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ABSTRACT

DISPUTE BETWEEN THE “USURPER” AND HIS COMMONS:
THE LONG PARLIAMENT OF 1406

by Ashley Sinner

The session of the English Parliament under Henry IV in 1406 was exceptionally long compared to other sessions of Parliament, lasting about 23 weeks compared to the average of two to three weeks. A session was called only when the king requested additional revenue and Henry IV had called several sessions in the first years of his reign. By 1406 those men serving in Parliament were less likely to grant money to the king because of the dissatisfaction with the king over the continued requests, as well as because of certain personal characteristics of the members. These members were less likely than in years past to have a prior loyalty to the king or members of his family and were more likely to be serving for the first time than not. The parliamentary session of 1406 included lawyers, merchants, men of property, and cloth manufacturers, as well as pirates and a murder defendant. The session lasted until the Commons granted additional revenue to the king in exchange for his agreement to rely more on his council for advice. The concessions made by the king were unique because they were unprecedented. Henry IV most likely made these concessions because he relied on Parliament for his legitimacy as king and because of an illness he suffered during the middle of this session.
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INTRODUCTION

Researching medieval history is not something that interests a wide range of people, and researching medieval governments is something that reduces those numbers even more. For some reason, this time period has always interested me and I thought that this topic would be interesting for my thesis since it encompassed aspects of my two majors (history and political science). I was particularly interested in how social and political history interact so I researched the social history of the English parliament, looking at the backgrounds of the people who served within the context of the political history of its development and increasing importance within society.

This project began in the summer of 2002. With a broad idea of what I hoped to research (the development of the English parliament with emphasis on social history), I trekked to downtown Milwaukee, braving rush hour traffic and the summer pastime in the city - road construction. I spent more time at the Marquette University library that summer than I think many Marquette students do during a semester. Eventually I narrowed down my topic to looking at the reign of Henry IV and who attended his parliaments and how that affected what was accomplished. One parliament in particular stood out in the history books, the so-called Long Parliament of 1406. It was the longest session of parliament up until that time and held that record until 1640, when a new session of parliament was given that descriptive title. This parliament lasted from March
22 until December 22, with a break from April 3 until April 30 for Easter and from June
19 until October 13 for the summer and the harvest. It owed its length to the dispute
between members of the Commons and the king over the granting of taxation. The
Commons felt that the king was not living within his means, a popular idea of the time,
simply meaning that he should be able to live and run the country with the revenues from
his many estates. The king believed that there were extenuating circumstances, such as
rebellions in Scotland and Wales and the threat of a continuing war with France, which
created a need for additional revenue. Parliaments past had granted particular taxes for
the king and therefore felt that the king did not need any additional sources of revenue.

It was my hope that, by looking at who was in attendance in 1406, some pattern
might emerge relating who was there with the conflict between parliament and the king.
I consulted a four volume collection of biographies of the men who served in parliament
between 1386 and 1421 to learn more about who was in attendance. Once I wrote out the
names, which years they served in parliament, and other biographic information, I set out
to tally the results. In this advanced age, I was able to use a highly technological system
to do this: the tally mark. In order to have a basis for finding if there was change in 1406,
I looked at two other parliaments in the reign of Henry IV, 1401 and January 1404. I
wanted to find who attended in 1406 compared to who attended the other two sessions to
see how they compared with the length and what was accomplished.

One of the “big” questions that I wanted to look at was how the development of
the gentry class, a wealthy class without noble titles, was related to who attended
parliaments at this time. I also wanted to look at the relationship between king and
The parliament was originally created as a king’s court of his feudal vassals, and it continued to be called in the name of the king, but two hundred years later, the parliament began to be the venue for nobles to challenge the king and it happened with increasing frequency. Henry IV had an interesting relationship with his parliaments because of how he became king. He did not follow the traditional ascension to the throne after the death of the king, but instead was a “usurper,” taking the throne from his cousin Richard II in 1399. Prior to that Richard had exiled Henry and did not allow him to inherit what was left to him upon his father’s death. He was not crowned by Parliament, but crowned in their presence. Parliament was therefore the basis for Henry’s legitimacy as king which made the relationship unique.

Since one of the roles of Parliament, particularly the House of Commons, was the ability to grant taxation, it was the primary motive for the king’s interactions with them. During the first few years of Henry’s reign he was successful in gaining additional revenue from the Commons for use toward fighting rebellions in Scotland and Wales, as well as for protection against possible French attacks during the Hundred Years War. By 1406, however, the Commons were no longer as easily persuaded to grant taxation to the king, and this session of parliament was dragged out until December 22 when the Commons granted taxation in exchange for the king agreeing to rely more on his councilors for advice, thereby making the leadership of England more conciliar in nature. A question that I asked myself was whether the length was attributed to the impatience over yet another request for taxation, or was the length affected by who was in attendance in 1406. It was with these questions in mind that I set out to do my research.
CHAPTER 1

MEDIEVAL DEVELOPMENTS

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were a time of great change throughout Europe as a whole, and played a large role in the development of modern England. The period was marked at first by famine then disease, and finally resulted in the “golden age of workers” and the development of the wealthy farmer and gentry classes. Long-term war abroad and rebellion within affected all levels of English society of this time and rebellions rose as a result of legislation in Parliament for the creation of taxes to support these battles. Changes and events of this time permeated into all aspects and levels of society.

This time of sudden change had followed a long period of steady growth. England experienced a population increase from approximately two million in 1086 to about four million people in 1300, triggered by the strong agricultural economic gains made in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The boom placed incredible pressure upon both the natural and man-made elements. In a time when approximately ninety percent of the population made their living off the land, the growth in population created a situation in which there were too many people for not enough land. The population had

---

1 Simon Schama, *A History of Britain: At the Edge of the World?: 3000BC-AD1603* (New York: Hyperion, 2000), 226-228. There are many scholarly books which detail these developments. For a recent reliable narrative and bibliography, see Schama which I will use for this section.
2 Ibid., 228.
grown too rapidly for the agrarian system that was in place, causing people to move to the outward regions where the land was not as productive. By about 1250 peasants were forced to move to lands which had not been brought into cultivation prior to this because they were not well suited for growing crops. Even the once-fertile lands were exhausted by the intensive cultivation, all of which led to a decline in production. The burden of this decline fell on the peasants.

In addition to natural problems, seemingly endless wars with Scotland, Wales and France drained the king’s treasury and after 1250 increasingly forced tax collectors into the villages, where they most frequently leaned on the peasants to fulfill the quota for that area. They were the ones who both could least afford and least resist this practice. Rent prices also increased dramatically during this time which benefited the landholders but caused a decrease in size of peasants’ landholdings. The landholders not only increased the rent but free peasants were forced to sell their labor cheaply.3 Peasants were not the only ones feeling the pressure; towns also felt the pressure of the population growth. As the population expanded, so too did the towns until new towns were created but by 1250 the newer towns, like the marginal lands for farming, did not thrive.

The population continued its upward trend until around 1310. By now, agricultural troubles became noticeable and the population growth appears to have begun to stagnate, but now the weather had become more erratic; one year would see a large amount of rainfall while the next would see drought. Cattle and other livestock suffered

---

3 Ibid.
from an increased spread of disease, compounded by a succession of poor harvests.\(^4\) Although the people of this time had experienced bad weather in years past, the weather had become increasingly unpredictable and affected a much larger area than before. Excessive rain caused crops to rot and placed an even greater pressure on the population of England of this time.\(^5\) The erratic and unpredictable weather led to poor crop yields year after year from about 1313 until 1320, the height of which was the Great Famine of 1315-16.\(^6\) The effects of the famine had been exacerbated by the large population of the time; there was less food available to feed the increased population even before the famine struck.

Famine was not the only disaster to strike England in the fourteenth century. In December 1347 a Genoese ship arrived to port in Messina from the east. Seeming like a ghost ship with almost all of its crew dead, it carried the bubonic plague from the Byzantine world to Europe. Spreading incredibly quickly, all of Europe (with only a few exceptional regions) was affected within two years. The plague reached England in September of 1348 and spread rapidly throughout the British Isles, reaching London by the end of that month. The first wave lasted from 1348 until late spring of 1350 and it was during this wave that the bacillus-caused and flea-transferred disease caused the most destruction. Disease completely eliminated some villages, and throughout England as a whole the population may have dropped in the first wave of plague or within sixteen

\(^4\) Ibid.
\(^5\) Dictionary of the Middle Ages, 1982 ed., s.v. “Famine in Western Europe.”
\(^6\) Schama, 228.
months from approximately four million to three million people. The population decrease was augmented by the fact that the population was already weakened from years of famine.

