante bellum is that it cannot be figured out why Richard Duke of York left the safety of Sandal Castle.⁸⁴ The author claimed that Richard Duke of York was tricked by Lord John Neville, brother of Earl

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 150.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 150. 'Rotuli Parliamentorum XXXIX Henry VI', in *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, 6 vols. Ed. by John Strachey. London: 1767-77, V: 375-80, cited in Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 149.

⁸¹ Weir, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 255-9; Richardson, *The Hollow Crowns*, pp. 43-6; Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 119-22; Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 42-3.

⁸² Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, p. 523.

⁸³ Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 42.

⁸⁴ Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, p. 523.

of Westmorland⁸⁵ and thus, this can be the alternative answer he could find. According to the author, the Lord John Neville demanded from the Duke of York “a commyssyon of hym forto reyse a peple forto chastyse the rebelles of the cuntre”.⁸⁶ Trusting Lord John Neville, Richard Duke of York granted him the commission “demyng that he [Lord Neville] had be trew and on hys [the Duke’s] parte”. “When he had his commysssyon, he reysed to the nombre of viij M men, and broute thaym to the lordes of the cuntre, that ys to say, the Erle of Northumbrelond, Lord Clyfford, and Duke of Somerset, that were aduersaryes and enemyes to Duke Richarde”.⁸⁷ When the Duke, the Earl of Rutland, his son and the Earl of Salisbury went out of the castle, they were killed by their enemies but it is hard to know how this exactly happened.

The author narrated the events of the second battle of St Albans on 17 February 1461.⁸⁸ This battle was between the forces of the Earl of Warwick and the forces of Queen Margaret.⁸⁹ The king was with the Yorkist lords who came to St Albans with their men. The Yorkist lords were defeated by the Queen’s forces. It has been argued whether the Yorkist lords were defeated due to the incapability of Warwick’s forces or the treachery of Sir Henry Lovelace.⁹⁰ The author blamed Lovelace for the defeat:

And at the laste, thorow the withdrawing of the Kentysshmen with thayre capteyn, called Lovelace, that was in the vauntwarde – the whyche Louelace fauored the north party, forasmoche as he was take by the northurnmen at Wakefeld whan the Duk of York was slayne, and made to theym an othe forto saue his lyfe, that he wold neuer be agaynes theym – and also be vndysposicion of the peple of the kyngis

⁸⁵ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 97.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 97-8.

⁸⁹ For the second battle of St Albans, see Weir, *The Wars of the Roses*, 266-70; Goodman, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 46-8; Seward, *The Wars of the Roses*, pp. 64-5; Richardson, *The Hollow Crowns*, pp. 50-5.

⁹⁰ Weir, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 268.

syde, that wold nat be guyded ne gouerned by theyre capteyns, Kyng Harryes parte loste the feeld.⁹¹

Henry VI was reunited with the Queen and his son after the battle. The Earl of Warwick met with the Earl of March who had recently returned from Wales after he learned the aftermath of the second battle of St Albans.⁹² The Earl of March was in Wales fighting against the Earl of Pembroke and the Earl of Wiltshire and accordingly he defeated these earls at the battle of Mortimer's Cross on 2 or 3 February.⁹³ The author of the Continuation 1440-1461 gave an account of the battle of Mortimer's Cross after the Edward Earl of March returned to London.⁹⁴ He also made use of a portent that happened a day before the battle of Mortimer's Cross:

And the Monday before the daye of batayle, that ys to say, in the feest of Puryficacion of Oure Blessed Lady, abowte x ate clocke before none, were seen iij sonnys in the fymament shynyng fulle clere, whereof the peple hade grete meruayle, and therof were agast. The noble Erle Edward comforted and sayde, 'Beeth of good comfort, and dredeth not; thys ys a good sygne, for these iij sonys betokene the Fader, the Sone, and the Holy Gost, and therefore late vs haue a good harte, and in the name of Almyghty God, go we agayns oure enemyes'.⁹⁵

In a way, the author ended the narrative with this portent. The portent served best the Yorkist propaganda. Edward, Earl of March was depicted as the herald of good days to come. Furthermore, this portent was usually related to the delivery of Christ.⁹⁶ Therefore, the portent symbolizes the two 'saviours': the birth of Jesus Christ and the beginning of the reign of Edward, Earl of March who would rule England as Edward IV. The author wanted to imply that a new era would begin for England.

In this chapter, I examined the second part of the *Chronicle*, that is the Continuation 1440-1461. The most remarkable feature of this part of the *Chronicle* is

⁹¹ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 98.

⁹² Gillingham, *The Wars of the Roses*, p. 129.

⁹³ Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century*, p. 524; Kendall, *Warwick The Kingmaker*, p. 89, 90.

⁹⁴ According to the compiler the battle took place on 3 February.

⁹⁵ Marx, ed. *The Chronicle*, p. 99.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

that it was written by a Yorkist author in order to convey Yorkist propaganda. The Yorkist aim, and thus the author's aim, was to demonstrate that Henry VI was ruled by evil counselors, and the Yorkist basis was to act for the common weal of the country. The author tried to rationalize the Yorkist basis both to his contemporary readers and his future readers. In order to do that, the author made use of many different techniques: he used portents, documents, parataxis, and so forth.

The first part of the *Chronicle* is regarded as an example of Lancastrian history writing although it does have some distinct features of itself. However, the Continuation 1440-1461 is definitely a piece of Yorkist history writing. The author made use of every means to justify the Yorkist cause: he continuously degraded the Lancastrian government by criticizing its evil counselors and by constantly emphasizing the grievance of the commoners. He made use of documents, both official and popular, in order to make his narrative seem like an official version. He made use of portents in order to indicate the bad events following. He made use of parataxis in order to make his readers think about the events and understand the hidden meaning beneath the sentences.

