NOTES

1. Although one of the 'histories', *Richard II* may be included in a study of Shakespearian tragedy with full propriety under either Elizabethan or modern theory.

2. I refer to the simplified basic doctrine. To say that this is conventional does not mean that Shakespeare treated simply or conventionally the crises of his characters as they attempt to adhere to the doctrine or depart from it.

3. See W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakespere's Holinshed* (London, 1896). Holinshed exhibits Richard in an early state of despair, but with no preconception of dethronement (p. 106), and in a mood of willingness to abdicate after arrival in London (p. 113). Shakespeare, however, presents a king determined to abdicate as early as the landing in Wales (III, ii), before Richard has even encountered Bolingbroke; and he continues to portray him in this mood from there onward.

4. Samuel Daniel indicates that in Shakespeare's time Bolingbroke's motives were commonly viewed as suspect. He develops the subject at some length (*Civil Wars*, Book I, stanzas 87–99) and concludes that, in charity, judgment should be suspended.

5. Self-delusion on Bolingbroke's part is a trait clearly suggested by Daniel in his enigmatic passage on Henry's motives (*Civil Wars*, Book I, stanzas 90–1). I mention this only to show that such an interpretation was made at the time *Richard II* was written. The concluding lines of stanza 91 are :

> Men do not know what then themselves will be
> When-as, more than themselves, themselves they see.

For an additional reference to Daniel, as well as for a denial that Bolingbroke is a conscious schemer, see J. Dover Wilson's edition of *Richard II* (Cambridge, 1939), pp. xx and xxi. Mr. Wilson briefly describes Bolingbroke as an opportunist led by Fortune.

6. The Chronicle accounts of Richard's latter days do not provide a suggestion of these cumulative steps. As usual, a play-source comparison emphasizes Shakespeare's artistry both in structure and motivation. Daniel (*Civil Wars*, Books I and II) likewise fails to present Bolingbroke's opportunistic conduct in the telling manner of Shakespeare. He does amply suggest the possibility of 'unconscious' drift toward usurpation but in no way dramatizes this action in successive, cumulative disclosure....

E. H. Kantorowicz

FROM *THE KING'S TWO BODIES* (1957)

> Twin-born with greatness, subject to the breath
> Of every fool, whose sense no more can feel
> But his own wringing. What infinite heart's ease
> Must kings neglect that private men enjoy! . . . .
> What kind of god art thou, that suffer'st more
> Of mortal griefs than do thy worshippers?

Such are, in Shakespeare's play, the meditations of King Henry V on the godhead and manhood of a king.[1] The king is 'twin-born' not only with greatness but also with human nature, hence 'subject to the breath of every fool'.

It was the humanly tragic aspect of royal 'gemination' which Shakespeare outlined and not the legal capacities which English lawyers assembled in the fiction of the King's Two Bodies. However, the legal jargon of the 'two Bodies' scarcely belonged to the arcana of the legal guild alone. That the king 'is a Corporation in himself that liveth ever', was a commonplace found in a simple dictionary of legal terms such as Dr John Cowell's *Interpreter* (1607);[2] and even at an earlier date the gist of the concept of kingship which Plowden's *Reports* reflected,* had passed into the writings of Joseph Kitchin (1580)[3] and Richard Crompton (1594)[4]. Moreover, related notions were carried into public when, in 1603, Francis Bacon suggested for the crowns of England and Scotland, united in James I, the name of 'Great Britain' as an expression of the 'perfect union of bodies, politic as well as natural'.[5] That Plowden's *Reports* were widely known is certainly demonstrated by the phrase 'The case is altered, quoth Plowden', which was used proverbially in England before

*[Editor's Footnote : Edmund Plowden, *Commentaries or Reports* (London, 1816), collected and written under Queen Elizabeth, are discussed in Kantorowicz's previous chapter.]

and after 1600.[6] The suggestion that Shakespeare may have known a case (*Hales* v. *Petit*) reported by Plowden, does not seem far-fetched, and it gains strength on the ground that the anonymous play *Thomas of Woodstock*, of which Shakespeare 'had his head full of echoes' and in which he may even have acted,[7] ends in the pun: 'for I have plodded in Plowden, and can find no law'. Besides, it would have been very strange if Shakespeare, who mastered the lingo of almost every human trade, had been ignorant of the constitutional and judicial talk which went on around him and which the jurists of his days applied so lavishly in court. Shakespeare's familiarity with legal cases of general interest cannot be doubted, and we have other evidence of his association with the students at the Inns and his knowledge of court procedure.