The population suffered a shocking drop in a short period of time, and the following years brought a polarization of society as a result. Population and economic shifts both took place as a result of the drop in population size and could be seen both in the towns and farming lands. The marginal lands that were farmed prior to the Black Death were no longer used for cultivation; there was no need to use lands that were not productive. Those farmers who survived the waves of plague while farming marginal lands left those lands for more productive lands that had been abandoned during the plague due to death. The marginal lands, however, did not go without being used. Farmers who owned the marginal lands began to substitute sheep pasture for farm cultivation. The export of raw wool produced and the growth in cloth manufacturing in England helped to create a demand for the wool, providing those involved in the booming cash crop with a strong source of income. During this time wages and prices rose, and the real wage rose because the increase in wages surpassed the increase in prices. The standard of living increased noticeably for most of society as the recovery began, especially within the lower ranks of society. The Black Death had left a large amount of good land but a labor shortage along with it. Free laborers were able to earn higher wages for their labor and if the owner of the land was not willing to pay their asking

---

8 Schama, 238.
price, they were able to find one who would pay the asking price.\textsuperscript{9} Those who were not free found that, with the extra labor unavailable, serfdom began to be enforced as were restrictions on their movement. The lords also attempted to keep the level of wages down at the pre-plague levels and restrict the mobility of free laborers as not to encourage those laborers still bound to the land.\textsuperscript{10} Some peasants were able to benefit from the declining value of the land (declining since there was a shortage of people to work it) by buying or leasing extra acres of land and hiring landless peasants to farm it. This led to a polarization between the wealthy peasants and the landless and dispossessed peasants, who were hired as low paid day laborers, served as foot soldiers in armies, or became bandits in the woods (the origin of the Robin Hood legends).\textsuperscript{11} Clearly, this development in social structure was directly related to the decrease in population as a result of the Black Death and the other population disasters of the Later Middle Ages.

In spite of the immediate effects, the ultimate demise of serfdom in England was another result of the Black Death. Most peasants, whether free or un-free, prior to the outbreak of the plague, had rented the lands that they worked from their lord in an arrangement that had become more commercial than feudal. In response to the plague, when the peasants had some freedom of mobility from the availability of lands, the lords within Parliament attempted to reimpose serfdom and limit the movements of the peasants. Control over the land and the peasants working on it provided the nobility with

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 236.
\textsuperscript{10} George Macaulay Trevelyan, \textit{History of England} (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1929), 237-38. While Trevelyan is an old source and outdated in some ways, it is still rich in detail.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 242.
the wealth to maintain their dominance.\textsuperscript{12} In the past, the division of English society had been defined between free and un-free, but this distinction eroded in post-Black Death England after rebellions erupted.\textsuperscript{13} In England the lords reiterated the feudal obligations (including limited wages and movement) that the peasants had to them in the Statutes of Wages and Laborers, which attempted to hold wages down to pre-plague levels. Unlike conditions prior to the Black Death, the lords were no longer able to hire the surplus workers to farm their land; they tried to reinforce feudal obligations to ensure that peasants would work their land as well as the land that they had rented. In addition, reasserting the feudal obligations would guarantee a labor force to work the lands without the lords having to give up their wealth; hiring non-feudal workers would be even more expensive than prior to the Black Death due to the labor shortage (the laborers were able to charge more for their work since it was in demand).

Peasant resentment and revolts provided the ultimate momentum for the elimination of serfdom throughout England. But it was a combination of the reassertion of feudal obligations in post-plague England, and the new Poll Taxes used to fund the Hundred Years War against France and the wars in Wales and Scotland, which caused the peasants to rise up in rebellion against their former feudal masters. The poll taxes were passed by Parliament first in 1377, with a flat tax of one groat (or four pence) per person over the age of fourteen, followed by a graduated tax based on rank and income in 1379. The Poll Tax of 1381 went back to the flat tax that was used in 1377, but the rate

of one shilling per person was more than three times the tax of 1377. This tax was evaded by almost a third of the population, which led government officials to investigate villages to find the evaders. The English Peasant Rebellion began as a result of this poll tax, as well as the investigation of tax evaders, when men of several villages attacked the government officials sent to investigate. Those who participated in the rebellion were not only from the lower levels of society, but were also landowners and artisans. The rebellion was put down, but not before the peasants had attacked the landowners who were members and agents of the government, expressing their grievances about the wage hold and reasserted feudal obligations. The nobles got the message; serfdom was essentially allowed to die.

The English peasants, although they were taxed to fund the war with France, benefited for the most part because, unlike the French peasants, they did not have to worry about battles being fought on their lands. As a group of peasants achieved major wealth through landholding, they began to be sought for marriage by the nobility, which led to the creation of the gentry class. It was this class of commoners often given honorary titles that gained political power and status through their positions in the House of Commons as the Parliament grew in strength. Those peasants who did not achieve major wealth as a result of the post-plague polarization helped to continue a war that had begun a decade before the outbreak of plague by being a ready supply of footsoldiers. Considered to be the first “national war” in Europe, the Hundred Years War decided who

---

would have control over disputed lands on the Continent. Landless peasants played a role that helped to continue the war; they were hired as foot soldiers in the armies fighting in the war.

The availability of foot soldiers not only helped in the continuation of the war, but also aided in the transition of the upper classes of society from nobility to an aristocracy. The feudal importance of the nobles in the past to protect their land from invasion was no longer needed; the noble cavalry was replaced by armies of foot soldiers with nobles acting as generals. The feudal warrior class of the past with military functions, such as protecting the land and the people on it from the imposition of other nobles or the king, lost the necessity of the military role around this time. In England, the king began to call together the nobles in a council to discuss grievances so that disputes might be settled diplomatically rather than militarily. Over time, the military functions of the nobles began to disappear, but the privilege that had been associated with the title did not. One such privilege of the nobility was the invitation to the king’s council to discuss and advise the king in matters related to the nation. It was with the necessity of foot soldiers for battles during the Hundred Years War and their availability due to the polarization of the peasantry that the transition from nobility to aristocracy occurred.

Another important development of the time, and one which played a role in the continuation of the Hundred Years War, was the growth of national identity. By the time of the war, England was already a strong nation, united under a single monarch. France,

---

16 Trevelyan, 222.
17 Ibid., 227.
18 Ibid., 167.
on the other hand, was still a collection of feudal lords who were overseen by a monarch. In both countries the vernacular both as a spoken and written language became the indicator of the nation. The country identified itself based upon the language that was spoken and a person who did not speak that vernacular language or dialect was the enemy. Although the upper classes of English society had been bilingual (speaking English and French) because of the nobles’ past connection with Normandy, English became the primary language of the gentry during this time, just as it became the official language of government. National identity helped to spur on the Hundred Years War; both England and France believed that the land was a part of their country and saw the other as the enemy attempting to spread the influence of their national identity onto it.

The growth of national identity within England during this time, as well as the decline in military importance of the nobility and the growth of the gentry class, aided the development of a Parliament. Originally this group of nobles met in the king’s council to discuss grievances and other national matters with the king. Growing out of the feudal tradition where nobles were protected from the king by feudal laws and customs, the king looked to his nobles for loyalty, support, and advice. He also found it easier to meet with the nobles collectively rather than to deal with issues affecting them all individually. But by the Later Middle Ages the meetings of this council of nobles had led to the development of the Parliament and the opportunities for the gentry to gain political power.

19 Ibid., 224.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid., 167.
CHAPTER 2
THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARLIAMENT

The Parliament in England was not England’s parliament, but the king’s parliament. Although the body began exclusively as a group of barons who hoped to exert some control by providing the king with advice, by the end of the fourteenth century Parliament will have expanded to include not only representatives of the shire knights but also representatives of the towns. The business of the Parliaments will have expanded from being primarily for agreeing to grants of taxation to include making petitions to the king for “good governance.”

During the Middle Ages, English towns were under the control of those lords and other nobles who had possession of the land. These communities most often started out as villages and then grew into market towns, but remained under the jurisdiction of the lords. This changed during the twelfth century when charters were granted to the towns giving them internal self-government through elected officials. There were also towns called boroughs which the king controlled even if they were located in the middle of a noble’s land. However, if the lands on which the towns resided were subenfeudated, the king had to rely on the rural nobility for the management of the business, enforcement of peace, and increasingly to uphold judicial and financial rights of the king. The same was true for the counties, known as shires, which had both feudal and non-feudal governing
structures. By the end of twelfth century it was not unusual to elect representatives to express grievances to the king.\textsuperscript{22}

The king would need to consult those who carried out his work throughout his realm. Originally the kings consulted representatives of the towns and shires individually but eventually they realized it was more time-efficient for the king to meet with the representatives as a collective group.\textsuperscript{23} Some of the noble representatives became members of councils which helped to govern the realm while the king was out of country since, in the twelfth century, the king spent little time in England because he also ruled much French land and sometimes went on crusades. After John lost Normandy in 1204 he became a stay-at-home king, and the councils which had ruled in the king’s absence became somewhat obsolete.\textsuperscript{24} The councils did not go into extinction, however, as the king gathered councilors around him to provide him with advice, this group being referred to as concilium regis, the king’s council.\textsuperscript{25}

In 1215, John signed the Magna Carta as a result of powerful barons whose uprising the document calmed. Through this text, concessions were made by the king which gave greater control to barons, such as the necessity that they be consulted in order to levy a tax. Magna Carta also helped to formalize the meeting of the great council for the purpose of gathering information. John had issued general writs to the counties, summoning representatives in 1212 and 1213, to gather information about the baronial

\textsuperscript{22} Trevelyan, 165-6.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 36.
plot against him which would later lead to the creation of the Magna Carta. This document also laid out a means for creating extraordinary taxation. The king’s revenue originally came from feudal and customary dues, but as the chains of feudalism began to weaken, they were eventually replaced by public obligations. According to the concessions made by John in the Magna Carta, taxation could only be granted for public needs of state and could only be granted freely by the body representing the community as a whole (the great council). This was a major step in the eventual power of the Parliament to grant taxation. As a sense of national identity emerged and the administrative capacity of the government grew, the granting of taxation increased in frequency. The sense of national identity impacted the necessity of additional revenue in that this new national identity helped to fuel wars, sparked by the desire for additional land, which brought a need for money beyond what the royal revenue could afford. The necessity of additional revenue was also impacted by the growing size of the government. As the responsibilities of the administration of the country grew, so did the amount of money required for the governing of the realm.