The narrative was written between 1461 and 1470, during the first part of the reign of Edward IV. Therefore, the author must have had access to official sources such as Rolls of Parliament in order to make use of this extensive borrowing of documentary sources. He must have been someone close to the Yorkists and, in this sense, it is easier to understand why he narrated the events on the behalf of the Yorkists. He did not blame the king, except the incident of Richard Duke of York's coming to the parliament and claiming the throne on 10 October 1460. On the one hand, he constantly condemned the Lancastrian government and he gave his readers a picture of a king who was controlled by his counselors and his queen who had

never regarded the common weal. On the other hand, the author always praised the Yorkist lords and cause by stressing the value they gave to the common profit; he repeated this very major theme in every possible occasion.

The purpose of this chapter was to analyze the Continuation 1440-1461 in terms of its author, its features, its style and its aim. I intended to highlight the differences between the two parts of the *Chronicle*. My method was to examine each major event that gives us a clue about the author and thus the narrative's attitude towards the events. By doing so, I wish to understand what was the actual reason lying behind the author while writing his text. I attempted to analyze each event in detail and tried to give answers to the questions why the author narrated each incident the he did and whether he achieved his aim.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

An English Chronicle 1377-1461 is a witness to the turbulent years of late medieval England. For this period, the *Chronicle* is mainly concerned with the political events surrounding kings, their counselors and ministers, and usually opposition group of royal lords. The *Chronicle* is divided into two parts: the first part encompasses the period from 1377 to 1437 narrating the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and the first nineteen years of Henry VI. The second part of the *Chronicle* covers up the years from 1440 to 1461. Surprisingly enough, the two parts of the *Chronicle* are different from each other in the sense that they present two distinct points of view.

The reason why the *Chronicle* displays two different points of view is that there are two different compilers. On the one hand, a Lancastrian compiler wrote the first part of the *Chronicle*. On the other hand, the Continuation 1440-1461 is written by a Yorkist compiler. Two compilers who had two different perspectives and aims mean that there are two contrasting styles in the *Chronicle*. This very situation marks the exclusiveness of the *Chronicle*.

The first part of the *Chronicle* is considered to be written from a Lancastrian point of view. Since this part is a Lancastrian work, it is to be expected that the compiler would have been hostile to Richard II. However, the compiler presented a different method while narrating Richard's rule: the narrative starts with a neutral

tone. Gradually, the narrative takes another stance: the compiler did not openly criticize the king and his deeds, but instead, severely criticized Richard's counselors and ministers. The narrative reaches its climax with the deposition of Richard II; the compiler tried to justify the accession of Henry IV, which is highly natural when it is considered that he was a Lancastrian.

For the reign of Henry IV, the compiler started his narrative in accordance with his sympathy to Henry IV. However, the compiler unexpectedly and abruptly changed his view and he made use of three cases to discredit Henry IV and his succession to the throne. The compiler did not hesitate to give voice to royal lords, ecclesiastic and lay, who wished to have Richard II as their king. According to the compiler, Henry IV was punished with leprosy and accordingly died because of the injustice he had done to the Archbishop Scrope.

The narrative continues with the reign of Henry V but this part of the *Chronicle* is not covered in this dissertation since this reign accords with the central aim of the compiler. The compiler also narrated the first nineteen years of Henry VI. However, the compiler's narrative of this period is very weak in the sense that he simply lined events up without making any comments. Since this period is the minority of Henry VI, the tension between Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort is given in a very restricted manner.

Speaking for the first part of the *Chronicle*, the compiler's method in narrating the reign of Richard II is quite interesting. Although he is a Lancastrian compiler he did not choose to discredit Richard and his reign entirely; he presented his criticism through Richard's counselors and ministers. The compiler's method of narrating the reign of Henry IV is opposed to his main aim: although the compiler was supposed to be Lancastrian and he intended to justify the Lancastrian cause, he

just discredited Henry IV gradually, and finally he concluded that Henry IV died as a result of natural justice.

The Continuation 1440-1461 was written by the Yorkist compiler who made use of different means in order to justify the Yorkist cause. The compiler did not present any surprises as the compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle*. The compiler had a very clear aim: he attempted to display that the Yorkists had very valid reasons to claim the throne. In one of the documents the Yorkist compiler presented, Richard Duke of York revealed the reasons why he had to be the heir to the throne by pointing out his pedigree that based on Henry III. The aim of the compiler molded his style as well: he made use of official documents, portents, and popular means in order to make his aim clearer and stronger.

The Yorkist compiler did not criticize Henry VI: as the compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle* did to Richard II, the compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 criticized Henry VI's counselors and ministers harshly. To be more precise, the compiler concentrated on the tension between the Yorkist lords and the 'evil' counselors of Henry VI. The Yorkist lords tried to protect the 'common weal', which was destroyed by the falsehoods of the counselors of Henry VI. The compiler emphasized that the Yorkist lords did not act on their own behalf but the public good. He made use of every chance to stress the contrasting aims of the two parts.

In the first chapter, I have attempted to analyze the general structure and the basic features of the *Chronicle* such as the two different parts of the *Chronicle*, their possible dates of compilation, the compilers, their aims, the language, the sources the compilers made use of, etc. I have tried to sketch out the fundamental stylistic and structural differences between the two parts of the *Chronicle*. Furthermore, I have

endeavoured to locate the first part of the *Chronicle* and the Continuation 1440-1461 in the Lancastrian and Yorkist history writing.

In the second chapter I have focused mainly on the first part of the *Chronicle* in terms of its crucial points such as the compiler, the aim of the compiler, style, etc. I have attempted to do this by closely analyzing the parts of the text where these features are obviously witnessed. For the first part of the *Chronicle*, the compiler's use of two sources, namely the *Brut* and the *Continuation* is worth examining since the compiler chiefly constructed his narrative by juxtaposing extracts from these sources. The *Brut* and the *Continuation* have different approaches to the politics of the period: the former is Yorkist and the latter is Lancastrian. Bearing in mind the contrasting views of these two sources, the analysis of what selections the compiler of the first part of the *Chronicle* gains importance in order to comprehend the aim of the compiler.