Admittedly, it would make little difference whether or not Shakespeare was familiar with the subtleties of legal speech. The poet's vision of the twin nature of a king is not dependent on constitutional support, since such vision would arise very naturally from a purely human stratum. It therefore may appear futile even to pose the question whether Shakespeare applied any professional idiom of the jurists of his time, or try to determine the die of Shakespeare's coinage. It seems all very trivial and irrelevant, since the image of the twinned nature of a king, or even of man in general, was most genuinely Shakespeare's own and proper vision. Nevertheless, should the poet have chanced upon the legal definitions of kingship, as probably he could not have failed to do when conversing with his friends at the Inns, it will be easily imagined how apropos the simile of the King's Two Bodies would have seemed to him. It was anyhow the live essence of his art to reveal the numerous planes active in any human being, to play them off against each other, to confuse them, or to preserve their equilibrium, depending all upon the pattern of life he bore in mind and wished to create anew. How convenient then to find those ever contending planes, as it were, legalised by the jurists' royal 'christology' and readily served to him!

The legal concept of the King's Two Bodies cannot, for other reasons, be separated from Shakespeare. For if that curious image, which from modern constitutional thought has vanished all but completely, still has a very real and human meaning

today, this is largely due to Shakespeare. It is he who has eternalized that metaphor. He has made it not only the symbol, but indeed the very substance and essence of one of his greatest plays: *The Tragedy of King Richard II* is the tragedy of the King's Two Bodies.

Perhaps it is not superfluous to indicate that the Shakespearian Henry V, as he bemoans a king's twofold estate, immediately associates that image with King Richard II. King Henry's soliloquies precede directly that brief intermezzo in which he conjures the spirit of his father's predecessor and to the historic essence of which posterity probably owes that magnificent ex-voto known as the Wilton Diptych.[8]

> Not to-day, O Lord!
> O! not to-day, think not upon the fault
> My father made in encompassing the crown.
> I Richard's body have interr'd anew,
> And on it have bestow'd more contrite tears,
> Than from it issu'd forced drops of blood. (IV, i, 312–17)

Musing over his own royal fate, over the king's two-natured being, Shakespeare's Henry V is disposed to recall Shakespeare's Richard II, who—at least in the poet's concept—appears as the prototype of that 'kind of god that suffers more of mortal griefs than do his worshippers'.

It appears relevant to the general subject of this study, and also otherwise worth our while, to inspect more closely the varieties of royal 'duplications' which Shakespeare has unfolded in the three bewildering central scenes of *Richard II*. The duplications, all one, and all simultaneously active, in Richard —'Thus play I in one person many people' (V, v, 31) are those potentially present in the King, the Fool, and the God. They dissolve, perforce, in the Mirror. Those three prototypes of 'twin-birth' intersect and overlap and interfere with each other continuously. Yet, it may be felt that the 'King' dominates in the scene on the Coast of Wales (III, ii), the 'Fool' at Flint Castle (III, iii), and the 'God' in the Westminster scene (IV, i), with Man's wretchedness as a perpetual companion and antithesis at every stage. Moreover, in each one of those three scenes we encounter the same cascading: from divine kingship

to kingship's 'Name', and from the name to the naked misery of man.