In the years of the reign of Henry III, the king had two councils to assist him with the governance of his realm, the great council and the small council. The great council was theoretically a body of barons who owed the king their feudal duty of attendance and advice at the king’s court. This council could be held as often as king wanted, with only the greatest barons receiving a writ of summons to attend. The small council, which later

---

27 Lyon, 412.
became the nucleus for parliament, gave advice to king on legislation and help to create royal legislation and fiscal policy. This council was made up primarily of professional administrators and judges from throughout his realm.\textsuperscript{29} Although they were each made up of different people and had different responsibilities, both councils were called by the king so that he might collect information about the goings on throughout his lands.\textsuperscript{30}

The first known concentration of elected knights met in 1227 with the king, Henry III, to provide him with information. In 1254 the king was in need of additional revenue and therefore summoned two knights from each county to provide whatever aid they could.\textsuperscript{31} The frustration felt by the barons toward Henry and his requests for money was evidenced in the Mad Parliament of 1258. It was during this session of parliament that an elected council created and met with four knights who were nominated within each county to investigate local grievances. The Provisions of Oxford of June 1258 provided for this election of knights to investigate and receive complaints against sheriffs and other local officials to be heard by king. Although the Provisions did not last long, these assemblies continued to meet only to deal with administrative problems, as knights and other nobles did not have legislative power at this time.\textsuperscript{32}

It was also in 1258 that the word parliament, a term which applied to feudal assemblies of king’s court, became enshrined in records. The Provisions of Oxford made the parliament an established part of the government although the administrative body

\textsuperscript{29} Lyon, 409-11.
\textsuperscript{30} Holt, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{31} Lyon, 46.
\textsuperscript{32} Holt, 9, 16-19.
was still the king's court. This document made provisions for formal summons of barons and stated that only the great council needed to be present in order for a meeting of nobles to be considered a parliament. In order to retain power over his barons, Henry III had to insist that it was a parliament only if the king was present at its meeting.

Although these administrative gatherings occurred and gave additional control and input to the barons, the knights of shire and burgesses were not summoned frequently during this time. Between 1258 and 1274 there were thirty-four parliaments called, four of them to which knights of the shire were summoned and only one where burgesses were summoned. The first parliament in which boroughs were known to have been summoned for a general political purpose was the parliament in 1265. Prior to this occasion, towns would send representatives to parliament for a specific purpose, but this was the first time that the boroughs were summoned to attend the general discussion. Business of the parliaments in Henry III’s reign remained primarily for the consultation of barons by the king on public affairs and the supervision of administrative bodies within the counties, especially with the barons airing their concerns.

There is no evidence that parliaments under Edward I were any different than those of his father Henry III in terms of what was discussed. Parliament did become much more of an institution with an exact purpose during the reign of Edward I, being

33 Sayles, 48.
34 Ibid., 61.
36 Sayles, 63-4.
established as an instrument of royal government. They were called so regularly, every Michaelmas and Easter whenever he was in England, that writs of summons were only sent when the session was not meeting in London (the newly established center of parliaments) or if an unusually large group was required. Parliaments became a place where the king received complaints and gave remedies, and became the place where petitions could be given to the king and answered most conveniently because of the frequency of the sessions. These parliamentary meetings usually only consisted of Edward’s ministers and magnates and lacked the representatives of the counties that would be present in later years.

Although the presence of shire knights and burgesses was not required, there was one session of parliament in 1295 which became known as the Model Parliament because it called all of the groups which would make up later parliaments. This session did not set a very strong example however, as only 12 of the 20 parliaments during his reign had any representatives of boroughs or counties and only three mirrored the session in 1295. Legislation still originated with the king and his council, so the only role that the representatives played was in giving their opinions through petitions. By 1280 petitions were presented in such high numbers that the time spent by the king answering them threatened the royal business of the king and his council. Toward the end of Edward’s reign, Parliament began meeting less frequently because of the war in Scotland, for which

38 Sayles, 71-2.
39 Harriss “Formation”, 30.
40 Lyon, 420.
he sought additional revenue through taxation from his subjects, one reason why representatives of the commons were summoned. By the end it is likely that Edward I felt parliament had become a place for confrontation between the king and his subjects.

This general feeling seemed to carry over to the reign of Edward II. Conflicts between the king and the subjects of the realm continued due to the king’s dependence on his favorites and the consequences of an unwinnable war in Scotland, as the war forced both military and financial support from the nobles. The result of this conflict was the creation of the Ordinances of 1311, in which the barons voiced their concerns to the king that he was receiving the wrong counsel. They insisted that their advice should be taken in higher regard than the advice of his council, and in doing so created the idea that Parliament was an instrument through which the barons could control the king for the benefit of the entire realm. According to these ordinances, the parliament should meet once a year, during which time the king would deal with lawsuits and hear the grievances of those who had suffered under unlawful actions of the king’s representatives. Although these ordinances were annulled in 1322, this was not the end of parliamentary development. Edward II used Parliament primarily as a means for gaining taxation, but the frequency of his requests for taxation to pay for the war in Scotland helped to transform the body from an occasional meeting to an administrative body with its own traditions.

42 Harriss “Formation”, 31.
43 Ibid.; Sayles, 97.
44 Sayles, 97-99.
45 Harriss “Formation”, 31-2.
The business of parliaments made this administrative body unique. Parliament had two functions; it was both an instrument of the royal government and a voice of the community. Parliament also had a judicial aspect to it, as it served as the high court for hearing appeals from lower courts, as well as being the arena for settling conflicts between the king and his greater subjects. In addition to hearing appeals and being a place of diplomacy between the king and his nobles, this administrative body also dealt with the petitions of individuals and communities.\textsuperscript{46} It came to have this function after a proclamation was made in 1330, stating that any person wishing to proclaim a wrongdoing by an administrator or another subject of the king who was in a position of authority should come to Parliament to make the accusation to the king.\textsuperscript{47} This set the precedent for members of the Commons coming to the sessions with petitions to the king regarding the misadministration of his realm.

From Edward III on, the main developments in Parliament dealt with the growing role of the Commons. By the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the nobility had changed from an undifferentiated mass of landowners to a structured class system which was reflected in divisions in parliament.\textsuperscript{48} While the greater nobles made up the Upper House, which later came to be known as the Lords, the shire knights made up the upper group within the Commons. These knights of shire were the leaders of commons because of their higher standing compared to the town representatives. These representatives, known as burgesses, played little role in parliament despite the fact that

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 35.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 38.
they made up the numerical majority.⁴⁹ Burgesses not called to every session of Parliament but were called with enough frequency to suggest that, over time, their presence was becoming expected.⁵⁰ The Commons were originally summoned to Parliament so that they might simply be consulted about taxation and give formal assent to measures put forward to them by the king and the Lords.⁵¹ The role of the Commons eventually became more broadly defined to include the introduction of legislation through petitions. There were no set qualifications for who could be elected to represent the towns in the fourteenth century. The election of competent representatives was left up to the discretion of those voting. The number of towns represented in Parliament fluctuated over the years from the first time their representatives were summoned. Fewer towns were represented under Edward II than were present in the sessions held under his father Edward I. There was an increase in the number of towns making returns in the later years of the reign of Edward III and numbers increased even more under Richard II.⁵² The numbers began to level out under Henry IV.

The general attitude toward parliament changed from its initial meetings as the king’s council to its more current form including both Lords and Commons. Serving in a session of Parliament was becoming less of a duty and more of a privilege during this time, since service could open up a world of opportunities for those who participated, being recognized by their communities as good representatives.⁵³ Annual sessions of Parliament became ideal during this time so that all of the problems of the realm could be
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met effectively, although it continued to be called by the king primarily when additional revenue was needed. There were no rules about when it could meet, but it rarely met in the summer, which was the time of both campaigns and the harvest. Although it became ideal for Parliament to meet once a year, the length of each session tended to vary, from a little more than a week to twenty-three weeks in 1406.54 The ideal length was less than five weeks in the mind of the king.