In the third chapter I have used the same method I employed in the second chapter: I have analyzed the general outline of this part of the *Chronicle* and have attempted to examine the structural properties of it. The compiler of the Continuation 1440-1461 did not benefit from other sources while narrating the events of this period. Since the compiler is a Yorkist, he had a very clear aim in his mind and, in order to realize his aim, he used many different techniques. I have endeavoured to display what kind of techniques he used in his account. Furthermore, I have referred to the secondary sources as in the second chapter in order to reveal the precision of the text and the compiler's aim.

To conclude, in this dissertation I have attempted to analyze *An English Chronicle 1377-1461* in terms of its structural and stylistic features. I have concluded

that this *Chronicle* gives its reader an idea about the political turbulence of England in the late Middle Ages. By narrating the events that prepared the Wars of the Roses, the *Chronicle* enables us to see the contrasting ideas of the two groups that involved in the Wars of the Roses. It is not only important in the sense of what it narrates: it is also of significance for a historiographical study of the epoch. As readers, we witness both the Lancastrian and Yorkist history writing. Through two different texts and thus their compilers, we have a chance to analyze the historiographical characteristics of the genres they belong to. Accordingly, the *Chronicle* assures a very interesting glance to the political history of the late medieval England and a very remarkable study of the late medieval historiography.

APPENDIX A

THE LETTER WRITTEN BY THE EARL OF WARWICK AND RICHARD DUKE OF YORK TO HENRY VI AFTER THE BATTLE OF BLORE HEATH (1459)

Most Crystyn kyng, ryght hygh and mighty prince, and oure most drad souuerayn lord, after as humble recommendacion to youre hygh excellence as we suffice. Oure trewe entent to the prosperyte and augmentacion of your hygh estate, and to the commone wele of this reaume, hath be showd vnto your hyghnesse in suche wrytyng as we made thereof. And ouer þat, an endenture sygnd by oure handes in the churche cath[edral] of Worcestre comprehending the preef of the trouthe and dewte that, God knowethe, we bere to your seyde estate and to the preemynence and prerogative þerof, we sent vnto your good grace by the prior of the sayde churche and diuerse other doctors, and among other, by Master William Lynwode, doctour of diuinite, whyche mynistred vnto vs seuerally the blessed body of God, Oure Lord Ihesu sacred, whereupon we and euery of vs deposyd for oure sayde trouthe and dewtee according to the tenure of the seyde endenture. And syth that tyme, we haue certyfyed at large in wrytyng and by mouth by Garter Kyng of Armes, nat only to youre sayde hyghnesse, but also to the good and worthy lordes being aboute youre moste noble presence, the largenesse of oure sayde trouthe and dewte, and oure entent and oure dysposicion to seche all the mocions that myght serue conueniently to thaffirmacion therof, and to our parfyte suertes from suche inconuenient and vnreuerent geopardyes, as we haue ben put yn dyuerse tymes herebefore. Whereof we haue cause to make, and owe to make, suche exclamacion and compleynt, nat withoute reasone, as ys nat vnknownen to all the sayd worthy lordes and to all his lande, and woll offer vs to youre hygh presence to the same entent, yef we myght so do with oure sayde sewrte, whiche onely causeth vs to kepe aboute vs suche felyshyp as we do in our leefull. And hereto we haue forborne and avoided alle thyngis that myght serue to the effusion of Crysten blood, of the drede that we haue of God and of youre royall mageste, and haue also eschewed to approche youre seyde moste noble presence, of the humble obeysaunce and reuerence whereon we haue and during oure lyfe woll haue the same. And yet, neuertheles, we here that we be proclaimed and defamed in oure name vnryghtfully, vnlawfully, and sauynge your hygh reuerence, vntrewly, and othurwyse that God knoweth þen we haue yeue cause, knowing certainly that the blessed and noble entent of your sayde good grace and the ryghtwysnesse thereof ys to take, repute, and accepte your trew and lowly sugesttys, and that it accordeth neyther with youre sayde entent ne with your wyll or pleasur, that we shuld be otherwyse take or reputed. And ouer that, oure lordshyppes and

tenauntes ben of hygh vylonce robbed and spoyled, ayenst your peese and lawes and alle ryghtwysnesse. We therefore, as we suffice, beseche youre sayde good grace, to take, repute, and receyue thervnto oure sayde trouthe and entent, whiche to God ys know, as we shewe it by the seyde tenur of the sayde endenture, and nat apply youre sayde blessednesse ne the grete ryghtwysnesse and equitye wherinne God hath euer endowed youre hygh nobeley, to thymportune impacience and violence of suche persones as entende of extreme malice to procede vnder the shadow of your hygh myght and presence to oure destruccion, for suche inordinate couetyse, whereof God ys nat pleased, as that haue to oure landes, offices, and goodes, not lettyng or sparyng therefore to put suche thyngys in all lamentable and to sorowfull geopardy, as moot in all wyse take effect by the mystery of Goddys wyll and power, nor nat hauyng regarde to theffusion of Crystyn blood, ne any tendrenesse to the noble blood of thys londe suche as serue to the tuicion and defens therf, ne nat weyng þe losse of youre trew liegemen of youre sayde ream, that God defende whiche knoweth oure entent, and that we haue avoided therfro, as fer as we may with oure sewertees, nat any of any drede that we haue of the sayde persones, but onely of the drede of God and of your sayde hyghnesse, and nat wyll vse oure sayde defence vnto the tyme that we be provoked of necessitye, wherof we calle heuene and erthe into wyttensse and recorde, and therynne beseche God to be our iuge, and to delyuer vs according to oure sayde entent and oure sayde trouthe and dutee to your seyde hyghnesse, and to the sayde commone wele. Most Crysten kyng, ryght hygh and myghty prince, and most drad souuerayn lorde, we beseche our blessed Lord to preseue your honour and estate in ioye and felycute.

Wretyn at Ludlow, the x day of Octobre,
R. York, R. Warrewyk, R. Salesbury.