Gradually, and only step by step, does the tragedy proper of the King's Two Bodies develop in the scene on the Welsh coast. There is as yet no split in Richard when, on his return from Ireland, he kisses the soil of his kingdom and renders that famous, almost too often quoted, account of the loftiness of his royal estate. What he expounds is, in fact, the indelible character of the king's body politic, god-like or angel-like. The balm of consecration resists the power of the elements, the 'rough rude sea', since

> The breath of worldly man cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord. (III, ii, 54–5)

Man's breath appears to Richard as something inconsistent with kingship. Carlisle, in the Westminster scene, will emphasize once more that God's Anointed cannot be judged 'by inferior breath' (IV, i, 128). It will be Richard himself who 'with his own breath' releases at once kingship and subjects (IV, i, 210), so that finally King Henry V, after the destruction of Richard's divine kingship, could rightly complain that the king is 'subject to the breath of every fool'.[9]

When the scene (III, ii) begins, Richard is, in the most exalted fashion, the 'deputy elected by the Lord' and 'God's substitute . . . anointed in his sight' (I, ii, 37). Still is he the one that in former days gave 'good ear' to the words of his crony, John Busshy, Speaker of the Commons in 1397, who, when addressing the king, 'did not attribute to him titles of honour, due and accustomed, but invented unused termes and such strange names, as were rather agreeable to the divine maiestie of God, than to any earthly potentate'.[10] He still appears the one said to have asserted that the 'Laws are in the King's mouth, or sometimes in his breast', and to have demanded that 'if he looked at anyone, that person had to bend the knee'. He still is sure of himself, of his dignity, and even of the help of the celestial hosts, which are at his disposal.

> For every man that Bolingbroke hath press'd . . . ,
> God for his Richard hath in heavenly pay
> A glorious angel. (III, ii, 58, 60–1)

This glorious image of kingship 'By the Grace of God' does not last. It slowly fades, as the bad tidings trickle in. A curious change in Richard's attitude—as it were, a metamorphosis from 'Realism' to 'Nominalism'—now takes place. The Universal called 'Kingship' begins to disintegrate; its transcendental 'Reality', its objective truth and god-like existence, so brilliant shortly before, pales into a nothing, a *nomen*. And the remaining half-reality resembles a state of amnesia or of sleep.

> I had forgot myself, am I not king?
> Awake thou coward majesty! thou sleepest,
> Is not the king's name twenty thousand names?
> *Arm, arm, my name!* A puny subject strikes
> At thy great glory. (III, ii, 83–7)

This state of half-reality, of royal oblivion and slumber, adumbrates the royal 'Fool' of Flint Castle. And similarly the divine prototype of gemination, the God-man, begins to announce its presence, as Richard alludes to Judas' treason:

> Snakes, in my heart-blood warm'd, that sting my heart!
> Three Judases, each one thrice worse than Judas! (III, ii, 131–2)

It is as though it has dawned upon Richard that his vicariate of the God Christ might imply also a vicariate of the man Jesus, and that he, the royal 'deputy elected by the Lord', might have to follow his divine Master also in his human humiliation and take the cross.

However, neither the twin-born Fool nor the twin-born God are dominant in that scene. Only their nearness is forecast, while to the fore there steps the body natural and mortal of the king:

> Let's talk of graves, of worms and epitaphs . . . (III, ii, 145ff)

Not only does the king's manhood prevail over the godhead of the Crown, and mortality over immortality; but, worse than that, kingship itself seems to have changed its essence. Instead of being unaffected 'by Nonage or Old Age and other natural Defects and Imbecilities', kingship itself comes to mean Death, and nothing but Death. And the long procession of tortured

kings passing in review before Richard's eyes is proof of that change:

> For God's sake let us sit upon the ground,
> And tell sad stories of the death of kings—
> How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
> Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
> Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping killed;
> *All murdered*—for within the hollow crown
> That rounds the mortal temples of a king,
> Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits
> Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
> Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
> To monarchize, be feared, and kill with looks,
> Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
> As if the flesh which walls about our life,
> Were brass impregnable: and humoured thus,
> Comes at the last, and with a little pin
> Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king! (III, ii, 155–70)

The king that 'never dies' here has been replaced by the king that always dies and suffers death more cruelly than other mortals. Gone is the oneness of the body natural with the immortal body politic, 'this double Body, to which no Body is equal'. Gone also is the fiction of royal prerogatives of any kind, and all that remains is the feeble human nature of a king:

> mock not flesh and blood
> With solemn reverence, throw away respect,
> Tradition, form, and ceremonious duty,
> For you have but mistook me all this while:
> I live with bread like you, feel want,
> Taste grief, need friends—subjected thus,
> How can you say to me, I am a king? (III, ii, 171–7)

The fiction of the oneness of the double body breaks apart. Godhead and manhood of the King's Two Bodies, both clearly outlined with a few strokes, stand in contrast to each other. A first low is reached. The scene now shifts to Flint Castle.

