

# John Ford's Artistic Exploitation of the Sources of Perkin Warbeck

by  
I-LU T ENG  
INTRODUCTION

John Ford (1586--?1640) is considered as the last of the important Elizabethan or Jacobean dramatists, though his creative period spanned actually the reigns of King James I and King Charles I. He wrote altogether about fifteen plays independently, of which only eight are extant, and six plays in collaboration. The three most important plays are *The Broken Heart*, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* and *Perkin Warbeck*. The first two are tragedies which fully demonstrate Ford's skill in characterization and his tragic perspectives. The second one has been cited by some critics as an example of Ford's "decadent" tendencies. *Perkin Warbeck*, Ford's only history play, is unanimously acclaimed as a successful revival of the genre after a whole generation.

*Pekin Warbeck* as a play is a great success with an immensely difficult subject. Apparently inspired and influenced by Shakespeare's history plays, it fills the gap in them, between *Richard III* and *Henry VIII*. Though the play deals with King Henry VII, the hero of the play is not the king, but the pretender Perkin Warbeck who claimed to be the son of King Edward IV, of the House of York, and later proclaimed himself King Richard the Fourth. *Perkin Warbeck*, in the words of a famous critic, is an excellent study of a romanticist in a realist world. In the opinion of T. S. Eliot, this play is undoubtedly Ford's greatest achievement, and one of the very best history plays in the whole of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama with the exception of the works of Shakespeare, and it is an almost flawless play, though somewhat lacking in action.

In the prologue of this play, after referring to the decline of the theater after Shakespeare's plays, Ford stated his purpose: to renew a style that was falling into disuse and to show that a playwright can be at once truthful and dramatic. Ford did make constant use of historical works in the writing of the play, among them Thomas Gainsford's *True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck* (1618) and Francis Bacon's *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1622).

It is the purpose of this study of trace the Perkin Warbeck story in every possible source of Ford's play, to make a summary and evaluation of the source studies published up to 1968, and to establish Ford's borrowings from his sources.

Source studies not only can establish a writer's debt to his sources, but, more importantly, by pointing out his own invention, can indicate the degree of a writer's genius and literary skill. This study, by summarizing what Ford found and took from his sources, has provided sufficient proof of Ford's indebtedness to his sources as well as how much he created himself. His magic touch as a dramatist transformed colourful history into magnificent drama.

As this study was begun in London, the author had the good fortune of making use of many original historical works published before 1640, in the North Library of the British Museum. In the quotations from these early historical works, the original spellings have been retained for authenticity.

### Chapter I. The Perkin Warbeck Story in the Chronicles

*The Chronicle Historie of Perkin Warbeck, A Strange Truth* by John Ford was printed in 1634. It was entered in the Stationer's Register on 24th February, 1634, as follows: "Hugh Beeston: lic. H. Herbert, observing the caution in the licence: a tragedy called Perkin Warbeck, by Jo. Ford."<sup>1</sup> It is not known when it was written or first performed. The statement in the titlepage of the 1634 quarto edition arouses interest. It says "Acted (some-times) by the Queenes Maiesties Servants at the Phoenix in Drurie Lane." Therefore, the play was either "not very often" performed, or "formerly" performed by the Queen's Servants. Anyway, it pointed to a date of composition considerably before its date of publication.<sup>2</sup>

The main chronicle sources for the Perkin Warbeck episode in the reign of Henry VII, as available in the time of John Ford, are as follows:

1. *De Vita atque gestis Henrici Septimi* by Bernard Andre, an Augustinian friar from Toulouse who came to England with the victorious Richmond and later became the new king's royal historiographer and poet-laureate. He died in England about 1521. This life of Henry VII is in Latin and it breaks off with Perkin's capture in 1497.
2. *The New Chronicles of England and France in Two Parts* by Robert Fabyan, published in 1516. This is a brief year to year account of the events of the reign of Henry VII from the point of view of London, with each annual entry preceded by the names of the mayor and two aldermen.
3. *Anglicae Historiae* by Polydore Vergil, the Italian historian. This history of England, in twenty-six books, written in Latin, was first published in Basle in