APPENDIX B

THE ARTICLES WRITTEN BY RICHARD DUKE OF YORK, EDWARD EARL OF MARCH, THE EARL OF WARWICK AND SALISBURY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND THE COMMONS OF ENGLAND (1460)

Worshypfull Syres, we, the Duk of York, the Erles of March, Warrewyk, and Salesbury, sewed and offred to haue come vnto the kyng our souuerayn lordes most noble presens, to haue declared there afore hym, for oure dewte to God and to hys hyghnesse, and to the prosperyte and welfare of his noble estate, and to the comon wele of all his londe, as trew lyegemen, þe matiers folowyng, þat ys to say:

For the first, the grete oppressyon, extorsion, robry, murthur, and other vyolencys doon to Goddys church, and to his mynystres therof, ayens Goddys and mannes law.

Item, the pouerte and mysery that to oure grete heuynesse oure sayde souuerayn lorde standeth inne, nat hauyng any lyuelode of the croune of Englund wherof he may kepe hys honorable housholde, whyche causeth the spylling of his sayde lyegemen by the takers of hys seyde howsholde, whyche lyuelode ys in theyre handes that haue be destroyers of his seyde estate, and of the seyde commone wele.

Item, howe hys lawes been parcially and vnryghtfully guyded, and that by thaym that shold moste loue and tendre hys sayde lawes, the sayde oppressyon and extorsyon [y]s most fauored and supported, and generally, that alle ryghtwysnesse and iustice ys exiled of the sayde lond, and that no man dredeth to offende ayenst the sayde lawes.

Item, that it woll please his sayde good grace to lyve vppon his owne lyuelode, whereupon hys noble progenytres haue in dayes heretofore lyued as honourably and as worthyly as any Crystyn princes, and nat to suffre the destroyers of the sayde londe and of his trewe suggettis to lyue thereupon, and therfore to lacke the sustenauncis that sholde be bylonyng to hys sayde estate, and fynde hys sayde householde oppon his pore communes withoute payment, whyche nouthur accordeth wyth Goddes nor mannes lawe.

Item, howe ofte the seyde communes haue ben gretely and merueylously charged with taxes and talages to theyre grete enporysshing, whereof lytell good hathe eyber growe to the kyng or to the sayde londe, and of the moste substaunce therof the kyng hath left to his part nat half so moche and other lordes and persones, enemyes to the sayde commune wele, haue to theyre owne vse, suffryng all the olde possessyons that they kyng had in Franncce and Normandy, Angew and Meyne, Gascoyne and Guyene, wonne and gotten by his fadre of most noble memory, and other hys noble progenitors, to be shamefully loste or solde.

Item, how they cannot cease therewith, but now beginne a new charge of imposition and tallages vpon the sayde peple whyche neuer afore was seen, that ys to say, euery tounshyp to fynde men for the kyngis garde, takyng ensample therof of oure enemyes and aduersaries of Fraunce; whiche imposition and tallage yef hit be continued to theyre heyres and successours, wolbe they heuyest charge & worst ensample that euer grewe in Englonde, and the forseide suggestes, and the seyde heyres and successours, in suche bandom as theyre auncetours were neuer charged with.

Item, where þe kyng hathe now no more lyfelode oute of his reame of Englonde but onely the londe of Ireland and the toun of Caley, and þat no kyng crystened hathe suche a londe and a toun withoute hys reame, dyuers lordes haue caused his hyghnesse to wryte lettres vnder his priuy seale vnto his Yrssh ene, yes, whyche neuer kyng of Englonde dyd heretofore, wherby they may haue comfort to entre into the conquest of the sayde londe, whiche lettres the same Yrssh enemyes sent vnto me the sayde Duke of York, and merueled gretly that any suche lettres shuld be to theym sent, spekyng þerinne gret shame and vylony of the seyde reame.

Item, in like wyse, the kyng by exccytacion and labour of the same lordes wrote other letters to his enemyes and aduersaries in other landes, that in no wyse that shold shew eny fauoure or good wyll to the toun of Caley, whereby þey had comfort ynowgh to procede to the wynnyng therof; considered also, þat hit ys ordeyned by the laboure of the sayde lordes, that nowther vetayle ner other thyng of refresshyng or defens shulde come oute of Englonde to the socour or relyef of the sayde toun, to thentent that they wolde haue hyt lost, as yt may opynly appere.

Item, it ys demed, and oweth gretely to be doutyd, that after that, the same lordes wolde put the same rewle of Englonde, yef they myght haue theyre purpos and entent, into the handes and gouernaunce of the seyde enemyes.

Item, how continually, syth the pytyous, shamefulle, and sorrowfull murther to all Englon, of that noble, worthy, and Crystyn prynce, Humfrey, Duk of Gloucestre, the kyngis trew vncl, at Bury, hit hathe be labored, studyed, and conspyred, to haue dystroyed and murthryd the seyde Duk of York, and the yssew that it pleased God to sende ne of the royall blode; and also of vs the sayde Erlys of Warrewyk and Salysbury, for none other cause but for the trew hert þat God knoweth we euer haue borne, and bere, to the profyte of the kyngis estate, to the commone wele of the same reame, and defens therof.

Item, how the Erles of Shrouesbury and Wylshyre, and the Lorde Beaumont, oure mortall and extreme enemyes, now and of long tyme past, hauyng the guydyng aboute þe most noble persone of oure sayde souerayn lorde, whos hyghnes they haue restrayned and kept from the liberte and fredom that bylongeth to his seyde astate, and the supporters and fauorers of all the premysse, wolde nat suffre the kyngis seyde good grace to resceue and accepte [us] as he wolde haue done, yef he myght aue had his owne wyll, in hys sayde presence, dredyng the charge that wolde haue be layde vpon theym of the mysery, destruccion, and wrechednesse of the sayde reame, wherof they be causes, and nat the kyng, whyche ys hymself a[s] noble, as vertuous, as ryghtwys, and blyssed of dysposicion, as any prince erthely.

