“Thou livest and breathest, yet art thou slain in him”:\footnote{1} The Absence of Power in Richard II

IMKE LICHTERFELD

Richard II begins with a dead body. There is no corpse present on stage and no funeral procession, yet the body of Thomas Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester and the king’s uncle, haunts the beginning of the play and sets the tone for its exposition. It haunts the opening scene as two opponents—Henry Bolingbroke and Thomas Mowbray—accuse each other of various crimes in front of the king, among them Bolingbroke’s claim that Mowbray murdered Woodstock. As Nicolas Grene writes, “the event to which Richard II looks back most immediately is the relatively recent murder of the Duke of Gloucester.”\footnote{2} This unexplained death—Michael Hattaway notes that Woodstock “died in mysterious circumstances” in Calais in 1397—foreshadows future difficulties for the king.\footnote{3} As I will show, his absent body becomes a vital instrument in the plot of Shakespeare’s play.

Henry Bolingbroke, son of the Duke of Lancaster, and Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, are called into the king’s presence to air their grievances. Richard questions their motives: “What doth our cousin lay to Mowbray’s charge? / It must be great” (1.1.84–85). With corresponding accusations and defenses, the scene presents both a polarizing exposition and first impressions of the major characters. As John Blades puts it, it is “crucial in swiftly introducing the principal characters of the play”: the king, his court circle, two of his subjects.\footnote{4} John Norwich sums this up, recollecting the historical event that “on 29 April 1398...for the first time, the two Dukes appeared face to face before the King; and it is at this point that Shakespeare raises the curtain on The Tragedie of King Richard the Second.”\footnote{5} The first scene thus reminds the audience of the recent historical events of the rebellion against Richard by his uncles, an action that is not
directly presented onstage but looms over the play like a skeleton in the cupboard. The accusations that Bolingbroke brings forth at the king's request are grave indeed:

Look what I speak, my life shall prove it true:
That Mowbray hath received eight thousand nobles
In name of lendings for your highness' soldiers,
The which he hath detained for lewd employments,
Like a false traitor and injurious villain.
Besides I say, and will in battle prove,
Or here or elsewhere to the furthest verge
That ever was surveyed by English eye,
That all the treasons for these eighteen years
Complotted and contrived in this land
Fetch from false Mowbray their first head and spring.
Further I say, and further will maintain
Upon his bad life to make all this good,
That he did plot the Duke of Gloucester's death,
Suggest his soon-believing adversaries,
And consequently, like a traitor coward,
Sluiced out his innocent soul through streams of blood—
Which blood, like sacrificing Abel's, cries,
Even from the tongueless caverns of the earth
To me for justice and rough chastisement.
And by the glorious worth of my descent,
This arm shall do it, or this life be spent! (1.1.87–108)

Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of three crimes, each more horrible than the previous: corruption, treason, and murder. His speech is well structured: according to John Blades, he shows "full vocal command"; his delivery is "even and controlled." The third charge is obviously the climax to his speech; the first two "are relatively mild preambles to his most alarming charge." As Hattaway puts it, Bolingbroke's claim of murder is his "gravest accusation, casting himself in the role of a minister or scourge of God, one sent to cleanse depravity from the world." The dead Gloucester thus provokes this quarrel between Mowbray and Bolingbroke, and in doing so, proves to be what Blades has described as the catalyst to Richard's downfall.

In response to the charge, Mowbray answers with as much force as his opponent, calling him "so foul a liar" (1.1.114) and the accusation mere "slander" (1.1.113). He takes up each of Bolingbroke's three charges.
He throws back the accusation of bribery—"Now swallow down that lie" (1.1.132)—but the accusation of murder reveals a more complicated situation: "For Gloucester's death, / I slew him not, but to my own disgrace / Neglected my sworn duty in that case" (1.1.132–34). These words are not easy to decipher: is he saying that he failed to prevent Gloucester's murder; or acknowledging his role in a plot to kill him? His words can be interpreted in different ways, but on the surface, they undoubtedly deny involvement with Woodstock's death. Mowbray also implies that he and Bolingbroke had not exactly been friends, but hoped that they would have been reconciled by now: "I...begged / Your grace's pardon, and I hope I had it" (1.1.140–41). Yet, since Bolingbroke has brought charges of murder against him, Mowbray now too engages in this verbal fistfight and demands compensation from Bolingbroke in a duel, a trial to the death that may decide who is speaking the truth and who is lying: "I...hurl down my gage / Upon this overweening traitor's foot, / To prove myself a loyal gentleman" (1.1.145–48).