1534. Vergil's work was very much used by Edward Hall.

4. *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke* by Edward Hall. 1548, 1550, 1552.
5. *A Chronicle at Large and Meere History of the Affayres of England* by Richard Grafton. 1568, 1569. For the reign of Henry VII, Grafton almost completely copied from Hall, with only a few unimportant verbal changes.
6. *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* by Raphael Holinshed. 2 Vols, 1578; Enlarged into 3 Vols., 1587. Holinshed followed Hall very closely, condensing Hall's account, making some verbal changes.
7. *The Annals of England* by John Stow. 1592, 1600, 1615.
8. *Albion's England* by William Warner. 1586, 1589, 1592, 1596, 1601, 1612.
9. *The History of Great Britaine* by John Speed. 1611, 1623, 1627.
10. *The True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck* by Thomas Gainsford. 1618.
11. *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* by Francis Bacon. 1622, 1629.

Bernard Andre and Polydore Vergil are the two contemporary authorities of Henry VII's reign. It is Andre who tells a wonderful story about Perkin Warbeck's origin: that Perkin had been brought up in England by a converted Jew named Edward at whose baptism King Edward IV had stood godfather. Andre asserts that he is giving the substance of Warbeck's confession; in fact there is nothing of the kind in the confession.<sup>3</sup> It was also Andre who started the story that Perkin was first selected and instructed in Flanders by the Duchess of Burgundy to impersonate the Duke of York, and then sent to Portugal and from there to Ireland.<sup>4</sup> This story is not in Perkin Warbeck's confession either.

In his *New Chronicles* Robert Fabyan makes only a brief mention of the pretender and what happened to him after he was arrested.

Polydore Vergil's history of the reign of Henry VII in his twenty-seven-book English history was called by Wilhelm Busch, "the best and most original part of the whole work."<sup>5</sup> However, an observer for only the last four to six years of Henry VII's reign, Polydore Vergil often makes mistakes about events prior to his arrival in England. He inherited from Andre the mistaken story that Perkin started his impersonation before he went to Ireland; and he made a bigger mistake in making Warbeck go back to Flanders first after his failure to land in Kent, and not straight to Ireland and then Scotland as he really did.<sup>6</sup> Both mistakes have

been inherited by Hall and his followers. The most reliable source of Perkin Warbeck's early history, as it has been established by modern historians like James Gairdner and G. R. Elton, is his own confession which is included, sometimes in contracted form, in the chronicles of Edward Hall, Richard Grafton, Raphael Holinshed, John Speed, and Thomas Gainsford. According to the confession, the impersonation was begun in Ireland and Perkin never saw the Duchess of Burgundy until he went to Flanders from the French court. The reason why Andre and Vergil get the story wrong is, as Busch rightly puts it:

But as Perkin did not play any great political part, and was not generally known till he went to Margaret from France, it is easy to see how tradition came to regard her as the author of the plot. It was the view of the contemporaries . . . .<sup>7</sup>

Hall's *Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies* is in the main a literal translation of Polydore Vergil's account, and therefore tells almost the same story as that of Andre and Vergil about how and where Perkin began his impersonation of the Duke of York, namely, that Perkin Warbeck was first tutored in Flanders and then dispatched to Ireland.<sup>8</sup> However, Hall does not give any comment concerning the different account in Perkin's confession of how Perkin was first forced into the impersonation when he went to Cork as a merchant's servant.<sup>9</sup> Since Hall's account<sup>10</sup> has already become the basic version of the Perkin Warbeck story, it seems justified to give a summary of it here.

Lady Margaret, the Duchess of Burgundy, found the handsome and majestic-mannered Perkin Warbeck from Flanders a fit person for her designs against King Henry VII of England. She had the youth secretly trained to impersonate her nephew, Richard, Duke of York second son to Edward IV. When England was invading France, Margaret dispatched Perkin to Portugal and then to Ireland, where Perkin was honoured as the true Duke of York by the Irish. Then King Charles of France welcomed Perkin to his court and treated him cordially, with the intention of sending him against the English. After a peace treaty was concluded with England, he dismissed Perkin from France. The disappointed Perkin went back to Flanders and was greeted with great joy by the Duchess as if she never had seen him before. She made him declare openly how he was preserved from murder and how he came to her court, so as to persuade people that Perkin was the true son of her brother. She called him "the white Rose, Prince of Eng-

land”.