Item, the Erles of Wylshyre and Shrouesbury, and the Lorde Beaumont, nat satysfied nor content with the kyngis possessyouns and hys good, stered and exccyted hys sayde hyghnesse to holde hys parlement at Couentre, where an acte ys made by theyre prouocacion and labour ayenst vs the sayde Duk of York, my sones

March and Rutlande, and the Erles of Warrewyk and Salysbury, and þe sones of the sayde Erle of Salysbury, and meny other knyghtis and esquyers, of dyuerse matiers falsly and vntrewly ymagened, as thay woll answere afore Almyghty God in the day of Dome; the wyhche the sayde Erle[s] of Shrouesbury and Wylshyre and þe Lorde Beaumont prouoked to be maad to thentent of oure destruccion and of our yssew, and that thay myghte haue oure lyfelode and goodes, as they haue openly robbed and dydpoyled all oure places and oure tenementis, and meny other trew men; and now procede to hangyng and drawyng of men by tyranny, and woll therinne shewe the largenesse of theyre vylonce and malyce as vengeably as they can, yef no remedy be prouyded as þe kyngis hyghnesse, whos blessednes ys nother assenting ne knowyng therof.

We therfore, seyng all the sayde myscheues, heryng also that the Frenssh kyng maketh in hys lande grete assemble of hys peple whyche ys gretely to be drad for many causes, purpose yet ayene with Goddes grace [to] offre vs to come ayene to þe sayde souuerayn lorde, to opene and declare there vnto hym the myscheues aboue declared, and in the name of the land to sew in as reuerent and lowly wyse as we can to hys seyde good grace, and to haue pyte and compassion vppon hys sayde trew sugesttys, and nat to suffre the same myscheues to regne vppon theym, requiryng yow on Goddys behalf and prayng yow in oure oune thereinne to assyste vs, doying alwey the dewte of ligeaunce in oure personnes to oure sayde souuerayn lorde, to hys estate, prerogatyf, and preemynence, and to thesuerte of hys most noble persone, whervnto we haue euer be and wyll be as trew as any of his sugettis alyue, whereof we calle God, Our Lady Saynt Mary, and alle the sayntis of heuen vnto wytttenesse and record.

APPENDIX C

BALAT SET VPON THE YATIS OF CANTERBURY

In the day of faste and spirituall afflixion,
The celestially influence o[n] bodyes transitory,
Set asyde alle prophecyes, and all commixtion
Of iuiementys sensuall to ofte in memory.
I reduced to mynde the prophete Isay,
Consideryng Englund to God in greuous offence;
With wepyng ye, this text I fonde in his story:
Omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens!

Regnum Anglorum regnum Dei est,
As the Aungell to Seynt Edward dede wyttensse,
Now regnum Sathane, it semeth, reputat best,
For filii scelerati haue brought it in dystresse.
This preueth fals wedlock and periury expresse,
Fals heyres fostred, as knoweth experience,
Vnryghtwys dyssherytyng with false oppresse,
Sic omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens!

A planta pedis, fro the pore tylyer of the lond
Ad verticem of spirituall eke temperall ennoynted crown
Grace ys withdrawe and Goddys mercyfull hand;
Exalted ys falsehood, trowthe ys layde adoune;
Euery reame cryeth owte in Englonde's treson.
O falshod with thy colored presence!
Euer shall we syng during thy season,
Omne caput languidum, & omne cor merens!

'Omne regnum in se divisum,' sayeth dyuine Scrypture,
'Shallbe desolate'; than foleweth translacion
Into the handes of theyre enemyes – Iewys arn figure.
And now ys Englund in lyk reputacion,
In wey to be conquered; truste it for sewre!
Ihesu, for thy mercy and thy noble reuerens,
Reforme vs to goodnesse and condicione pure,
For, omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens!

Harry oure souuerayn and most Crysty kyng,
His trew bloode hathe flemed bothe be swerde and exyle;
What prynce by thys rewle may haue long enduryng,
That also in moste pouert hath be long whyle?
Tho bestys that thys wrought to mydsomer haue but a myle!
But euer morneth Englund for ham þat be hens

Wyth languysshynge of herte rehersyng my style,
Omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens!

Ionathas ys ded that Daudid shuld restore
To the presence of þe kyng, vnyte to make,
Murum pro domo Israel; presthode dar no more
Put hymself forth, his fat benefice he shulde forsake.
Mercyfull God! It ys tyme thow for vs awake.
Mercenarius fugit, ne wyll make resistence,
He fereth the wolf that wolde hys bonys crake:
Omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens.

Tempus ys come falshede to dystroy,
Tempus eradicandi the wedes fro the corn,
Tempus cremandi the breres þat trees noye,
Tempus euellendi the fals hunter with his horn,
Tempus miserendi on þor alle to torn,
Tempus ponendi falsnes in perpetuell absence,
Thorough whom we syngyn boþe euyn and morn,
Omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens!

Send hom, most gracious Lord Ihesu most benygne,
Send hoom þy trew blode vnto his proper veyne,
Rychard Duk of York, Iob thy seruaunt insynge,
Whom Sathan not ceseth / to sette at care and dysdeyn,
But by the preserued, he may nat be slayne.
Sette hym vt sedeate in principibus, as he dyd before,
And so to oure newe songe, Lorde, thyn erys incline,
Gloria, laus, & honor tibi sit, Rex Christe Redemptor!

Edwarde, Erle of Marche, whos fame þe erthe shall sprede,
Richard, Erle of Salisbury, named prudence,
Wyth that noble knyght and floure of manhode,
Richard, Erle of Warrewyk, sheelde of oure defence,
Also lytell Fauconbrege, a knyght of grete reuerence,
Ihesu ham restore to thayre honoure as thay had before,
And euer shall we syng to thyn hyghe excellence:
Gloria, laus, & honor tibi sit, Rex Christe Redemptor!