The structure of the second great scene (III, iii) resembles the first. Richard's kingship, his body politic, has been hopelessly shaken, it is true; but still there remains, though hollowed out,

the semblance of kingship. At least this might be saved. 'Yet looks he like a king', states York at Flint Castle (III, iii, 68); and in Richard's temper there dominates, at first, the consciousness of his royal dignity. He had made up his mind beforehand to appear a king at the Castle:

> A king, woe's slave, shall kingly woe obey. (III, iii, 210)

He acts accordingly; he snorts at Northumberland who has omitted the vassal's and subject's customary genuflection before his liege lord and the deputy of God:

> We are amazed, and thus long have we stood
> To watch the fearful bending of thy knee,
> Because we thought ourself thy lawful king:
> And if we be, how dare thy joints forget
> To pay their awful duty to our presence? (III, iii, 72–7)

The 'cascades' then begin to fall as they did in the first scene. The celestial hosts are called upon once more, this time avenging angels and 'armies of pestilence', which God is said to muster in his clouds—'on our behalf' (III, iii, 85f). Again the 'Name' of kingship plays its part:

> O, that I were as great
> As is my grief, or lesser than my *name*! (III, iii, 136–7)

> Must [the king] lose
> The *name* of king? a God's *name*, let it go. (III, iii, 145–6)

From the shadowy name of kingship there leads, once more, the path to new disintegration. No longer does Richard impersonate the mystic body of his subjects and the nation. It is a lonely man's miserable and mortal nature that replaces the king as King:

> I'll give my jewels for a set of beads:
> My gorgeous palace for a hermitage:
> My gay apparel for an almsman's gown:
> My figured goblets for a dish of wood:
> My sceptre for a palmer's walking-staff:
> My subjects for a pair of carved saints,
> And my large kingdom for a little grave,
> A little little grave, an obscure grave. (III, iii, 147–54)

The shiver of those anaphoric clauses is followed by a profusion of gruesome images of High-Gothic *macabresse*. However, the second scene—different from the first—does not end in those outbursts of self-pity which recall, not a Dance of Death, but a dance around one's own grave. There follows a state of even greater abjectness.

The new note, indicating a change for the worse, is struck when Northumberland demands that the king come down into the base court of the castle to meet Bolingbroke, and when Richard, whose personal badge was the 'Sun emerging from a cloud', retorts in a language of confusing brightness and terrifying puns:

> Down, down I come like glist'ring Phaethon:
> Wanting the manage of unruly jades....
> In the base court? Base court, where kings grow base,
> To come at traitors' calls, and do them grace.
> In the base court? Come down? Down court! down king!
> For night-owls shriek where mounting larks should sing.
> (III, iii, 178–83)

It has been noticed at different times how prominent a place is held in *Richard II* by the symbolism of the Sun, and occasionally a passage reads like the description of a Roman *Oriens Augusti* coin (III, ii, 36–53).[11] The Sun imagery, as interwoven in Richard's answer, reflects the 'splendour of the catastrophe' in a manner remindful of Brueghel's *Icarus* and Lucifer's fall from the empyrean, reflecting also those 'shreds of glow. . . . That round the limbs of fallen angels hover'. On the other hand, the 'traitors' calls' may be reminiscent of the 'three Judases' in the foregoing scene. In general, however, biblical imagery is unimportant at Flint Castle: it is saved for the Westminster scene. At Flint, there is another vision which, along with foolish Phaethons and Icari, the poet now produces.