Several sessions of Parliament stand out in the fourteenth century as being particularly memorable. The Parliament of 1376, known as the Good Parliament, was the first time the Commons used a spokesman in the Upper House whom they elected from the shire knights to serve for the duration of Parliament. The function of this Speaker soon became customary within the Commons, with his election being the first order of business for the group.55 Parliament became increasingly a scene for great political events after 1377, mostly because of discontent with taxation and the failures of the kings and their councilors to provide “good governance.”56 An example of this was the Parliament of 1386, known as the Wonderful Parliament, in which the parliamentary members threatened the king with deposition if he continued to be absent from parliamentary proceedings to ensure that he heard the petitions of the Commons. Another example of a particularly political session was the Parliament of 1388, called the Merciless Parliament. During this session, appeals of high treason were made against

Richard II’s favorites by the Lords Appellant, of whom the future Henry IV was a member.\textsuperscript{57} Almost two centuries after the first councils gave advice to the king, by 1399 Parliament was a fully established body, resembling the current legislative body today.\textsuperscript{58} It was with this fairly modern Parliament that Henry IV found himself interacting.

\textsuperscript{57} Roskell “Introduction”, 1-2.
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CHAPTER 3
HENRY IV

The reign of Henry IV of England is an interesting case in that he became king not through being the heir of a previous king, but through his own devices. The motives behind his actions, namely his usurpation of the throne, are still contested. His desire for “good government” may have led him to join with the other Appellants in 1387 to rid the government of the despised favorites. It is less likely, however, that this was the reason behind his seizing of the throne in 1399. It is probable that he saw a window of opportunity opened slightly after returning from exile and figured that, with the backing of a few nobles, he had nothing to lose and much to gain; ridding England of a despotic ruler to bring about “good government” was just the superficial justification.

Henry IV was born into a noble family with connections to the throne of England on both sides. Born in 1366 or 1367 at Bolingbroke Castle, he was the son of John of Gaunt and Blanche of Lancaster. His father was the third of five surviving sons of Edward III, the king of England at the time of Henry’s birth. His mother was the heiress to the duchy of Lancaster, the largest single territory in England, and connected to royalty through Henry’s maternal grandfather, Henry of Lancaster, who was the great-grandson of Henry III of England. His prospects for the throne were distant, however; Edward the Black Prince, John of Gaunt’s eldest brother, was heir to the throne until his death in
1376, and was then replaced by his son Richard of Bordeaux, with Henry’s father serving as regent during Richard’s minority.\textsuperscript{59} Henry most likely lived a childhood typical of his standing, but not much is known about it. One of his first appearances in history was his knighting alongside his cousin Richard, from whom Henry would later usurp the throne, by their grandfather Edward III on St. George’s Day in 1377.\textsuperscript{60} Henry was also with Richard seeking refuge in the Tower of London in 1381 during the Peasants’ Revolt, although when Richard left to confront the rebellion, Henry remained in the Tower. By a stroke of luck, Henry did not share the same fate as several other companions of Richard who met an untimely end. His life was spared surprisingly, since it was the unpopular acts of government created by Henry’s father that caused the rebellion in the first place.\textsuperscript{61} John of Gaunt had been given the title of regent and essentially ran the government for Richard, who was still in minority when he became king in 1376, assuming the throne on his own some ten years later.

Holding his father’s title of Earl of Derby, Henry was most likely first summoned to Parliament at Westminster in October 1385.\textsuperscript{62} Little else is known about his political and personal activities until 1387, the year when he joined with the other Appellants in accusing Richard’s “favorites” of treason.\textsuperscript{63} In the session of Parliament that met in October 1386, Richard II made Robert de Vere, a nobleman who already held the title of
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Marquess of Dublin, the Duke of Ireland. Several nobles resented the generous titles that were bestowed upon the king’s favorites and the influence which corresponded to those titles and, in accusing five of them of treason in the Merciless Parliament of 1388, could possibly have hoped that the removal of the favorites would allow some honors to be given to them. There were five Appellants in all, Henry, his uncle Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, Richard, Earl of Arundel, and Thomas Mowbray, Earl of Nottingham. The three original Appellants, Gloucester, Warwick, and Arundel, were the ones to originally bring up the charges against Richard’s favorites. It was not until the second meeting between the Appellants and Richard shortly after Christmas in December 1387 that Henry and Nottingham joined the original three. At this time Richard set a date for February 1388 when the appeal would be prosecuted. Henry may have joined the Appellants against the rise of de Vere, who held the position of justice of Chester and who potentially challenged Henry and his father, no longer regent, absent in trying to claim the throne of Castile for his second wife, in controlling Lancastrian lands.

There is much speculation as to the true reasons behind the Appellants’ actions, but they had sworn allegiance to the king and expressed their commitment to upholding the royal prerogative while ridding the government of the favorites. Along the same lines, when the five Appellants entered the Tower of London, to which Richard had retreated after the defeat of the resisting de Vere, there is a great deal of suspicion as to
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what actually occurred. While some believe that the Appellants cornered Richard in the Tower to secure his deposition, it is also possible that they simply made demands that the king must correct his past mistakes of favoritism.\textsuperscript{69} Throughout this process, however, Henry and Nottingham proved to be less hostile toward the king than the other three elder Appellants. This may be as a result of their childhood; Henry and Richard had been knighted by their grandfather Edward III at the same time, and at Richard’s coronation, it was Henry who held the sword before him.\textsuperscript{70} They were possibly not as disillusioned with Richard’s government as the original Appellants were, since they were just beginning their political careers when this event occurred, whereas the other three had been present in politics for some time. Whatever the reason, Henry was not willing to remove Richard from the throne at this time; his primary goal was to simply see Richard’s court purged and the favorites eliminated from influencing the king, but possibly so that he might have influence over his cousin the king.\textsuperscript{71}

After the events of the Merciless Parliament in 1388, Henry seemed to become an ever-present member in attendance at Parliament. Although many of the records from Richard’s reign were lost, there is evidence that he was in attendance at the January/February session of Parliament in 1390 before embarking on a crusade to fight with the Teutonic knights in Prussia, where he remained until the summer of 1391. Upon his return to England, Henry attended Parliament in November 1391, where he was appointed to the position of trier of petitions, in which he would hear the petitions \footnote{69 Ibid., 189.} \footnote{70 McFarlane, 16.} \footnote{71 Saul, 190; McFarlane, 32.}
presented by the Commons and decide their outcomes. He served in this position again in the session of 1395, as well as in the two parliaments in 1397. Henry was also in attendance at the Parliament of 1394. Later that year, when Richard traveled to Ireland to settle an insurrection, Henry was one of the nobles in a council who remained in England to rule in Richard’s absence.\(^72\) This possibly gave Henry a taste of what ruling the country would feel like, and also allowed him to exert control, however temporary, over the realm.

Almost ten years after the Merciless Parliament, Richard, who had initially protected the five Appellants from being accused of any crime, charged the original three with conspiracy in 1397. Gloucester died mysteriously in Calais, Arundel was executed, and Warwick was banished. In regards to the younger two Appellants, Henry and Nottingham, Richard stated in a Commons’ resolution that they were “innocent of malice” and therefore not under any threat.\(^73\) These two were pardoned possibly because they were not the leaders, but the younger followers of the original Appellants. Another possible explanation for the pardon was the close relationship between Henry, Nottingham, and Richard, all of whom were around the same age. A dispute nevertheless erupted between Henry and Nottingham a few months later; word leaked to Richard that Nottingham had warned Henry that they would be next to face accusation by the king. Henry stood by this story and Nottingham strongly denied the accusation. It was the word of one noble against another, so Richard exiled Nottingham for life and Henry for
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ten years (a sentence later reduced to six at the request of John of Gaunt).\textsuperscript{74} Favor to Henry or to John of Gaunt extended to Richard allowing Henry to receive the income of his father’s estate should John die during his exile. But the favor did not last as Richard would later rescind the grant when John of Gaunt died in 1399. Henry was suddenly a rival for Richard and the king had two choices: allow Henry to enjoy his new wealth and power as the new Duke of Lancaster while in exile or deny Henry his right to the inheritance. While the latter would be a very bold move that would make all of the nobles of England fear the same, there was too much of a risk of Henry raising a rebellion if he were allowed to inherit. On March 18, 1399 Richard declared that Henry was banished for life and all of his inheritance would be passed over to the king’s control.\textsuperscript{75}

Only a few months later, in July 1399, Henry was back in England, having sailed from France, to recover his inheritance and ostensibly to reform the government. He was accompanied by several companions who had been with him during his time in exile. After landing in Yorkshire, he gained the backing of several lords; they most likely backed him in his quest to regain his inheritance because if Richard had been able to take control of the largest duchy in England, it would be possible for him to take others.\textsuperscript{76} Henry’s arrival in England was made possible because of Richard’s absence; he was at that time in Ireland with his army putting down a rebellion. With both the king and his army absent, Henry was able to ride throughout the Lancastrian lands and regain support for his return. Richard and Henry first made contact through envoys upon the king’s
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return in August, and the king was captured by Henry’s men, led by the Earl of Northumberland.77 Henry entered London with Richard as his prisoner on September 1 and kept him locked up in the Tower. A session of Parliament had been called for later that month in Richard’s name, but he would not be there to preside over it.78 Henry had the king in his possession, so all that was needed was the public justification for the transfer of the crown. On September 30, 1399, Parliament gathered in Westminster as requested in Richard’s summons, but without his presence. Henry addressed those present, stating that Richard had willingly abdicated the previous day and the former king had given a deputation in the Tower saying that, if he had the power to choose his successor, it would be his cousin Henry. Thirty-two articles were then read, charging Richard with misdeeds from throughout his reign.79 When Richard’s abdication was accepted by both the Lords and the Commons, Henry stepped forward and made his claim to the throne.