No prynce, alle thyng consydered, wyth honoure
In all thyng requysyte to a kyngis excellence
Better may lyue, serche any worthy predecessore;
Yet hastow, souuereyn lord, in these lordes absence
Of alle thaym to a kyng ryghte reasonable expens;
Thay shall cone agayne and rekene for the score,
And thow shalt syng wyth vs thys verrey trew sens,
Gloria, laus, & honor tibi sit, Rex Christe Redemptor! & certera

The deed man greteth yow well,
That ys iust, trw as steele,

With verray good entent,
All the reame of Englonde
Sone to louse from sorowes bond,
Be ryght indifferent iugment.

To the ryght worshipfull cyte of Canterbury.

APPENDIX D

THE ARTICLES BETWYX KING HARRY AND THE DUK OF YORK

Blyssed be Ihesu, in whos handes and bounte resteth and ys the pease and vnyte betwyxt princes, and the weele of euery reaume yknow, by whos direccion agreed hit ys appoynted and accorded as foloweth, betwyxt the most hygh and most myghty prynce, Kyng Harry, the VIth, Kyng of Englund and of Fraunce and Lorde of Yrelond, on that on party, and the ryght hygh and myghty prynce, Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, on that other party, vppon the clayme and tyle vnto the corones of Englund and of Fraunce, and royall power, estate, and dygnyte apperteynyng to the same, and lordshyp of Yrelond, opened, shewed, and declared by the sayde duk afore alle the lordes spyrytuell and temporall beyng in thys present parliament - the sayde aggrement, appoyntement and accord, to be auctorysed by the same parlement.

Furst, where the sayde Richard, Duk of York, hathe declared and opened as aboue ys sayde, tyle and clayme in the maner as folowethe:

That they ryght noble and worthy Prince Harry, Kyng of Englund the IIIrd had issew and lawfully gate Edward hys furst begoten sone, born at Westmynstre the xv kalendis of Iuyll, in the vygyl of Seynt Marc and Marcellyan, the yere of oure Lorde MCCxxxix, and Edmond his seconde goten sone whyche was in Saynt Marcell day, the yere of Oure Lorde MCC[xxxv], the which Edward, after the dethe of Kyng Harry hys fader, entiteled and called kyng Edward the furst, had yssew Edwarde, hys furst begoten done, entitled and called after the desese of the sayde furst Edwarde, hys fader, Kyng Edward the secunde, the whyche had yssew and lawfully gate the ryght noble an honorable Prince Edward the thryd, trew and vndowted kyng of Englund and of Fraunce and lorde of Yrelond, whyche Edward IIIrd trew and vndowted kyng of Englund and of Fraunce and lord of Yrelond, had yssew and lawfully gate Edward hys furst begoten sone, Prince of Wales, Wyllyam of Hatfeld, secund begoten, Leonel, thryd begoten, Duke of Clarence, Iohn of Gaunt, fourthe begoten, Duke of Lancastre, Edmond Langley, fyfth begoten, Duk of York, Thomas Wodstoke, syxth goten, Duk of Gloucestre, and Wyllyam Wyndsore, the seuenth goten. The seyde Edwarde, Prince of Wales, whyche dyed in the lyf of the sayde Edward, kyng, hys grauntsyre, in royall dygnyte, entytelel and called Kyng Richard the secund, and deyed withoute yssew. Leonell, the iijrd goten sone of the seyde Edward, kyng, Duke of Clarence, had yssew and lawfully gat Phyllyppa, his comely doughter and heyre, whyche by sacrament of matrymony cowpeled vnto Edmond Mortymer, Erle of March, had yssew and lawfully beere Roger Mortymer, Erle of Marche, her sone and heyre. Whiche Roger, Erle of March, had yssew and lawfully begate Edmund, Erle of March, Roger Mortymer, Anne and Alianore, whyche Edmund, Roger, and Alyanore, dyed withoute yssew. And the sayde Anne, vndre þe sacrament of matrymony cowpeled vnto Richard, Erle of Cambrege, the sone of the sayde Edmond Langley, the fyfth goten sone of the sayde Kyng Edward,

as yt ys afore specyfyed, had yssew and bare lawfully Richard Plantagenet, comonly called Duk of York. the sayde Iohn of Gaunt, the iiijth goten sone of the seyde Kyng Edward, and the yonger brother of the sayde Leonell, had yssew and lawfully gat Harry, Erle of Derby, whyche incontinent after the tyme that they seyde Kynge Richard resygned the coronez of the sayde reames and the sayde lordeshyp of Yrlond, vnryghtwysly entred vppon the same, then be alyue Edmond Mortymer, Erle of March, sone to Roger Mortymer, Erle of Marche, sone and heyre of the sayde Phylppa, daoughter and heyre of the sayde Ser Leonell, the iijrd sone of the sayde Kyng Edward IIIrd, to the whyche Edmond the ryght and title of the seyde corones and lordeshyp by lawe and custom belonged. To the whyche Richard, Duk of York, as sone to Anne, doughter and heyre of the sayde Leonell, the iijrd goten sone of the sayde Kyng Edward the IIIrd, þe ryght tytle, dygnyte royall, and estate of the corones of the reames of Englund and Fraunce, and of the lordeshyp and the londe of Yrelond, of the ryght, lawe, and custume perteyneth and belongeth, afore any yssew of the sayde Iohn of Gaunt the iiijth goten sone of the same Kyng Edward.

The sayde tytle natheles natwythstandyng, and withoute preiudice of the same, the sayde Richard, Duk of York, tendrely desyryng the weele, reste, and prosperyte of thys lande, and to sette aparte all that that myght be trouble to the same, and consideryng the possessyon of the sayd Kyng Harry the VIth, and that he hathe for hys tyme be named, taken, and reputed Kynge of Englund and of Fraunce, and Lorde of Yrlond, ys content, agreed, and consenteth that he be had, reputed, and taken Kyng of Englund and of Fraunce, with the royall astate, dignyte and preemynence bylongyng therto, and Lorde of Yrlond, duryng hys lyfe naturall, and for that tyme the sayde duk, withoute hurte or preiudice of hys sayde ryght and title, shall take, worshyp, and honoure hym for hys souuerayn lord.