> I talk but idly, and you laugh at me,

remarks Richard (III, iii, 171), growing self-conscious and embarrassed. The sudden awkwardness is noticed by Northumberland, too:

> Sorrow and grief of heart
> Makes him speak fondly like a frantic man. (III, iii, 185)

Shakespeare, in that scene, conjures up the image of another human being, the Fool, who is two-in-one and whom the poet otherwise introduces so often as counter-type of lords and kings. Richard II plays now the roles of both: fool of his royal self and fool of kingship. Therewith, he becomes somewhat less than merely 'man' or (as on the Beach) 'king body natural'. However, only in that new role of Fool—a fool playing king, and a king playing fool—is Richard capable of greeting his victorious cousin and of playing to the end, with Bolingbroke in genuflection before him, the comedy of his brittle and dubious kingship. Again he escapes into 'speaking fondly', that is, into puns:

> Fair cousin, you debase your princely knee,
> To make the base earth proud with kissing it. . . .
> Up, cousin, up—your heart is up, I know,
> Thus high (*touching his own head*) at least, although your knee be low. (III, iii, 190–1, 194–5)

The jurists had claimed that the king's body politic is utterly void of 'natural Defects and Imbecilities'. Here, however, 'Imbecility' seems to hold sway. And yet, the very bottom has not been reached. Each scene, progressively, designates a new low. 'King body natural' in the first scene, and 'Kingly Fool' in the second: with those two twin-born beings there is associated, in the half-sacramental abdication scene, the twin-born deity as an even lower estate. For the 'Fool' marks the transition from 'King' to 'God', and nothing could be more miserable, it seems, than the God in the wretchedness of man.

As the third scene (IV, i) opens, there prevails again—now for the third time—the image of sacramental kingship. On the Beach of Wales, Richard himself had been the herald of the loftiness of kingship by right divine; at Flint Castle, he had made it his 'program' to save at least the face of a king and to justify the 'Name', although the title no longer fitted his condition; at Westminster, he is incapable of expounding his kingship himself. Another person will speak for him and interpret the image of God-established royalty; and very fittingly, a bishop. The Bishop

of Carlisle now plays the *logothetes*; he constrains, once more, the *rex imago Dei* to appear:

> What subject can give sentence on his king?
> And who sits here that is not Richard's subject? . . .
> And shall the figure of God's majesty,
> His captain, steward, deputy-elect,
> Anointed, crowned, planted many years,
> Be judged by subject and inferior breath,
> And he himself not present? O, forfend it, God,
> That in a Christian climate souls refined
> Should show so heinous, black, obscene a deed!
> (IV, i, 121–2, 125–31)

Those are, in good mediaeval fashion, the features of the *vicarius Dei*. And it likewise agrees with mediaeval tradition that the Bishop of Carlisle views the present against the background of the Biblical past. True, he leaves it to Richard to draw the final conclusions and to make manifest the resemblance of the humbled king with the humbled Christ. Yet, it is the Bishop who, as it were, prepares the Biblical climate by prophesying future horrors and foretelling England's Golgotha:

> Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny
> Shall here inhabit, and this land be called
> The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls. (IV, i, 142–4)

The Bishop, for his bold speech, was promptly arrested; but into the atmosphere prepared by him there enters King Richard.

When led into Westminster Hall, he strikes the same chords as the Bishop, those of Biblicism. He points to the hostile assembly, to the lords surrounding Bolingbroke:

> Did they not sometimes cry 'all hail' to me?
> So Judas did to Christ: But He, in twelve,
> Found truth in all, but one: I in twelve thousand, none.
> (IV, i, 169–71)

For the third time the name of Judas is cited to stigmatize the foes of Richard. Soon the name of Pilate will follow and make the implied parallel unequivocal. But before being delivered up to his judges and his cross, King Richard has to 'un-king' himself.

The scene in which Richard 'undoes his kingship' and releases his body politic into thin air, leaves the spectator breathless. It is a scene of sacramental solemnity, since the ecclesiastical ritual of undoing the effects of consecration is no less solemn or of less weight than the ritual which has built up the sacramental dignity. Not to mention the rigid punctilio which was observed at the ousting of a Knight of the Garter or the Golden Fleece,[12] there had been set a famous precedent by Pope Celestine V who, in the Castel Nuovo at Naples, had 'undone' himself by stripping off from his body, with his own hands, the insignia of the dignity which he resigned—ring, tiara, and purple. But whereas Pope Celestine resigned his dignity to his electors, the College of Cardinals, Richard, the hereditary king, resigned his office to God—*Deo ius suum resignavit*. The Shakespearian scene in which Richard 'undoes himself with hierophantic solemnity', has attracted the attention of many a critic, and Walter Pater has called it very correctly an inverted rite, a rite of degradation and a long agonizing ceremony in which the order of coronation is reversed.[13] Since none is entitled to lay finger on the Anointed of God and royal bearer of a *character indelibilis*, King Richard, when defrocking himself, appears as his own celebrant:

> Am I both priest and clerk? well then, amen. (IV, i, 173)

Bit by bit he deprives his body politic of the symbols of its dignity and exposes his poor body natural to the eyes of the spectators:

> Now mark me how I will undo myself:
> I give this heavy weight from off my head,
> And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,
> The pride of kingly sway from out my heart;
> With mine own tears I wash away my balm,
> With mine own hands I give away my crown,
> With mine own tongue deny my sacred state,
> With mine own breath release all duteous oaths:
> All pomp and majesty do I foreswear. . . . (IV, i, 203–11)

Self-deprived of all his former glories, Richard seems to fly back to his old trick of Flint Castle, to the role of Fool, as he

renders to his 'successor' some double-edged acclamations. This time, however, the fool's cap is of no avail. Richard declines to 'ravel out his weaved-up follies', which his cold-efficient foe Northumberland demands him to read aloud. Nor can he shield himself behind his 'Name'. This, too, is gone irrevocably:

> I have no name....
> And know not now what name to call myself. (IV, i, 254ff)

In a new flash of inventiveness, he tries to hide behind another screen. He creates a new split, a chink for his former glory through which to escape and thus to survive. Over against his lost outward kingship he sets an inner kingship, makes his true kingship to retire to inner man, to soul and mind and 'regal thoughts':

> You may my glories and my state depose,
> But not my griefs, still am I king of those. (IV, i, 192–3)

Invisible his kingship, and relegated to within: visible his flesh, and exposed to contempt and derision or to pity and mockery—there remains but one parallel to his miserable self: the derided Son of man. Not only Northumberland, so Richard exclaims, will be found 'damned in the book of heaven', but others as well:

> Nay, all of you, that stand and look upon me,
> Whilst that my wretchedness doth bait myself,
> Though some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,
> Showing an outward pity; yet you Pilates
> Have here delivered me to my sour cross,
> And water cannot wash away your sin. (IV, i, 237)

It is not at random that Shakespeare introduces here, as antitype of Richard, the image of Christ before Pilate, mocked as King of the Jews and delivered to the cross. Shakespeare's sources, contemporary with the events, had transmitted that scene in a similar light.

> At this hour did he (Bolingbroke) remind me of Pilate, who caused our Lord Jesus Christ to be scourged at the stake, and afterwards had him brought before the multitude of the Jews, saying, 'Fair Sirs, behold your king!' who replied, 'Let him be crucified!' Then Pilate washed his hands of it, saying, 'I am innocent of the just blood.' And so he delivered our Lord unto them. Much in the like manner did Duke Henry, when he gave up his rightful lord to the rabble of London, in order that, if they should put him to death, he might say, 'I am innocent of this deed.'[14]

The parallel of Bolingbroke–Richard and Pilate–Christ reflects a widespread feeling among the anti-Lancastrian groups. Such feeling was revived, to some extent, in Tudor times. But this is not important here; for Shakespeare, when using the biblical comparison, integrates it into the entire development of Richard's misery, of which the nadir has as yet not been reached. The Son of man, despite his humiliation and the mocking, remained the *deus absconditus*, remained the 'concealed God' with regard to inner man, just as Shakespeare's Richard would trust for a moment's length in his concealed inner kingship. This inner kingship, however, dissolved too. For of a sudden Richard realizes that he, when facing his Lancastrian Pilate, is not at all like Christ, but that he himself, Richard, has his place among the Pilates and Judases, because he is no less a traitor than the others, or is even worse than they are: he is a traitor to his own immortal body politic and to kingship such as it had been to his day:

> Mine eyes are full of tears, I cannot see. . . .
> But they can see a sort of traitors here.
> Nay, if I turn mine eyes upon myself,
> I find myself a traitor with the rest:
> For I have given here my soul's consent
> T'undeck the pompous body of a king. . . .
> (IV, i, 244, 246–50)

That is, the king body natural becomes a traitor to the king body politic, to the 'pompous body of a king'. It is as though Richard's self-indictment of treason anticipated the charge of 1649, the charge of high treason committed by the *k*ing against the *K*ing.