In the name of Fadir, Son and Holy Gost, I, Henry of Lancastre, chalenge this Rewme of Yngland, and the Corone, with all the membres and appurtenances als I that I am disendit be right lyne of the blode comyng fro the gude lorde Kyng Henry therde and thorghe that ryght that God of his grace hath sent me, with helpe of my kyn and of my frendes to recover it; the whiche Rewme was in poynyt to be undone for defaut of governance and undoyng of the gode lawes.80

Within his speech he made reference to three different reasons for his claim to the throne. First of all, he was descended from Henry III; Henry had attempted to use the claim that his ancestor, Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster, was actually the eldest
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son of Henry III but was passed over by his younger brother Edward to be the next king. No evidence was ever found to support this aspect of the claim, so he most likely just referred to his blood connection with Henry III instead. Secondly, he stated that God had sent him to recover the throne since the right to rule was within his blood. Finally, he made reference to the fact that the realm was falling apart and good governance needed to be reestablished. He did not make the claim strictly based on the inheritance factor, nor did he insist that the right was his by conquest. At the same time, he did not allow himself to be elected or appointed by the Parliament, an action which would have included the surrendering of the royal prerogative; if Parliament elected him, Parliament could just as easily depose him.

Henry IV’s relationship with Parliament throughout his reign was the result of the experiences of the past and the events that occurred during his reign. The fact that he was made king during a session of Parliament seemed to foreshadow the importance that the governing body would have throughout his reign. Throughout his reign Henry needed the money collected through taxation and through the Commons was the only way to pass the taxation statutes. He also felt the pressure to appease the Parliament in order to maintain legitimacy in their eyes; Henry came to power promising “good government” and most likely felt the need to make an attempt to provide it. The desire for legitimacy, “good government,” and the events of his reign forced Henry to consult and appease Parliament to a certain degree.

---

81 Kirby, 70; Pollard, 25.
82 Pollard, 26.
Throughout his reign, Henry IV swore that he would govern with the help of councilors, ideally in his mind they would be of his own choosing. However, due to the need for grants of taxation only achieved through the Commons, the king found himself to be much more conciliatory toward the assembly than he would have hoped, to the extent that Henry had to announce the names of his council members in front of Parliament and the members in turn had to swear an oath with members of the Commons as witnesses, a new and unprecedented demand.

One of the most important ideas of late medieval politics in England was that the king should “live of his own,” meaning that he should be able to support himself and his household through his own means, with the revenue from the royal estates, customs, and other miscellaneous, more minor sources of income. Direct taxation was something that was allowed as a way of financing any extraordinary circumstances that might arise, such as defending the realm from internal rebellion or external attacks and potential warfare. Earlier in the medieval period, revenue had been collected through feudal and customary dues but feudal relationships diminished and the need arose from time to time for additional revenue. The first occasion when taxation was called for was in 1207 due to
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public necessity, meaning that funds were needed to cover the expenses of domestic issues, and King John had to gain the consent of the “public” before this was enacted. By the fourteenth century the most common way for a king to declare the necessity of taxation was at a parliamentary session, and the Commons became the group by whom permission for taxation was granted. Voting for taxes was the primary reason for a parliament to be called, as it was only the Commons who could make a grant of taxation. Parliaments typically opened with the king requesting additional revenue, and after negotiating the terms, closed with the passing of the bill for the tax. There were two forms of taxation, indirect and direct. Indirect taxation was the paying of customs on wool exports and tunnage and poundage, the subsidies on the importation and exportation of other goods. Direct taxation was usually done through the subsidy paid on moveable goods of the subjects, with a tenth for the townsmen and a fifteenth for those in the country. While customs were usually voted during each parliament, the tenth and fifteenth were less common.

Although the first parliamentary session under Henry IV did not deal directly with taxation, issues relating to gaining legitimacy played an important role in this session and would affect later parliaments and the issue of taxation. In later years income in addition to Henry’s royal revenue was needed, according to the king, because of threats of rebellion in Scotland and Wales as well as conflict with France. The granting of land and money to both his supporters and his potential enemies as a way of maintaining alliances,
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payment for service during his usurpation, and keeping the nobles from rebelling created financial problems throughout his reign.

The members of the parliamentary group which met in October 1399 were those who had been called to meet at the end of September under Richard II. Although this session was called by Richard, circumstances led it to be witness to his deposition and Henry’s usurpation of the throne and it was then summoned back to convene on October 6, this time meeting in the name of the new king, Henry IV. Given the circumstances, surprisingly this session lacked the controversy and disputes between king and Commons which characterized later parliaments in Henry’s reign. In his first session of parliament as king, Henry sought to secure legitimacy for not only himself, but for his family as well. One of the main orders of business was the declaration of his son Henry as Prince of Wales and the heir of his father. At the same time, the Commons granted that the new king should have the same royal privileges as his predecessors, seeming to ensure that his rule would not be any more or less constrained by Parliament than kings in the past had been. In order to secure his rule even more, the new king repealed the acts of Richard’s last parliament of 1397 which had been created to punish the original Lords Appellants. To eliminate any threat of Richard returning to the throne, Henry placed the appellants of 1397 on trial and condemned Richard to imprisonment for life. It was not until Henry’s next parliament in 1401 that taxation and finances began to play an important role in the relationship between the Commons and the king.
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As stated Parliament expected the king to live of his own means, and this was especially true for Henry because he had inherited the vast duchy of Lancaster and other lands in addition to the royal land holdings. The Commons did not think that it was a difficult task for Henry to support himself and his household with the money from these estates, but certain factors created the need for additional sources of income as much as they had for previous kings. Two such factors were the grants of money or land given by Henry and the external and internal disturbances. When Henry decided to return from exile in France to England, he needed supporters within England who would back him in asserting his right to his inheritance. For their help in his return and subsequent rise to the throne, Henry gave these supporters grants of titles and lands as signs of thanks and as a way to keep their backing in the future. Henry’s supporters were not the only ones receiving grants; supporters of Richard II also received grants from the new king. As a way of making peace and gaining their favor, Henry was generous in the grants given to supporters of Richard who could potentially rise against the new king and place Richard back on the throne.90

Additional revenues were also needed to protect the country from internal rebellions and external attacks. A rebellion by those lords placed on trial in the Parliament of 1399 erupted in January of 1400. Although it was a failure the rebellion demonstrated to Henry that there were still strong supporters of Richard who would not submit to the new king without a fight. This rebellion essentially sealed Richard’s fate since it proved that those still loyal to the former king would not give up. The only way
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Henry saw to end these rebellions once and for all was to eliminate the threat of Richard returning to the throne. The former king had been transferred from the Tower of London to Pontefract Castle shortly before this event, and this was where he died sometime in February 1400.\footnote{Pollard, 27-28.} Other rebellions by English nobles occurred until 1403, all of which were put down by Henry, and although the government was shaken by these rebellions, the Lancastrian dynasty was not at risk again until the reign of Henry VI.\footnote{Ibid., 41.}

Border disputes constantly threatened to develop into full-scale war between England and Scotland during Henry’s reign just as they had since the reign of Edward I. The trigger for this occasion of warfare occurred in October 1399, when the Scots invaded Northumberland and raided one of the castles while the earl was in Westminster for the Parliament. Plans were made for full-scale invasion of Scotland to ensure that the King of Scotland, Robert III, and his barons would pay homage to Henry. Along with just over 13,000 men, the new king, known for his military successes of the past, marched unopposed to Edinburgh. The Scots neither came forward to do battle with the English troops, nor did they do homage to Henry. The English army withdrew from Scotland, but skirmishes did break out occasionally along the border, but the border was defended by the Earl of Northumberland and his son, Henry Percy.\footnote{Kirby, 99-103; Pollard, 31-32.}

As Henry as his army traveled back from Scotland, word reached him that a rebellion had broken out in Wales. A dispute between one of Henry’s loyal supporters, Lord Grey, and a Welsh landowner named Owen Glendower began as an argument over
boundaries of the two men’s estates but later spread as Glendower led troops on raids of English towns. The revolt was initially settled after a three week ride throughout Wales by Henry and his army, but this proved to be a temporary peace. In 1402 Glendower captured both Lord Grey and Sir Edmund Mortimer, though Henry only paid ransom for the former. Mortimer united with Glendower and they were joined in rebellion against the king by Scottish armies. This aspect of the Welsh rebellion was put down in September 1402, although again temporarily. It was not until 1408 that the rebellion was finally brought under control.94

At the same time, the tension between England and France began to grow again under Henry IV. Although the Hundred Years War had begun during the reign of Edward III, the relationship between the two feuding countries reached a temporary truce late in Richard II’s reign when he married Charles VI’s daughter Isabel in 1396. Charles refused to accept Henry as the new king of England, however, because his daughter was degraded by Richard’s deposition and a state of undeclared war began on the seas.95 Defensive measures needed to be taken to protect the English coasts and merchant ships traveling to the continent. This, along with the other disturbances throughout the reign of Henry IV, required more monetarily than the king could afford on his own.