Item, the sayde Rychard, Duk of York, shall promyt and bynde hym by hys solemne othe, in maner and forme as foloweth:

In the name of God, Amen. I, Duke of York, promytte and swere by the feythe and trowthe that I owe to Almyghty God, that I shall neuer do, consent, procure, or sterve, directly or indirectly, in pryve or appert, nether, as moche as in me ys, shall suffre to be do, consented, procured or stered, any thyng that may be or sowne to abyngment of the naturall lyfe of Kyng Harry VIth, or to hurte or amenusyng of hys regne or dygnyte royall, by vyolence or any otherwyse ayens hy[s] fredom or liberte. But yef any persone or persones wold do or presume any thyng to be contrary, I shall with all my myght and power withstande hyt, make yt to be wythstonde, as fer as my power wyll streche therevnto, so helpe me God, and His Holy Euangelyes.

Item, Edward, Erle of March and Edmond Erle of Rutlond, sones of the sayde Richard, Duk of York, shall make lyke othe.

Item, it ys accorded, appoynted, and agreed, that the sayde Rychard, Duke of York, shall be called and reputed from hensfoorth verray and ryghtfull heyre to the corounes, royall astate, dygnyte and lordeshyp abouesayde. And after the decrees of the sayde Kyng Harry, or to whanne he woll laye from hym the sayde corounes, astate, dignyte, and lordshyp, the sayde duke and hys heyres shall immediately succede to the sayde corones, royall astate, dygnyte and lordshyp.

Item, the sayde Richard, Duk of York, shall haue by auctoryte of thys present parlement, castelles, maners, and tenements, wyth the wardes, mariages, releues, seuces, fynes, amerciamentis, offyces, avousons, fees, and other appurtenaunces to thaym belongyng whatsoever they be, to the yerely valew of x M marcis, ouer all charges and repryses, whereof v M marcis shall be to his owen estate, iij M v marcis

to Edwarde hys furst begoten sone, Erle of March, for his astate, and M libras to Edmons, Erle of Rutlond, hys secund goten sone, for his yerly sustentacion, of suche consideracions and suche entent as shal be declared by the lordes of the kyngis counsell.

Item, yef any persone, or persones, ymagyne or compasse the dethe of the sayde duk, and therof prouably be atteynt of open dede doon by folkes of other condicione, that yt be demed and adiuged hygh treson.

Item, for the more estabylysshynge of the sayde accord, it ys appoynted and consented that the lordes spirituall and temporall beyng in thys present parliament, shall make othis to accept, take, worshyp. And repute, the sayde Richard, Duk of York, and hys sayde eyres, as aboue ys rehersed, and kepe and obserue and streyngh, inasmoche as apparteyneth vnto thaym, all the thyngis abouesayde, and resyste to theyre astates and degrees.

Item, the sayde Richard, Duk of York, Erles of March and Rutland, shall promyt and make othe to helpe, ayde, and defend the sayde lordes and euery of theym, ayens all tho that woll quarell or any thyng attempt ayenst the sayde lordes, or any of thaym, by occassyon of agreement or conse[n]tting to the sayde accorde, or assystence yeuyng to the duk and erles or any of thaym.

Item, hit ys agreed and appoynted that thys accorde, and euery article therof, be opened and notyfied by the kyngis letters patentes, or otherwyse, at suche tymes and places and in maner as hit shalbe thought expedyent to the sayd Richard, Duk of York, with thavyse of the lordes of the kyngis counseyll.

The kyng vnderstandeth certaynly the sayde tittle of the sayde Richard, Duk of York, iust, lawfull, and sufficient, by thauyse and assent of the lordes spirituall and temporall and communes, in this parliament assembled, and by auctoryte of the same parlement declareth, approueth, ratifyeth, confermeth, and accepteth the sayde tittle, iust, lawful, and trew, and therevnto yeueth his assent and agreement of his fre wyll and liberte; and ouer that, by the sayde avyse and auctoryte, declareth, entitleth, calleth, stabylyssheth, affermeth, and reputeth the sayde Richard, Duk of York, verray, trew, and ryghtfull heyre to the corones, royalle astate and dygnyte, of the reames of Englund and Fraunce and of the lordeshyp of Yrlond aforesayde, and that accordyng to the worshyp and reuerence, by all the states of the sayd reame of Englund, and of all hys subiects therof, sauynge and ordeynynge, by the same auctoryte, the kyng to haue sayde corones, reames, royall estate, dignyte, and preemynence of the, and the sayde lordshyp of Yrlond, duryng his lyf naturall; and forhtermore, by the same avyse and auctoryte, wyll, consenteth, and agreeth that after hys decease, or whan hit shall please his hyghnesse to ley from hym the seyde corones, estat, dignyte, and lordshyp, or therof ceaseth, the seyde Richard, Duke of York and his heyres shall immediately succede hym in the seyde corones, royall astate, dignyte, and worshyp, and thyng to the contrary maad, or interrupcion or dyscontynuanse of possessyon natwythstandyng; and all thyng theryn conteyned, and therevnto freely and absolutely assenteth and agreeth.

And by the same avyse and uctoryte ordeyneth and esablyssheth that yef any persone of persones ymagyne or compasse the dethe of the sayde duk, and prouably be atteynt of open dede done by folkes of that condicione, that it [be] demed and adiuged hygh treson.