The unexplained character of the charges sets the scene for further inexplicable political decisions. The audience never learns whether Mowbray is responsible, or if Bolingbroke is involved in a conspiracy of slander. As Hattaway points out, "Holinshed narrates that he [Gloucester] was indeed killed by Mowbray, and certainly at the King's behest." But Shakespeare leaves his audience wondering. There is no explained motive, no clear guilty party. It is this puzzle of possibly arbitrary allegations that makes the beginning of Richard II so fascinating, since it also sets the tone for the decisions that trigger the rest of the action. Why does Richard not try to get to the bottom of the murder charge? Why—instead of seeking proof for a judgment—does he simply insist: "Forget, forgive, conclude and be agreed; / Our doctors say this is no month to bleed" (1.1.156–57). He seems too eager to discard the conclusion that can be drawn from this quarrel. Jonathan Baldo sums up the situation effectively:

The opening is deceptive and unsound, like England under Richard's rule.... The references to Gloucester's murder in the opening scene, as well as hints of Richard's involvement, make us aware that something critical has been omitted or perhaps suppressed, whether or not we can recite the sequence of events leading up to the murder. Just as Richard urges the antagonists Mowbray and Bolingbroke to "forget" (1.1.156) the grounds for their quarrel, we might feel as if we have been enjoined to forget events that cast their shadow over the beginning.
This is truly a "hard-fought, sometimes acrimonious, dispute over bones." Gloucest er’s unseen dead body provides a physically memorable and therefore rhetorically forceful political issue in Richard’s downfall because it dominates questions of former power and present guilt. The uncertain status of the corpse structures the events of the play.

It is thus instructive to look at the story behind the murder of Gloucester in more detail—even though it is not directly presented in the play. The charge that the king is responsible for the crime reverberates in the scene but is never uttered. Grene phrases this as follows: "the unspoken subtext of that scene is the King’s known involvement in having his uncle killed." According to Jonathan Baldo, "in Richard’s presence,... nothing is illuminated, nor can it be, because Mowbray is constrained to speak obliquely, having taken part in Gloucester’s murder at Richard’s behest." The imputation that Richard is involved in Gloucester’s murder surfaces again in the next scene, and echoes throughout the play.

The question thus arises as to who Woodstock actually was, what the motivation for his murder may have been, and how Shakespeare plays with his role in court politics. He was the sixth son of Edward III, "Protector of England during Richard’s minority," and, as one of the Lords Appellant, a strong contender for power in the kingdom. With John of Gaunt, he had rebelled against his nephew. For Shakespeare though, Grene argues, "it hardly matters that the historical Gloucester had done a good deal to provoke his death and may have been conspiring against Richard at the time of his arrest.... It is Shakespeare’s strategy to identify these two uncles of the King as elder statesmen, survivors of the previous age of Edward III." Shakespeare also does not mention that Gloucester therefore might have provoked his own death, which might seem an act of clandestine revenge on Richard’s part. What he does instead is to establish a murky situation surrounding the murder of an elder statesman, and at the same time to present a king who displays an "indifference toward the past, because the generation to which the Duke belonged becomes almost an allegory of the obligation to remember." David Womersley argues that Richard discards the old order with which he is often associated, in contrast to a Machiavellian Bolingbroke: "It is Richard who exemplifies... a modern, absolutist form of kingship." Richard indeed demands to forget; he also proposes to "purge this choler without letting blood" (1.1.153). As such, Baldo states, "the opening
projects an atmosphere of concealment.”22 Baldo sees the denial of the past as the trigger for Richard’s own eventual downfall. Paradoxically, if the king does not insist on transition, dynastic rules, and continuance, Henry Bolingbroke has more freedom to replace him.23 Also, the more the past is neglected, the more the body of Gloucester stands out as beckoning recompense.