Need for additional revenue was Henry’s reason for calling the Parliament of 1401. The campaigns in Wales and Scotland cost approximately £60,000 in the first fifteen months of Henry’s reign.96 Initially it was scheduled to meet in York in October
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1400, but it was delayed to January 1401 in Westminster. Although the need for taxation was apparent to the king, the Commons had another agenda for this session. Through their speaker, Sir Arnald Savage, the Commons requested that they be informed about the king’s choice of councilors, the three officers of state (the Chancellor, Treasurer, and keeper of the Privy Seal), and the three officers of the household and that they be sworn in front of a full Parliament to hold office until the next session.\textsuperscript{97} Henry would not agree to this petition on the grounds that it was against his royal prerogative, but his council suggested a compromise by having representatives of the Commons and the Lords present at the appointment of these individuals.\textsuperscript{98} This suggestion was given to help remedy what the Commons saw as misadministration and wasteful spending of Henry’s household. They believed that, although there were outside forces that demanded monetary attention, there should have been money from the king’s household spending that could be devoted toward the military. The Commons asked that he give his response to their petitions before they granted monetary supply, the first of several times that they would ask for this change in precedent.\textsuperscript{99} In the past, the granting of the supply would be given before the responses to petitions. This request was most likely an attempt for the Commons to control the king through granting a greater amount of money if the responses to their petitions were favorable. Henry refused to take this suggestion, stating
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that it went against the traditional sequence of events. This request was repeated by
the Commons in the sessions of 1404 and 1406.

The session of Parliament in 1402, which opened on October 2, was fairly
uneventful in comparison to the one that preceded it and the three sessions that followed
it. Just as before, the main reason for the calling of this session was the king’s need of
money. Before granting any money, the Commons suggested that Henry should not
make any more grants of lands, revenues, or annuities, thinking that this would help to
save money within the king’s household which could therefore be used in the running of
the country. There must have been some knowledge amongst the Commons that Henry
had been making numerous grants to both his supporters and to win over supporters of
Richard II. In response to the Commons’ suggestion, Henry stated that he would not
make any grants unless they were deserving cases as agreed by him and his council. This
did not restrict the king in any way as he selected his own council, and he got the money
that he requested.

The year 1404 saw two sessions of Parliament, one which began in January, and
the other in October. The first session was the longest of Henry’s reign thus far at 67
days, but not much was accomplished. One of the main issues addressed by the
Commons in this session through Sir Arnald Savage, who was reelected speaker, was the
continued mis-governance by Henry’s advisors and the excessive spending of the
household that accompanied it. At the request of the Commons, the king released four
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members of the royal household and the Commons issued an ordinance that the household only be made up of those whose loyalty and honesty was known. This ordinance was partly in response to the uprisings of lords throughout Henry’s reign thus far, but also in response to the recent increase in foreign courtiers that accompanied the new queen, Joan of Navarre. Spending within the household, the wardrobe in particular (which covered day-to-day spending of food, drink, and other provisions), increased dramatically with the queen’s arrival. When the king asked for a grant of direct taxation, the Commons pointed out the spending of the household, as well as the large amount of lands that he collected revenues from both Crown lands and those of the duchy of Lancaster, as well as from customs and subsidies from trade. Henry’s response was that a grant was still needed for defense purposes, and it was only after a promise to regulate the spending of the royal household by granting only £12,100 for its use that the Commons agreed to taxation. The tax granted in this session was different than the usual grant, and for that reason the Commons insisted that there be no record so that no precedent could be set. The revenue from this taxation would go to four newly appointed treasurers of war who would make sure that the money was spent on what it was issued for. The last item of business of the first Parliament of 1404 was the announcement of the members of the continual council and, for the first time, these names were written down in the parliamentary record. This session of parliament was highly critical of the
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king and his government, so the second session in 1404 must have been absolutely necessary.

The second Parliament of 1404 met in October and has come to be known as the “Unlearned Parliament” because of the king’s prohibition of lawyers from returning to parliament. His stated reason for this restriction was the belief that lawyers would devote their time during the session to their own or their clients’ business rather than the king’s. The threat of invasion and assistance of the Welsh by the French caused the necessity of new grants of money to be addressed before anything else. After a month of debate a generous tax was granted and two new war treasurers were sworn in to ensure that the money was spent for the defense of the country against the Welsh rebels and any of their allies.106 The granting of this additional taxation in the second session of 1404 most likely had some effect on the next session of Parliament in 1406, which lasted even longer than the first session of 1404 because of the Commons’ debate over making grants to the king.
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CHAPTER 5
THE LONG PARLIAMENT OF 1406

The Parliament of 1406 finally began on March 1 at Westminster after location and date changes. The session was originally scheduled to begin on February 15 at Coventry, but the location was changed to Gloucester in order to be closer to a military march led by Prince Henry to fight the Welsh rebels. On February 9 the meeting date was changed to March 1 and the place was changed to Westminster. The location was changed again as a result of a large force of French ships appearing just off the Thames, and it was deemed more important for the king to be in London rather than near Wales. The difficulties in finalizing the location and start date of the session seem to foreshadow the difficulty that Henry IV would have in getting the Commons to agree to make a grant for additional revenue. It took until December 22 for the Commons to agree to grant the tax of one fifteenth and tenth payable the first week of Lent in 1407, as well as the usual subsidies on wool and tunnage and poundage for one year from the following Michaelmas as additional revenue for the king, and that was only granted after concessions demanded by the Commons were agreed to by the king.

The parliamentary session in 1406 did not meet continuously from March 1 until December 22. There was a break from April 3 until April 30 for Easter, and another from
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June 19 through October 13 for the harvest and for a break from the deadlock between the Commons and the king.\textsuperscript{109} During the twenty-three weeks of the session, the main conflict was between the king and the Commons over the granting of taxation, but there were other related issues that were raised by Parliament during this time. One of the first issues addressed was the presence of foreigners within the queen’s household. This was a concern because the cost of upholding her household was high, but was also a question of national identity, as they were mainly French and Bretons, and French ships were positioned just off the Thames. The foreign members of the queen’s household were suspect not only because of the ongoing battles between England and France, but also because they were not English. There was a push by the Commons to expel the foreigners, and the king eventually agreed for the safety of the realm. Safety on the seas was also of concern during this session of parliament. The king’s council and the merchant members of the Commons agreed to defend the seas against pirates and privateers who posed a threat to English trade.

But the main issue running throughout this session of parliament directly related to Henry’s desire for the grant of additional revenue. Concerned about money which had been appropriated for protection of Calais and other lands threatened by rebels or foreign threats being misspent, the Commons made several demands of the king, including that he must not make any additional grants of land or titles without the advice of his council. This would ensure additional royal revenue which would not exist if the lands were distributed. The Commons believed that this money was being spent on the royal
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household rather than what it was appropriated for and too much of it was being spent in Ireland and therefore moved for an audit to be done of the treasurers of war who had been appointed in October 1404. Henry refused at first, saying that it was against his royal prerogative, but he later agreed to submit to the audit. In addition, this session of parliament followed the tradition of trying to have petitions answered before the Commons granted money. The petition to have demands answered prior to the grant of revenue was rejected by the king and the lords just as it had been in the past on the basis that there was no precedent for it and Henry had no desire to upset the traditions of Parliament.