The Yorkist conspirators in England began to make contacts with the counterfeit duke, and sent Sir Robert Clifford to Flanders. King Henry's spies soon found out the true parentage of Perkin and the information was published: they also found out names of some of the conspirators in England and persuaded Clifford to defect to the king. Clifford returned in 1495 and he accused as chief conspirator Sir William Stanley, the king's chief chamberlain. Stanley was examined and executed soon afterwards.

In 1496 Perkin invaded England from Flanders with an army of vagabonds and men of all nations. They landed in Kent but were beaten back by the loyal Kentishmen. More than a hundred were captured; Perkin and the rest fled back to Flanders. From there he sailed with his followers first to Ireland and then to Scotland. In high-flown language he told the story of his survival, and as Duke of York petitioned the assistance of King James to restore his lawful inheritance of the throne of England. King James decided to take up Perkin's quarrel with England. Perkin was openly called the Duke of York. Lady Katherine Gordon, daughter to Alexander, Earl of Huntley, was married to Perkin by command of King James. Then in the company of Perkin, the Scottish king invaded northern England. Contrary to the counterfeit duke's boast and expectation, no Englishman came to his aid. When the Scottish troops returned with spoils, Perkin, to cover up the fact that his claim was not supported by any Englishman in the invasion, besought King James not to afflict "his" people and country again. The king answered that Perkin seemed to be taking much pains in preserving another prince's land.

In revenge for the Scottish invasion, King Henry secured the parliament's assent to a subsidy to finance the war. He was just sending a great army under Lord Dawbeney to attack Scotland when he had to withdraw it to cope with the Cornish rebellion. The poor Cornishmen were grieved at the subsidy. Under their two leaders Thomas Flamocke and Michael Joseph the mob marched toward London. On their way they were joined by Lord Audeley. When the rebels approached London, they were surrounded by the king's troops and soon after defeated. Two thousand rebels were killed and many more captured. King Henry had only the leaders and captains executed and pardoned the rest.

When the Scottish king learned that King Henry was vexed with the Cornish rebellion, he invaded England once more. Scottish troops attacked the Castle of

Norham against the strong resistance of Richard Foxe, Bishop of Durham. When the Earl of Surrey was coming with reinforcements, the Scottish retreated into Scotland. The Earl followed behind and destroyed a number of Scottish castles. Now King James sent heralds to the Earl, offering to fight him either army against army, or person against person. The Earl thanked the king for the honour, and answered that he was ready to fight the Scottish troops or indeed the king himself. But King James retreated still further without fulfilling the challenge.

King Ferdinando and Queen Elizabeth of Spain desired to marry their daughter Katherine to Arthur, Prince of Wales. So they sent Peter Hialas to Scotland as ambassador to mediate for peace between Scotland and England. Richard Foxe was sent to Scotland to join the negotiation. King Henry required to have Perkin Warbeck surrendered instantly, but King James refused. Finally a truce was concluded upon condition that Perkin be conveyed out of Scotland. England once again became allies with her neighbours. English merchants were welcomed back to Antwerp in 1498, and trade became normal.

Perkin shortly sailed out of Scotland with his wife and his followers to Ireland. There he had messages that the Cornishmen, grudging against King Henry, were ready to revolt again. So in September 1498 he sailed to Bodmin with four small ships and six score men. In Bodmin he gathered 3,000 people and made proclamations in the name of King Richard IV. By the advice of his three coun-tilors, John Heron, mercer, a bankrupt, Richard Skelton, a tailor, and John Astelley, a scrivener, Perkin decided to capture a strong town. They besieged Exeter for a number of days, but owing to the brave resistance could not take it.