This cleavage is not yet the climax of Richard's duplications, since the splitting of his personality will be continued without mercy. Once more does there emerge that metaphor of 'Sun-kingship'. It appears, however, in the reverse order, when Richard breaks into that comparison of singular imagination:

O, that I were a mockery king of snow,
Standing before the sun of Bolingbroke,
To melt myself away in water-drops! (IV, i, 260–2)

But it is not before that new Sun—symbol of divine majesty throughout the play—that Richard 'melts himself away', and together with his self also the image of kingship in the early liturgical sense; it is before his own ordinary face that there dissolves both his bankrupt majesty and his nameless manhood.

The mirror scene is the climax of that tragedy of dual personality. The looking-glass has the effects of a magic mirror, and Richard himself is the wizard who, comparable to the trapped and cornered wizard in the fairy tales, is forced to set his magic art to work against himself. The physical face which the mirror reflects, no longer is one with Richard's inner experience, his outer appearance, no longer identical with inner man. 'Was this the face?' The treble question and the answers to it reflect once more the three main facets of the double nature—King, God (Sun), and Fool:

Was this the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men?
Was this the face
That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?
Was this the face, that faced so many follies,
And was at last outfaced by Bolingbroke? (IV, i, 281–6)

When finally, at the 'brittle glory' of his face, Richard dashes the mirror to the ground, there shatters not only Richard's past and present, but every aspect of a super-world. His catoptromancy has ended. The features as reflected by the looking-glass betray that he is stripped of every possibility of a second or super-body —of the pompous body politic of king, of the God-likeness of the Lord's deputy elect, of the follies of the fool, and even of the most human griefs residing in inner man. The splintering mirror means, or is, the breaking apart of any possible duality. All those facets are reduced to one: to the banal face and insignificant *physis* of a miserable man, a *physis* now void of any metaphysis whatsoever. It is both less and more than Death. It is the *demise* of Richard, and the rise of a new body natural.

BOLINGBROKE Go, some of you, convey him to the Tower.
RICHARD O, good! convey? conveyors are you all,
That rise thus nimbly by a great king's fall. (IV, i, 316f)

PLOWDEN Demise is a word, signifying that there is a Separation of the two Bodies; and that the Body politic is conveyed over from the Body natural, now dead or removed from the Dignity royal, to another Body natural.[15]

The Tragedy of King Richard II has always been felt to be a political play. The deposition scene, though performed scores of times after the first performance in 1595, was not printed, or not allowed to be printed, until after the death of Queen Elizabeth. Historical plays in general attracted the English people, especially in the years following the destruction of the Armada; but *Richard II* attracted more than the usual attention. Not to speak of other causes, the conflict between Elizabeth and Essex appeared to Shakespeare's contemporaries in the light of the conflict between Richard and Bolingbroke. It is well known that in 1601, on the eve of his unsuccessful rebellion against the Queen, the Earl of Essex ordered a special performance of *Richard II* to be played in the Globe Theatre before his supporters and the people of London. In the course of the state trial against Essex that performance was discussed at some length by the royal judges—among them the two greatest lawyers of that age, Coke and Bacon—who could not fail to recognize the allusions to the present which the performance of that play intended. It is likewise well known that Elizabeth looked upon that tragedy with most unfavorable feelings. At the time of Essex' execution she complained that 'this tragedy had been played 40 times in open streets and houses', and she carried her self-identification with the title character so far as to exclaim: 'I am Richard II, know ye not that?'

Richard II remained a political play. It was suppressed under Charles II in the 1680s. The play illustrated perhaps too overtly the latest events of England's revolutionary history, the 'Day of the Martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles I' as commemorated in those years in the Book of Common Prayer.[16] The Restoration avoided these and other recollections and had no liking for that tragedy which centered, not only on the concept of a Christ-like

martyr king, but also on that most unpleasant idea of a violent separation of the King's Two Bodies.