The Speaker of the Commons for the Parliament of 1406 was Sir John Tiptoft, a shire knight who had been in Henry’s service in 1397 and 1398 and who served in the sessions of 1404, and it was through him that the petitions of the Commons were made. The first requests made to the king dealt with the security of the land, that Prince Henry should remain continuously in Wales to wage war against the rebels there, and that all aliens, both Breton and French, should be sent out of the kingdom. Henry responded that these things would be done as soon as possible. Another early petition dealt with the spoils captured from the Welsh rebels, that no castles, lordships or lands taken from the rebels be granted to anyone for three months, assuring that the king would have access to the revenues from these lands for a short time and also ensuring that there would be

---
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greater chance of outside influence on whom those new lands and titles should be handed to.\textsuperscript{112}

The last piece of legislation before the adjournment for Easter dealt with the protection of the seas. An agreement was reached between the king’s council and the merchants in the Commons as to how the seas should be policed, and the Commons suggested that a committee should be appointed to deal with the details of this legislation after the recess. The six men appointed to this committee were the Speaker, Sir John Tiptoft, along with Sir Hugh Luttrell, Sir Roger Leche, Sir Thomas Skelton, Sir John Dallingridge, and Laurence Drew. Following the recess it was decided that merchants would attempt to protect the seas from May 1, 1406 until Michaelmas 1407, with the assistance of 2000 fighting men provided by the government from May 1 until November 1, and 1000 men from November 1 until April 1407, along with the merchants receiving revenue from the customs paid on each sack of wool.\textsuperscript{113}

The session was late in beginning again due to the illness of the king. Henry suffered an attack of some sort, either a stroke or a heart attack, which left him in a weakened state at the time when Parliament was set to resume.\textsuperscript{114} Things were set to resume in Westminster on April 26, but did not begin until April 30, a Friday. The king had sent a letter to the members on the 28\textsuperscript{th} stating that Parliament should discuss the current needs of the kingdom in his absence. Records indicate that Henry arrived at Westminster around May 4, and four days later he agreed to expel forty foreign members
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of the queen’s household for the safety of the realm. Regarding the previous decisions toward the safety of the seas, the Speaker asked on May 15 that the king allow Richard Clitheroe, an admiral and a shire knight member of the Commons, to be released from his parliamentary duties to serve on the seas and allow Robert Clifford, the other shire knight from Kent, to speak for him, a request which was granted by Henry.\footnote{Kirby, 195-97.}

It was between the Easter and harvest recesses that the king announced his council. Its makeup was largely the same composition as it had been since the beginning of his reign with one difference; Henry did not include squires in his council, so knights became the members of the council with the lowest status. This may have caused distrust of the council by the Commons, with these feelings especially directed toward the knights, who may be more easily influenced by the king than those councilors of higher status.\footnote{Ibid., 197.} It was also during this time that the Speaker addressed the issue of misappropriation of funds by the king. On June 7, Tiptoft complained that money which had been set aside for the protection of Calais had been misspent, with the majority of it spent on Ireland. With this complaint, the Speaker requested that an audit be done on the accounts of the war treasurers who had been appointed in 1404. Henry refused at first, stating that kings should not be subject to audits because of the royal prerogative, but after the Commons continued to be deadlocked over the issue of granting additional revenue to the king, Henry agreed to allow the audit. Six members of the Commons, along with two members of the Lords, were placed on the auditing committee. Two were also members of the committee for protecting the seas, Laurence Drew and Hugh
Luttrell, while the others were Richard Redmayne, Thomas Chertsey, David Holbache, and William Standon.\textsuperscript{117}

The Commons also complained that the king had a history of making outrageous grants to people undeserving of such honors, and that if he was restrained in his liberality or if he granted such honors with the advice of his council he would not have need to tax his subjects. They petitioned that all future grants should be made only with the advice of his council. The king’s resources could be conserved by not making any grants until his household expenses and debts were paid. These petitions remained unacknowledged until after the recess for the harvest.\textsuperscript{118} The frequent cry of the Commons throughout this session of Parliament was for “good governance,” and the restraint of the king by his council seemed to the Commons to be an effective way of achieving this concept.

The Commons, although their petitions for “good governance” remained unanswered until after the next recess, did grant the king small financial concessions. They granted for the king tunnage and poundage for one year from June 24, as well as the remaining subsidy after the revenue for the merchants for the protection of the seas on each sack of wool. After the money was granted Parliament recessed until October 18 for the harvest.\textsuperscript{119} It is interesting that this reason is given for the recess, as none of the members would directly be involved with the harvesting of crops. The excessive heat is also mentioned, so this may have been another reason for the break. It also may have been that the members wished to leave London to journey home. However, the deadlock
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between the Commons and the king which occurred in the month after the session resumed in October may indicate that the same was true prior to the recess and was a deciding factor in the summer break.

Although the session resumed on October 18, nothing of significance was accomplished until a month later. On November 18 the Speaker requested that the king ask the Lords what they thought was wrong with the governing of the realm and Henry agreed to do so.\textsuperscript{120} The Commons also requested that treasurers and controllers be appointed to assure that the money which was granted for the campaign in Wales be used in Wales rather than for the payment of the king’s household debts. Although this restriction was placed on the spending of the king, on December 22, the last day of the Parliament of 1406, the Commons made a grant of taxation so that they might be released from their parliamentary duties. The Commons had held out hope that their request to certain Lords, that money granted for taxation would be refunded if misspent, would be granted, but in the end it was not.\textsuperscript{121}

In exchange for this grant, there were several restrictions placed on the king. Before Parliament ended, the names of the council were again given, and it is likely that this was a council with some new members. Members of this council were to be around the king at all times until the next meeting of Parliament so that they might give advice to Henry and regulate his decisions. The king agreed to hear petitions twice a week with councilors present. There were thirty-one conditions placed on the king in all, all of which dealt with the regulation of the proceedings of the council and regulations on
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Henry’s household. The king was expected to place greater faith in his council and councilors, which made the governing of England more conciliar than it had ever been. Several possible reasons for the king’s consent to the restriction on his rule have been suggested over the years. One such reason was that Henry’s poor health following his illness earlier in the year made him more willing to give up some control over the governing of England. Another possible reason is that, as a former Lord Appellant and with his “obligation to the Parliament,” Henry felt that he was answerable to his people and, if this was what his realm asked of him, he would grant it. The latter could be the case, especially with the memory of Richard’s more despotic reign, but it is more likely that these concessions were made because of his failing health.

If these are two possible reasons for Henry granting greater control to his council, then what are the possible reasons for the length and the deadlock between the king and his Commons? The session of Parliament was dragged out to the unprecedented length because of the debate over the granting of taxation. The king felt that additional revenue was necessary for the successful running of the kingdom, while the Commons believed that, if Henry lived a little more practically, he should be able to afford his household expenses and those of the realm. One way of determining why this deadlock occurred and why this parliament was so hostile toward the king in regards to granting taxation is to look at who was present in 1406.
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125 Roskell, Clark, and Rawcliffe, The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1386-1421. This four volume collection of biographies of the men who served in the Commons during this time was
There were a total of 242 men who, through either shire or town elections, were registered to attend this session of Parliament. There were 74 shire knights called, two from each shire, and 168 burgesses called, two from each participating town. One shire knight was unable to attend due to illness, but the records for this session are fairly unique in that they are complete. There are many sessions of parliament for which the records are incomplete, so it was nice to find a session with complete records. From the biographies, it was determined that 38% of the people attending this session in 1406 had attended prior sessions of parliament, while the remaining 62% had not attended a session of parliament prior to this session. Over half of the members of the Commons had prior experience with positions of administration in the towns or shires, serving as a sheriff, justice of the peace, escheator, or another large position within local administration. Almost a quarter of the total number followed a family trend in serving in the Commons. A little over 10% were lawyers, around the same number were merchants. There were fourteen men who had a prior connection to Henry, his father John of Gaunt, or the House of Lancaster, eight men who had supported the Lords Appellant, of which Henry was one, and three men who served with Henry during his campaign in 1399. Overall the men who served in 1406 were men with prior administrative experience, albeit not within Parliament, whose family may or may not have served but rarely had a strong connection with Henry. Those who were burgesses were most likely merchants, although a large number were also involved with the manufacturing of cloth (see table 1).

---

essential to my research and the biographies presented in these volumes will be the main source of my evidence from this point forward.
Of those who served in the Parliament of 1406, there are several who stand out in importance as they are nominated to serve on certain committees organized during this session. Who are these men who made up the committees for auditing and for the protection of the seas and what set them apart from all of the others that they were chosen for these responsibilities?

- Sir John Tiptoft was a shire knight, the Speaker of the Commons and also served on the committee determining what should be done for protecting the seas. He had served in both sessions of 1404 and his father also served in the Commons. Tiptoft had been in Henry’s service prior to his exile and also served as a justice of the peace and as the treasurer of Henry’s household.

- Sir Hugh Luttrell was a shire knight who previously served in the session of October 1404. Luttrell served on both the committee for the protection of the seas as well as the committee auditing the accounts of the war treasurers. His family had a history of parliamentary service and he had been retained by John of Gaunt as an esquire in earlier years, as well as being a mayor and a justice of the peace.

- Sir Roger Leche was a shire knight who served on the committee for the protection of the seas. He served previously in 1402 and his father also had served in Parliament. He had administrative experience as a justice of the peace, sheriff, and was also a controller of Henry’s household.

- Sir Thomas Skelton served on the committee for the protection of the seas. A shire knight with two sessions of parliamentary experience, he also had served as a justice of the peace and as a tax collector. His father also had served in
Parliament. Skelton was also a lawyer who had been a supporter of Richard II when Henry returned from exile, and was one of the men to receive grants from Henry in attempts to win the knight’s support.