In fact, Shakespeare does not allow the spectator to have a clear insight to Richard’s actions. Nonetheless, Bolingbroke’s motives are also often called unclear. He has no monologues that demonstrate his ambition ever to become king in the course of the play, yet, as Hattaway points out, his “magniloquence” suggests that he may be ambitious and that “his target is Richard himself.”24 Lynn Staley emphasizes that Bolingbroke knows very well the “ways of centering a court.”25 Historical circumstances all point toward a conclusion that Mowbray killed Gloucester on Richard’s command.26 But possibly Bolingbroke too was involved: When Mowbray fell out of royal favor, Blades suggests, Richard may have asked Bolingbroke to accuse Mowbray to dispose of him.27 As the Duke of Norfolk was not directly part of the royal family—even though Shakespeare’s Richard claims this does not matter—he is judged harshly. However, Bolingbroke was in danger of royal disaffection and desertion, too. His knowledge about the terms of the murder and possible involvement put him in as much disdain as Mowbray. Shakespeare presents the context differently: the dramatic reworking of the historical events displays an arbitrary elusiveness that allows for more distinct motives and political implications.28 As we have seen, the practice of dramatic composition in Richard II demands the recollection of the absent body by memory, and it is this memory which drives the plot. What we are presented with here is the use of the dead corpse as a political instrument. “In theory,” Hattaway observes, “Richard’s power was as great as that of any English monarch. His right to rule was undisputed. However, Richard faced political difficulties caused by the shadow of Woodstock’s death.”29 The denial of proper judgment after the murder of Woodstock infringes his own rights and his position as king. Denying the sacred state of his uncle, his insistence on forgetting presents itself as a cover-up. To the very extent that Richard refuses to raise Woodstock from the grave of oblivion, Shakespeare raises questions about his motives,30 creating a highly selective dramatic version of historiographical interpretation.31
The next scene in the history play illuminates the role of John of Gaunt. Brother to Woodstock, Gaunt historically plotted with his sibling against the king to gain more power and is here portrayed by Shakespeare mourning his brother’s untimely death with Woodstock’s widow, the Duchess of Gloucester: “Alas, the part I had in Woodstock’s blood / Doth more solicit me than your exclaims. / ...Put we our quarrel to the will of heaven” (1.2.1–6). Lancaster thus laments his own guilt in the political struggle that led to the murder when speaking to his brother’s widow; but Shakespeare transfers the question of guilt from a religious context to a secular politico-pragmatic domain in the following lines: “God’s is the quarrel, for God’s substitute, / His deputy anointed in His sight, / Hath caused his death” (1.2.37–39). He articulates the king’s responsibility for the murder of his brother and implies the political dangers that might ensue, evoking once again the haunted atmosphere of this political world.

The widowed Duchess of Gloucester elaborates less on the guilty party and instead further laments her murdered husband as a medieval statesman whose remembrance should not be ignored, since his murder implies a violation of sacred blood:32

Edward’s seven sons, whereof thyself art one,
Were as seven vials of his sacred blood,
Or seven fair branches springing from one root.
Some of those seven are dried by nature’s course,
Some of those branches by the Destinies cut;
But Thomas, my dear lord, my life, my Gloucester,
One vial full of Edward’s sacred blood,
One flourishing branch of his most royal root,
Is cracked, and all the precious liquor spilt,
Is hacked down, and his summer leaves all faded
By Envy’s hand and Murder’s bloody axe. (1.2.11–21)

The Duchess paints a glorious picture of her husband, underlining what Grene describes as the “the violent iconoclasm” of his murder.33 At the same time, she demands justice through revenge: “What shall I say? To safeguard thine own life / The best way is to venge my Gloucester’s death” (1.2.35–36). Thus the body of the murdered Duke, evoked as part of the “divinity of their common lineage,” raises further questions about Richard’s prowess and the powers that have molded his reign and still shape his rule, and also whether the murder is the first symptom of his weakness,
in that it is one of the first dramaturgical causes to substantiate his own deterioration.\textsuperscript{34} It makes his position suspicious from the beginning, as he seems to build his kingship on a platform of death, deceit, and plain lies. The dead body is clearly shaping the plot, and is, as Gemma Miller argues elsewhere in this volume, “dramatically empowering.” Leon Harold Craig further underlines the fact that grief dominates the atmosphere of the play and that, beginning with the Duchess of Gloucester’s expressed sorrow, this mood, clearly caused by Gloucester’s premature demise, functions like a “debilitating passion” with an “oppressive power.”\textsuperscript{35} This presentation of power—paradoxically embodied in a corpse—lies at the center of the play.