King Henry soon led his hosts to the rescue of Exeter. Perkin and his troops then withdrew to the next big town of Taunton. Now the number of his army decreased as many Cornishmen fled home, so Perkin was losing confidence. The king then pushed his troops toward Taunton. Perkin seemed to be preparing for war but at midnight he fled with sixty horsemen to a sanctuary town beside Southampton. There Perkin, Heron and others registered themselves as privileged persons. When they learned of the flight of Perkin, the Cornishmen surrendered themselves to the king who pardoned most of them and rode into Exeter victorious without bloodshed. Lady Katherine Gordon was also captured, and the king had her sent to London to the Queen. The king's horsemen surrounded the sanctuary, and when messengers offered the king's pardon of his life, Perkin gave himself up.

When King Henry returned to London, he put Perkin under close watch. After some time, however, Perkin deceived his keepers and escaped to the coast. When the king's guards closed in, he went to a priory. Once again being pardoned Perkin was set in stocks in Westminster for a whole day. The next day he was carried through London, and set upon a scaffold where he openly read his confession. The essence of his confession is as follows:

I was born in Tournay, Flanders, son of John Osbeck, comptroller of Tournay, and Katherine de Faro. From Tournay I went to Antwerp to learn Flemish. Then back in Tournay, I went into the service of merchants and traveled to Antwerp, Barowe and Portugal. I then served a Briton merchant, Pregent Meno, who brought me to Cork, Ireland. As I was dressed in some of my mater's silk clothes, the townspeople thought I was the Duke of Clarence's son. I took my oath that I was not such. Then Stephen Poitron, an Englishman, and John a Water came to me and swore that I was King Richard's bastard son, which I again denied on oath. Then they advised me to take up the title without fear, and they, as well as the Earls of Desmond and Kildare, should assist me against the king of England, so that they might be revenged upon him. So against my will they made me learn English and taught me what I should do and say. They called me Duke of York, second son of King Edward IV, because King Richard's bastard son was in the hands of the English king. Within a short time the king of France sent an ambassador to invite me to his court. From France I went to Flanders, then to Ireland, from there to Scotland, and finally to England.

At the end of the day Perkin was put in the Tower of London. Soon after he corrupted the keepers, and they intended to set him free. The plot was found out. Perkin was arraigned and condemned at Westminster on 15th November, 1499, and on the 23rd he was drawn to Tyburn. There Perkin was again made to read his confession publicly before he was executed.

As it will be seen, the story of how the Duchess of Burgundy picked and trained Perkin to impersonate the Duke of York, and then had him sent to Ireland, passed down from Andre through Vergil to Hall, is then handed down to Grafton, Holinshed, Stow and Speed, and then to Gainsford and Bacon.<sup>11</sup>

Richard Grafton's *A Chronicle at Large and Meere History* is almost a reproduction of Hall's account in the periods concerned, with only minor verbal differences. Yet the attitude is more didactic, and the account more elaborate and picturesque than those of Hall. Grafton's chronicle is named by Gainsford

as one of those that contain the complete text of Perkin Warbeck's confession.<sup>12</sup> It is very likely that Gainsford contracted his account of the confession from Grafton, and based his *History of Perkin Warbeck* on Grafton.

Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles*, in the reigns of the Wars of the Roses, is an abridged form of Hall's *Union*. As in Hall, there is no comment, after giving the text of Perkin's Confession, on the discrepancy between the historian's account and that contained in Perkin's confession as to how Perkin began as impostor, whether under the tutelage of the Duchess or forced upon him by the Irish.<sup>13</sup> Neither do Speed, Gainsford and Bacon, who all include the confession.

*The Annales of England* by John Stow contains a rather brief account of the Perkin story except where the Cornish revolt and Perkin's attack on Exeter are concerned. Stow does not include the incident of Perkin's petition to King James of Scotland, after the first Scottish invasion of England, not to afflict and ruin "his" people and land again; whereas in that incursion on Perkin's behalf no Englishmen came to join the counterfeit duke. This incident is in all the other chronicles mentioned above, except those of Stow and Speed.<sup>14</sup> Perkin's confession is not included in Stow, either.