- Sir John Dallingridge was a shire knight who had served under Henry prior to his exile. He served on the committee for the protection of the seas. His father had parliamentary experience and Dallingridge served in parliament prior to this session of parliament. He also had prior administrative experience as a sheriff.

- Laurence Drew served on both the committee for the protection of the seas and also on the committee for auditing the war treasurers’ accounts. He was a lawyer and a shire knight who, having served in parliament previously, had been a member of Richard’s council.

- Sir Richard Redmayne was a shire knight who served in his first session of Parliament in 1406. He had previous experience as a sheriff, justice of the peace, and escheator, and served on the auditing committee. He played an important role in Henry’s battle against the Scots early in the king’s reign. Thomas Chertsey was a burgess who was a member of the committee for auditing the war treasurers’ accounts. This was his first session of parliament.

- David Holbache was a shire knight serving in his first session of Parliament when he served on the auditing committee. He was a lawyer and a shire knight who had also served as an escheator, a bailiff, and a justice of the peace.
- William Standon was a wealthy merchant who served as a burgess from London and had experience as a tax collector and as sheriff. He had served in five sessions of Parliament before serving on the auditing committee in 1406.

Of these ten men, only two were burgesses and most of them had previous experience in parliament and other administrative positions. A large number of them had a family history of parliamentary service, which might have given them important influence over the Commons. A few had served with Henry previously and their connection with him may have made them prominent members of the Commons, but there were two men who had been strong supporters of Richard II. These men may have gained influence because of Henry’s attempt at gaining their support. Overall, these men who stood out amongst their peers were of the upper group in the Commons, had previous experience, came from a parliamentary-minded family, and had prior connections to Henry.

One question that arises is, if Sir John Tiptoft and others had served with Henry prior to the king’s exile, what would explain the strong stance against the king during this session of Parliament? It was not that they were against the king, but simply that they did not believe that he was providing “good governance” of his realm. Several times throughout this parliament, Sir John Tiptoft asked for Henry’s forgiveness if he had caused offense in the king’s mind. But he still asked a great deal of his king and petitioned for several reforms to ensure that the king lived within his means. It may be that Tiptoft, along with all of the other members of this session, felt that Henry had
requested additional revenue too many times in the past few years and did not believe that it was necessary in this session. But taxation had been granted at many other sessions of parliament prior to 1406, and there were not as many complaints, nor did the Parliament meet as long in the past as it did that year. If the members of this session were more opposed to the granting of taxation than members of sessions in years past, what made the members of the 1406 session different from the men who served in the earlier years of Henry’s reign?

Incomplete records become a problem when attempting to compare the session of 1406 with other earlier sessions of Parliament in Henry’s reign. The sessions of 1401 and January 1404 had complete records in terms of the shire knights, but neither had complete records for the burgesses. This means that, although some comparisons can be made, it is difficult to say for certain that these generalizations are accurate. Looking at the percentages, about 62% of the people serving in 1406 were serving for the first time, while those numbers in 1401 were 43% and 44% in 1404. This suggests that there was a movement toward bringing new people into parliamentary service. These numbers are also noticeable in looking specifically at the burgesses. Although the numbers are not complete for 1401 and 1404, about 69% of the burgesses in 1406 were serving for the first time compared to 51% in 1401 and 39% in 1404. These numbers seem to suggest that there was dissatisfaction with the pervious sessions of parliament and there was an attempt to bring new people into parliamentary service to change the way business, especially fiscal business, was handled.
There are also interesting comparisons to be made with absolute numbers of the shire knights. In the session of 1406, there were eight members who had supported the Lords Appellant and fourteen who had prior connection with Henry, John of Gaunt, or the House of Lancaster. In the session of 1401, there were fourteen men who had supported the Lords Appellant and twenty-two who had prior connection with Henry or his family. The numbers were similar for the session of January 1404, with twelve supporters of the Lords Appellant and twenty-one members with prior connection to Henry or his family. There were also differences in the numbers of men who served with Henry upon his return from exile in 1399, three in 1406 compared with eight in 1401 and four in 1404. There seems to be a decrease in the numbers of men over time who had connections with Henry prior to their parliamentary service. The fact that there are fewer men who have an established loyalty and may have felt obligated to the king for their successes in 1406 than in the previous two sessions should not be ignored. Although it may not play a large role in the reasons behind the different relationships between Henry and his sessions of Parliament, there is a possibility that a higher number of men with prior connection to the king may have been more likely to be loyal to the king and more likely to agree with him and not question his actions or requests.

Along with these comparisons, there are some interesting aspects of the membership of the parliamentary sessions in the early fifteenth century, with 1406 in particular. There are two members who are described as being pirates. Although there is also mention of a “pirate” serving in the session of 1401, their participation in this session of parliament is particularly interesting since one of the pieces of legislation passed was
for the protection of the seas from pirates and privateers. It may have been that the pirates and privateers who threatened the coasts of England were not English, but the fact that there were “pirates” present in 1406 is still interesting. The question which remains unanswered is to why they would have been elected to represent their towns in Parliament, what were their constituents thinking? It is true that “pirate” was sometimes a term used in place of merchant and might not imply the outlawish behavior the word connotes today. Nonetheless, it is significant that these men are distinguished by this term from the other merchant members of Parliament. Interesting information was given for another member of the session of 1406, who is recognized in his biography as a murder defendant. The reason why he would have wanted to be present in Parliament is not difficult to assume; he would have most likely wanted to explain his side of the story before the king in hopes of gaining a royal pardon for his crime. But like the “pirates,” why would the town have elected a man who may have been a murderer? Again, the answer to this question is almost impossible to determine.

By looking at all three sessions of Parliament, some conclusions can be made. The higher percentage of men with first time service in 1406 than in 1401 and 1404 may suggest that the overall feeling in English counties and towns was dissatisfaction with Henry’s fiscal policies and they therefore attempted to elect a group unassociated with those policies. The gradual reduction in the numbers of men who had been supporters of the Lords Appellant, of which Henry was a member, as well as those who had prior connections to the king, his father, or his family may have decreased the likelihood that the members would be blindly loyal to Henry. Therefore, it is most likely that the length
of the Long Parliament of 1406 was due to the dissatisfaction with the king’s fiscal policies, as well as the shrinking number of staunchly loyal supporters of Henry.
CONCLUSION

Through this research, I was able to come to several conclusions regarding the parliaments under Henry IV. The relationship between the king and his parliament was unique because of the way that Henry became king, which allowed the growing reputation of Parliament as a place to challenge the policies of the king. Although he was not crowned by Parliament, they gave him legitimacy to rule and the relationship between the administrative body and the king is evidence of this fact. Henry was probably more likely to make concessions to his Parliament than any kings previously not only because of the unique relationship between the two, but also because of the health concerns which emerged during the session of 1406. Henry may have been willing to make these concessions because of the illness he suffered but also because of the desire to bring an end to that session. The Commons held out from granting additional revenue to Henry for twenty-three weeks until he agreed to have more confidence in his council and allow them to advise him. Those who were present in this particular session of Parliament differed in who attended from sessions previously which had granted taxation more quickly to the king in that there were fewer members who had previous association with Henry or his family. This may have had an impact on the length in that these members might have been less easily appeased by the king’s policies. This reason, combined with
the possible growing frustration with Henry’s repeated requests for additional revenue, were the most likely causes of the unprecedented length of the Parliament of 1406.

Although some conclusions were reached in this project, there are still many unanswered questions. I was unable to find enough evidence in my research to demonstrate the developing importance of the gentry class. In order to do this, I would have had to look at parliaments before Henry’s reign as well as sessions which occurred later in time. The same is true for the merchant class. For both of these groups, I would have to examine the biographies of who served to look at the numbers and the other involvements of members (such as other positions they held), as well as finding out what their role was within the sessions of Parliament. I was also unable to find evidence to create a theory regarding the relationship between the gentry and the nobility and between the gentry and the burgesses and to determine if these relationships changed as the gentry class evolved. In order to have done this, I would have had to examine many more sessions throughout the early years of Parliament. None of this research was possible in the time available.

The largest question that remains unanswered deals with looking at the overall changing role of Parliament based upon who was in attendance throughout the first centuries of its existence. I had hoped to reach a more definite conclusion about the relationship between the king and parliament during its early years. I would have needed to research many more sessions of Parliament, as well as finding more details about the goings-on of the sessions, both within the Commons and between the Commons and the king. All of these questions remained unanswered not only because of the amount of
research that would go into answering them, but they are also affected by the incomplete records of Parliament during this time. With the latter being true, it is a possibility that no amount of time, effort, or research would allow these questions to be answered. Although some questions remain unanswered, I am happy with the questions that I was able to answer through this work.
### TABLE 1

MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF 1406

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shire knights</td>
<td>74 (one unable to attend)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgesses</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First or Only Parliament</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served in Prior Session</td>
<td>93 (minus one)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of Administration</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Represented</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Henry IV, John of Gaunt, or House of Lancaster</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporters of Lords Appellant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served with Henry in 1399</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgesses: Merchants</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgesses: Cloth Manufacturers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder Defendant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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