It is a picture of Edward’s blood that also raises questions of national and collective identity that are often seen as a “sanctioned...essence” but also a “collective performance.”\textsuperscript{36} His rejection to deal with Gloucester’s murder openly shows that Richard is not capable of holding the royal performance together. This flows into the development of the plot, as Richard does not seem able to fulfill his role and play the king. Aspects of kingship like the cardinal virtues fortitude, temperance, justice, and wisdom seem to elude him. He cannot uphold respect amongst his noblemen; he cannot carry through firm politics. When Mowbray and Bolingbroke accuse each other, the king at first decides to grant them the duel they ask for by throwing down their gage. However, in 1.3, in the lists at Coventry upon Saint Lambert’s day, he calls off the fight to the death before it even starts by throwing his warder down. Instead of God’s judgment, Richard almost subverts the power that he had had—as God’s anointed—but had then transferred back to the higher power. Now, he deliberately takes it into his hands again and thereby demonstrates how arbitrary his resolutions are. Because his reaction seems so rash and unpremeditated, it obviously weakens his position, as his decisions for the interruption of the duel and the verdict of ensuing banishment are not clarified. The king apparently cannot take wise and just decisions without rebuking them; the incident seems to prove that his resolution was either unwise or unjust initially, or is now. In any way, it is inconstant and capricious. However, David Womersley stresses the fact that Richard’s regular command of extraordinarily beautiful language can also dive into a contrastingly dark image by displaying a blunt spiciness in “moments when Richard’s language [is] itself brutally instrumental.”\textsuperscript{37}
Richard does not allow the duel that might bring the unresolved murder to people's attention again should Bolingbroke win: it might not only support Bolingbroke's position as the popular and politically strong cousin of the king but it could also, as Craig emphasizes, "validate his charge against the Duke of Norfolk regarding the murder of Woodstock (with everyone who counts believing that Mowbray does only what the King bids)." The surprisingly late decision to call off the fight to the death, however, also has consequences for the living Mowbray. Instead of declaring judgment, Richard banishes both, Mowbray for life and Bolingbroke for ten, nay six years (1.3.152, 248). This does not only rid him of Bolingbroke but also implies the similar fate for Mowbray, as Craig reflects: "this solution ill-requires Mowbray for his loyal service—a lesson not apt to be lost on the King's other adherents—though his permanent absence might also have a silver lining: riddance of a confederate who perhaps knows too much for the King's own good." If both candidates were involved in Woodstock's murder, their banishment—including the oath that they must not meet again and plot in any regard—saves the day for Richard, if only in the short term.

Richard's shortsightedness in both respects—seeming arbitrariness in not standing by his decisions, and banishment of two contenders to be judged by God alone—must weaken his position on the long run. The question remains what this means for the king's situation and the development of the play. As has been argued above, the random and autocratic decisions that Richard takes throughout the play only underline the aspects of arbitrary rule that Richard displays with regard to Woodstock's murder: the dead body functions as a figurative and dramaturgical trigger in the development of the plot of Richard II. It precipitates further instances of unrestrained and transgressive actions by the king; for instance, the seizing of Lancaster's lands once John of Gaunt dies and his heir Bolingbroke is still in exile. With this act of land seizure, Richard displays another aspect of ignorance and neglect toward the sociopolitical system that allowed him his inheritance. By taking Lancaster, Richard not only provokes Bolingbroke to come back and demand his inheritance; he also almost legitimizes Bolingbroke to transgress the rules of dynastic order: "In ostentatiously breaking these central tenets of medieval culture, Richard lays the foundation for the Lancastrian monarchs' project of legitimating their rule by means other
than dynastic descent." When Richard later realizes that his inheritance derived from the old customs and tries to insist on them, the tides have already turned against him. His crown is practically usurped and his title lost before Bolingbroke even ascends the throne.

Baldo claims that "crimes against rightful inheritance and dynastic continuity lie at the center of the play's action." The rightful place as the king's uncle that Richard denies Gloucester by demanding his extinction—because he meant too much trouble, it seems—turns against Richard. Baldo continues that the "murder of Gloucester by his [nephew] Richard..., the alleged plot against John of Gaunt by Thomas Mowbray (1.1.137), Richard's denying Bolingbroke his inheritance, and the latter's usurpation of the English throne all belong in this class." The crimes against legitimate inheritance and justified remembrance shape the play. This again refers back to the first incident of the denial of rightful place. Gaunt has criticized the king for deliberately infringing nobility's rights. He also accuses him of inaptitude shortly before his own death:

My brother Gloucester, plain well-meaning soul—
Whom fair befall in heaven 'mongst happy souls!—
May be a precedent and witness good
That thou respect'st not spilling Edward's blood (2.1.128–31).