William Warner's *Albion's England* has as its subtitle, "A Continved Historie . . . from the Originals of the first Inhabitants thereof . . . unto . . . the happie Raigne of our new most Soueraigne Lord King James". In a small book covering such extensive ground the facts are very sketchy and brief. However, in the narration of Perkin's career, Warner, alone among the sixteenth- or seventeenth-century historians mentioned, gives the same account of how the impersonation was forced upon him, as Perkin tells in his confession. The confession itself is not included nor mentioned. After that, according to Warner, but contrary to what Perkin says in his confession, the Duchess "had him soone to Burgone, and informes him everything. That might concerne Yorks pettegree, or apted for a king." What follows this is about the same story, though very brief, as told in Hall.<sup>15</sup>

Hall, followed by other chroniclers, only mentions that King James "Caused Lady Katherine . . . to be espoused" to Perkin from political motives. Little is said about her love toward him, though Gainsford gives an elaborate account of how Perkin courted her.<sup>16</sup> Warner, however, elaborates very much in relating Katherine's love for Perkin by adding another lover, a gentleman at the English court, presumably after Perkin was captured but before he was executed, though

it is not clearly indicated. The bulk of Warner's account of Perkin Warbeck deals with Katherine's conversation with this suitor, in the form of two romantic tales. She made it clear to him that she had vowed to live a chaste woman.

She both before, and after that her low-pris'd Mate was dead,  
When well she knew his parentage, and felt his ebb'd estate,  
In onely sorrow did abound, in love no whit abate:  
Howbeit in the *English* Court prefer'd to high estate.

Theare (for she was of comely parts and uncompeered face)  
She, often brauely courted, yeelds no Courtier labor'd grace.  
To one among'st the rest, that most admired her answers chast,  
She said, besides the sinne, and that I so might liue disgra'st,  
A Presedent of wrong and woe did make me long since vow  
Chastly to live the Loue of him whom Fates should me allow:<sup>17</sup>

She told the "Presedent"--a lady who was disloyal to her lover met a tragical ending after both her lovers had sad deaths. Finally, the suitor had to give up, saying,

*Perkin* is yours, and be you onely his,  
.....

Mine amorous sute hath here an end: and would you might prevaile  
With *Perken* too, that proudly striues to beare too high a saile.<sup>18</sup>

Perkin's defeat by King Henry and his subsequent hanging is briefly mentioned after this refusal by Katherine of the suitor.<sup>19</sup> No mention is made of how Lady Katherine Gordon was captured after Perkin's defeat and brought to the English court, as in the accounts of Hall and other chroniclers.<sup>20</sup>

Speed's *History of Great Britaine* gives a picturesque account of Perkin Warbeck's career. In relating Perkin's early life, Speed follows Andre's version, that Perkin "(by reason of his abode in England in King Edwards days) could speak our language . . . . This youth was borne . . . the son of a converted Jew, whose father at Baptisme King Edward himselfe was."<sup>21</sup>

Unique among the chronicles mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, Speed's *History* has some very sympathetic remarks for the pretender when referring to the Duchess' training of Perkin,

That Peter Warbecke should be inflamed by her favours, and encouragements, to dare in earnest the personation of a Kings sonne, seems not a thing to be admired; for there is in humane nature (which tyes not her selfe to Pedigrees, nor Parent-ages) a kinde of light matter, which will easily kindle, being toucht with the blazing hopes of ambitious propositions.<sup>22</sup>

And some more psychological analysis:

... [Having left the French court, Perkin was received with great honor at the court of the Duchess of Burgundy] as it is so observed of some, that by long using to report an untruth, at last forgetting themselves to be the Authors thereof, beleeve it in earnest; so these honours making our Peter to bury in utter oblivion his birth's obscurity, hee seemed to be perswaded, that he was indeed the selfe partie, whom he did so exactly personate.<sup>23</sup>

Again, before Perkin started for King James's court from Ireland, there is an insight into the pretender's mind:

... and Perkin himselfe daring to entertaine the hope of a Crowne, (for by so long personation of a King's Sonne and heire, ambition had throughly kindled his youthful blood) was by now no little cause of bring things to an issue by his own forwardness.<sup>24</sup>