It would not be surprising at all had Charles I himself thought of his tragic fate in terms of Shakespeare's *Richard II* and of the king's twin-born being. In some copies of the *Eikon Basilike* there is printed a lament, a long poem otherwise called *Majesty in Misery*, which is ascribed to Charles I and in which the unfortunate king, if really he was the poet, quite obviously alluded to the King's Two Bodies:

> With my own power my majesty they wound,
> In the King's name the king himself uncrowned.
> So does the dust destroy the diamond.[17]

SOURCE: *The King's Two Bodies* (1957).

NOTES

32 footnoes in the original are here shortened to 17.

1. *King Henry V*, IV, i, 254ff.
2. Dr. John Cowell, *The Interpreter or Booke Containing the Signification of Words* (Cambridge, 1607), s.v. 'King (*Rex*)', also s.v. 'Prerogative', where Plowden is actually quoted.
3. Joseph Kitchin, *Le Court Leete et Court Baron* (London, 1580), fol. 1[r-v], referring to the case of the Duchy of Lancaster.
4. Richard Crompton, *L'Authoritie et Jurisdiction des Courts de la Maiestie de la Roygne* (London, 1954), fol. 134[r-v], reproducing on the basis of Plowden the theory about the Two Bodies in connection with the Lancaster case.
5. See Bacon's *Brief Discourse Touching the Happy Union of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland*, in J. Spedding, *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon* (London, 1861–74), III, 90ff.
6. A. P. Rossiter, *Woodstock* (London, 1946), p. 238.
7. *Woodstock*, V, vi, 34f, ed. Rossiter, p. 169.
8. V. H. Galbraith, 'A New Life of Richard II', *History*, XXVI (1942), p. 237ff.
9. See also *King John*, III, iii, 147–8:

> What earthly name to interrogatories
> Can task the free breath of a sacred king?

10. This is reported only by Holinshed; see W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakespeare's Holinshed* (London, 1896), p. 130; Wilson, 'Introduction', p. lii. The *Rotuli Parliamentorum* do not refer to the speech of John Busshy, in 1397.
11. For Richard's symbol of the 'Rising Sun', see Paul Reyher, 'Le symbole du soleil dans la tragédie de Richard II', *Revue de l'enseignement des langues vivantes*, XL (1923), pp. 254–60. The 'sunne arysing out of the clouds' was actually the banner borne by the Black Prince; Richard II had a sun shining carried by a white hart, whereas his standard was sprinkled with ten suns 'in splendor' with a white hart lodged; see Lord Howard de Walden, *Banners, Standards, and Badges from a Tudor Manuscript in the College of Arms* (De Walden Library, 1904), figs. 4, 5, 71.
12. The ecclesiastical *Forma degradationis* was, on the whole, faithfully observed; see the Pontifical of William Durandus (ca. 1293–5), III, c.7, §§21–24, ed. M. Andrieu, *Le pontifical romain au moyen-âge* (Studi e testi, LXXXVIII, Rome, 1940), III, 607f and Appendix IV, pp. 680f. The person to be degraded has to appear in full pontificals, then the places of his chrismation are rubbed with some acid; finally 'seriatim et sigillatim detrahit [episcopus] illi omnia insignia, sive sacra ornamenta, que in ordinum susceptione recepit, et demum exuit illum habitu clericali. . . .'
13. See p. 58 above.
14. The passage is found in the *Chronique de la Traïson et Mort de Richard II*, ed. B. Williams, *English Historical Society*, 1846, and in Creton's French metrical *History of the Deposition of Richard II*, ed. J. Webb, *Royal Society of the Antiquaries* (London, 1819). A fifteenth-century English version, which has been rendered here, was edited by J. Webb, in *Archaeologia*, XX (1824), 179. See, on those sources, Wilson, 'Introduction', lviii, cf. xvi f and 211. The crime of treason would naturally evoke the comparison with Judas. The comparison with Pilate was likewise quite common (see, e.g., Dante, *Purg.*, XX, 91), though his role was not always purely negative.
15. Plowden, *Reports*, 233a.
16. See *Richard II*, xvii, edited by John Dover Wilson, and *The Stage History of* Richard II, lxxix, by Harold Child, both in the Cambridge *Works of Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1939).
17. According to Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948), 162, n. 1, the poem was first printed in the *Eikon Basilike*, edition of 1648.