No reconciliation is possible after these transgressions of royal status. York too can only lament the deterioration of the state, while he gives various wrongs that Richard has committed, stressing, like his brother Gaunt, the spilling of "kindred blood" (2.1.182): "Not Gloucester's death, nor Hereford's banishment, / Nor Gaunt's rebukes, nor England's private wrongs, / ... Have ever made me sour my patient cheek" (2.1.165–69). Both Gaunt and York remind the audience of Richard's guilt and both invoke Gloucester's death as the first incident that paves the way for further misdeeds.

Indeed, Richard's rule seems doomed. When Bolingbroke comes back from exile to claim his Dukedom, the situation rapidly changes and Richard quickly offers his crown to the pragmatic, military leader who seizes the crown. Yet Bolingbroke also reflects once more upon the first instance that made the audience aware of something being rotten in the state of Richard's England: in 4.1, just before he decides to ascend the throne, he questions Bagot, an intimate of the king, about the murder of
Gloucester. The issue, which has not been mentioned for a few scenes in the play historically covering a few months, is now unearthed, and the question around the murdered dead body surfaces yet again toward the end of the play: “What thou dost know of noble Gloucester’s death, / Who wrought it with the King, and who performed / The bloody office of his timeless end” (4.1.3–5). Bolingbroke thus underlines the constancy of the recurring image of Gloucester’s death and thus its firm place in the dramaturgy of the play. Bagot names Aumerle, the Duke of York’s son, as one of the murderers and also accuses him of plotting against Bolingbroke: “My Lord Aumerle,”

In that dead time when Gloucester’s death was plotted,
I heard you say, “Is not my arm of length,
That reacheth from the restful English court
As far as Calais to mine uncle’s head?” (4.1.8–13)

Aumerle had supported Richard against the returning Bolingbroke and was thus clearly on the king’s side; however, the denunciation of involvement in Gloucester’s murder is new at this point. The charge certainly strikes home the intended implication that an association with the king would translate as cooperation with his past commands. Unless the above is a blunt lie, it must be taken as oral proof of Aumerle’s guilt. Lord Fitzwater argues similarly toward Aumerle: “I heard thee say—and vauntingly thou spak’est it— / That thou wert cause of noble Gloucester’s death. / If thou denyest it twenty times, thou liest!” (4.1.37–39). The challenge Fitzwater poses to York’s son quickly develops into a charge of gages but, in contrast to Richard at the beginning of the play, Bolingbroke seems settled to put Aumerle to trial. Richard had tried to marginalize the past by disregarding the issues that Woodstock’s murder implies. Indeed his neglect seems to have been intentional, yet the consequences push him from his legitimate place as England’s heir toward the margins itself. Remembering Gloucester becomes a crucial problem in the plot.

One further point worth noting is the commonly told story of the Earl of Essex, who, in 1601, ordered a commissioned performance of Richard II before his rebellion against Queen Elizabeth, who famously commented “I am Richard, know ye not that?” What is worth attention in this context is the fact that Essex was descended from Thomas Woodstock.
to the throne, then, certainly invokes the legacy of the dead body and its weight-giving absence in a performance of Richard II during the late years of Elizabeth’s reign.

The memory of death manifests itself physically and politically in Shakespeare. Richard II is overshadowed by the question of guilt that surrounds the murder of Thomas Woodstock. His dead body shapes the politics of this history play. Baldo claims, "History in Richard II is primarily about decisive, irreversible, and traumatic loss, about becoming aware of what one was and is no longer." A dead body serves as an ample reminder of this loss and also proves the symptomatic image of how loss heralds future loss.

The idea of murder as existent and non-existent compensation recurs again and again in this as well as in other history plays. In his introduction to Richard III, John Jowett writes that "death creates absence, and memory sustains it." Referring to the term "structuring absence," coined by Barbara Hodgdon, his comment concerns Margaret of Anjou; however, the same can be applied to the memory of the deceased Duke of Gloucester in Richard II. Woodstock's murder creates an absence of power in the first history play of the second tetralogy, yet the memory of this unresolved issue pervades the play, influences its proceedings, and, ultimately, has undeniable impacts on those histories to follow.
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