*The True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck* was published in 1618. This small book of 112 quarto pages deals mainly with the career of the pretender. Gainsford in general follows Hall's account, probably through Richard Grafton's version.<sup>25</sup> The tone is highly moralistic and didactical: all praise for the king, and all condemnation for the pretender. Gainsford's history is highly biased and contains some elaborate and romantic accounts; so it is not a regular and legitimate history at all. In relating, for example, the training that Perkin received under the Duchess, Gainsford says, "she caused the young man to travell into many Countries to learne as many languages, whereby he was so perfect in the English . . . by which occasion the basenesse of his stock . . . was so obscured."<sup>26</sup>

As a rule, Gainsford amplifies Hall's account with his own vivid imagination. There is a long elaborate account of Perkin's wooing of Katherine Gordon, which is not in any other chronicle, not even in *Albion's England*. According to Gains-

ford, Perkin "fancied" her and wooed her with formal courtly protest of love and assurances of faith, and moreover, a promise of a royal future for the lady. Katherine, pleased with Perkin's fine behaviour and aspiring to become queen of England, returned Perkin's love by saying, "I shall be proud to call you mine, and glad if you vouchsafe to esteeme me yours." Consequently, the marriage is celebrated presumably with King James' and her father, the Earl of Huntley's approval: King James, Gainsford says, "giving way to the motion" that Perkin fancied her.<sup>27</sup>

Concerning the capture of Katherine, Gainsford follows Hall's story; he also says about her:

Some confirme, that she was of that greatnesse of spirit, that she scorned all others in regard of herselfe, both by the priuiledge of her birth-right, and the possibility of her greatnesse.<sup>28</sup>

Gainsford is the only writer who says that King Henry had met the pretender face to face. After Perkin had fled from Taunton and taken sanctuary, the King's horsemen surrounded the sanctuary:

Therefore . . . relying on the Kings Pardon, and those honourable conditions propounded, he [Perkin] voluntarily resigned himselfe, and came to his maiesty . . . .

The King not much wondred at him: for he only found him superficially instructed of a natural wit, or reasonable qualities, wel languaged and indifferent apprehension, but farre from that highnesse of spirit, or heroick disposition to deserve the character of a Prince, or lay claime to a Diadem: yet loth with any boisterous strength to . . . draw the fellow into a new self-loue, or good opinion of himselfe, hee passed ouer his examination the slightlier, and brought him immediately to London.<sup>29</sup>

However, the version of Perkin's confession that Gainsford gives does not seem to have been contracted, as he says, from Grafton's or any other chronicle containing Perkin's confession. There are in Gainsford's version many points which are not found in Grafton's version, which is a reproduction of Hall's version of the confession. Holinshed's version which is also reproduced in Speed's *History* is in fact the same as Hall's, except for a few unimportant words.<sup>30</sup> It seems that Gainsford has altered Hall's version partly from his own invention, and partly according to the account of Perkin's early adventure that he has also inherited

from Hall.

According to Gainsford, Perkin learned the English language when he was ill in Antwerp, and even before reaching Ireland he was told by one employer that he was someone not ordinary, by another that he was a Plantagenet. Having agreed to be an impostor, he was taken to the Duchess who then instructed him to impersonate the Duke of York. Then back to Ireland again, he was proclaimed by the Irish as Richard the Fourth.

...at Antwerp, where I fell sicke awhile, and so was boorded in a Skinners house much conversant with the English nation, whereby I learnt the language, as you see.<sup>31</sup>

In Hall's version, Perkin does not say that he learnt English there and then. According to Gainsford, Perkin goes on to say:

Afterward, Mr. *Barlo* left me at Middleborough with *John Strew*, a Merchant, who first made me beleue, I was better than I was . . . . Then *Pregent Meno* a Brittain carried mee into Ireland, and either commanded so by my Lady *Margaret*, who (as shee said) was my aunt, or proiecing something for his own priuate, would needs perswade me I was a *Plantagenet* of the house of Yorke.<sup>32</sup>

In Hall's version, John Strew and Pregent Meno were only merchants who employed Perkin, and the second one happened to take Perkin to Cork, Ireland, on business. The term "my Lady *Margaret* . . . aunt" does not correspond with the general tone of the confession wherein Perkin is speaking as Perkin Warbeck, not as Richard of York.