And forhtermore ordeyneth, putteth, and stabylyssheth, by the sayde avyse and auctoryte, that all statutys, ordenauncis, and actes of parlement, made in the tyme of the sayde Kyng Harry IIIth, and the heyres of the body of the same Kyng Harry Vth comyng, were or be enherytable to the sayde corones and reames, or to the

herytage or enherytament of the same, be annulled, repeled, reuoked, dampned, cancelled, voyde, and of no force or effect. And ouer thus, the kyng by the sayde aduyse, assent, and auctoryte, wyll, ordeyneth, and stabylyssheth, that all other actis and statutis, maade afore thys tyme by auctoryte of parlement, nat repeled or adnulled by lyk auctorite, or otherwyse voyde, be in suche foorce, effect, & vertew as that were afore the makyng of these ordenaunces, and that no letters patentis royalis of record, nor actys iudycyall, maade or done afore thys tyme, nat repeled, reuersed, ne otherwyse voyde by the lawe, be preiudyced or hurt by thys present acte.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aers, David. *Community, Gender, and Individual Identity: English Writing, 1360-1430*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Allmand, Christopher T. *Henry V*. London: Methuen London, 1992.
- Archer, Rowena, and Simon Walker, eds. *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England*. London: Rio Grande; Ohio: Hambledon Press, 1995.
- Bellamy, John G. *Crime and Public Disorder in England in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Bevan, Bryan. *Henry IV*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- . *King Richard II*. London: Rubicon Press, 1996.
- Brie, F.W.D., ed. *The Brut or the Chronicles of England*. London: Early English Text Society, original series, 131, 136 (1906-08; rpt. 2000).
- Britnell, R. H., A. J. Pollard, eds. *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society*. Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Chrimes, S.B., C.D. Ross and R.A. Griffiths, eds. *Fifteenth Century England, 1399-1509: Studies in Politics and Society*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997.
- Carpenter, Christine. *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution of England c. 1437-1509*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Clark, Linda, ed. *The Fifteenth Century III: Authority and Subversion*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Davies, John Silvester, ed. *An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI*. London: Camden Society, 1856.
- Dobson, R., ed. *The Peasants' Revolt of 1381*. London: Macmillan, 1983.
- Dunn, Alastair. *The Politics of Magnate Power in England and Wales, 1389-1413*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Richardson, Geoffrey. *The Hollow Crowns: A History of the Battles of the Wars of the Roses*. Shipley: Baildon, 1996.
- Gillespie, James L., ed. *The Age of Richard II*. Stroud: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

- Gillingham, John. *The Wars of the Roses: Peace and Conflict in Fifteenth-Century England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1990.
- Given-Wilson, Chris. *Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400: The Reign of Richard II*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- . *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community*. London; New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- . ‘The Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation: A Lancastrian Narrative?’ *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 138 (1993), 365-70.
- Goodman, Anthony. *The Loyal Conspiracy: The Lords Appellant under Richard II*. Florida: University of Miami Press, 1971.
- . *The Wars of the Roses: Military Activity and English Society, 1452-1497*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Grandsen, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England, v. 2, c. 1307 to the Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974-1982.
- Haydon, Frank Scott, ed. *Eulogium (historiarum sive temporis): Chronicon ab orbe condito usque ad annum Domini M.CCC.LXCI., a monacho quodam Malmesburiensi exaratum ; accedunt continuationes duæ, quarum una ad annum M.CCCC.XIII., altera ad annum M.CCCC.XC. perducta est*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858-63.
- Hicks, Michael. *Warwick the Kingmaker*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Hilton, Rodney. *Bond Men Made Free: Medieval Peasant and the English Rising of 1381*. London: Methuen, 1973.
- . *Class Conflict and the Crisis of Feudalism: Essays in Medieval Social History*. London; New York: Verso, 1990.
- Holmes, George. *The Later Middle Ages, 1272-1485*. New York; London: W.W. Norton , 1966.
- Jacob, E. F. *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Kendall, Paul Murray. *Warwick the Kingmaker*. London: Phoenix, 2002.
- Keen, Maurice Hugh. *England in the Later Middle Ages: A Political History*. London: Methuen, c1973.
- Kingsford, C. L. *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1962.

- Lander, J. R. *Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth-Century England*. London: Hutchinson, 1977.
- . *The Wars of the Roses*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Marx, William C., ed. *An English Chronicle, 1377-1461: Edited from Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 21068 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lyell 34*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Matheson, Lister M. *The Prose Brut: The Development of a Middle English Chronicle*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 180. Tempe, Arizona 1998.
- Mayhew, A. L., Walter W. Skeat, eds. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle English from A.D. 1150 to 1580*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.
- McFarlane, Kenneth B. *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays*. London: Hambledon Press, 1981.
- McIntosh, Angus. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, vol. 3. Aberdeen and New York.: Aberdeen University Press, 1986.
- McKisack, May. *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- McNiven, Peter. 'The Problem of Henry's Health, 1405-13', *English Historical Review*, 100, (1987), 747-772.
- Ormrod, W.M. *Political Life in Medieval England, 1300-1450*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Pollard, A. J. *Late Medieval England, 1399-1509*. Harlow: Longman, 1995.
- Richardson, Geoffrey. *The Hollow Crowns: A History of the Battles of the Wars of the Roses*. Shipley: Baildon, 1996.
- Roskell, J. S. *The Impeachment of Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, in 1386, in the Context of the Reign of Richard II*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Sayles, G. O. 'The Deposition of Richard II: Three Lancastrian Narratives'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 54 (1981), 257-70.
- Saul, Nigel, ed. *Fourteenth Century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- . *Richard II*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 1999.
- Seward, Desmond. *The Wars of the Roses: and the Lives of Five Men and Women in the Fifteenth Century*. London: Constable, 1995.

- Storey, R. L. *The End of the House of Lancaster*. Stroud: Sutton, 1999.
- Strohm, Paul. *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- . *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399-1422*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Thomson, John A. F. *The Transformation of Medieval England, 1370-1529*. London; New York: Longman, 1992, c1983.
- Tuck, Anthony. *Crown and Nobility, 1272-1461: Political Conflict in Late Medieval England*. Otowa, N.J.: Barnes & Noble, 1986.
- . *Richard II and the English Nobility*. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.
- Vale, John. *The Politics of Fifteenth-Century England: John Vale's book*. Ed. by Margaret Lucille Kekewich. Stroud, Gloucestershire: A. Sutton for Richard III & Yorkist History Trust, 1995.
- Valente, Claire. *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Weir, Alison. *Lancaster and York: The Wars of the Roses*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1995.