Gainsford's version does not say that Perkin denied, when Stephen Pointron and John a Water approached Perkin and were resolved that he was King Richard's bastard son, and promised their help to obtain the crown of England, as in Hall's version. It seems that he agreed.<sup>33</sup> Then,

After this they carried mee into Flanders, to Lady *Margaret* Regent and Duches of Burgundy, who preuailed so far with me, that I took upon me the person of *Richard* Duke of Yorke, second sonne of King *Edward* the fourth, and so with reasonable preparation, I returned backe again into Ireland, where . . . I was proclaimed by them *Richard* the fourth.<sup>34</sup>

According to Hall, Perkin says in his confession that he was persuaded to impersonate the Duke of York by the Irish in Cork, Ireland, and he had never seen the Duchess nor been to her court in Flanders before he went to her after being dismissed from the French court. And it was in Bodmin that Perkin, at the beginning of the second Cornish revolt, made proclamations in the name of King Richard the Fourth.<sup>35</sup> After Perkin was dismissed from the French court, according to Gainsford's version, "Then I sayled into Flanders, where my supposed aunt made more of me then before."<sup>36</sup> In Perkin's confession according to Hall, he of course met the Duchess for the first time. Unless Gainsford has some other authority than Hall's version for the confession, it seems very likely that he has altered the confession to make it correspond with his narrative of Perkin's adventure, though only to a degree, as he made Perkin refer, in the speech to the Scottish King, to his "bringing vp in Tornay"<sup>36 a</sup> which is not in Hall's history.

In 1622 Bacon's *Historie of the Raigne of King Henrie the Seventh* was first published. Bacon based his account mainly and freely on that of Hall whose additions to and alterations of Polydore Vergil are found throughout Bacon's work, yet, as W. Busch has pointed out, later histories and the general opinion of the reign of Henry VII have been not only influenced, but in fact dominated by Bacon, as by no other.<sup>37</sup> However, Bacon also made use of Fabian's *London Chronicle* and Andre's *Vita* and so on, and from misinterpreting Andre come some of Bacon's mistakes. It is not known whether Bacon knew Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck*; it seems not likely that he made use of the work at all.

In relating the early life of Perkin, Bacon has made some of the wildest mistakes. Listed as one of the things that made Perkin a suitable impersonator of Duke of York, in Bacon's words, is:

Lastly, there was a *Circumstance* (which is mentioned by one that wrote in the same time) that is very likely to have made somewhat to the matter; which is, That King Edward the Fourth was his *God-father*. Which, as it is somewhat suspicious, for a wanton *Prince* to become Gossip in so meane a House; and might make a man thinke, that hee might indeed haue in him some base Bloud of the House of Yorke: so at the least (though that were not) it might giue the occasion to the *Boy*, in being called *King Edwards God-sonne*, or perhaps in sport, *King Edwards Sonne*, to entertayne such Thoughts into his Head.<sup>38</sup>

As James Gairdner has pointed out, by "one that wrote in the same time" Bacon

meant Bernard Andre. Bacon not only did not examine the words of this contemporary historian of Henry VII, but had further misunderstood Speed's mistaken version of what Andre said. Perkin is, in Speed's version, "the son of a converted Jew whose godfather at baptism King Edward himself was."<sup>39</sup> Andre says only, however, in Gairdner's words, that "Perkin was brought up in England by the converted Jew in question, not that he was his son." In another passage, Gairdner observes, Andre says that Perkin was the Jew's servant. Even Andre's view, Gairdner thinks, is not trustworthy.<sup>40</sup> So one can see how far astray is Bacon in this surmise.

In relating Perkin Warbeck's family origin, Bacon has more than incorporated his misinterpretation by saying that Perkin's father, John Osbeck, was:

a *Convert-Jew* . . . whose businesse drew him, to liue for a time with his wife at London, in King Edward the fourths daies. During which time hee had a sonne by her: and being knowne in Court, the King either out of a religious Noblenesse, because hee was a *Convert*, or vpon some priuate acquaintance, did him the Honour, as to bee *Godfather* to his Child, and named him Peter.<sup>41</sup>

Actually what Bacon says is contradictory to what Perkin admits in his confession, "I was borne in the toune of Turney in Flaunders."<sup>42</sup> However, Perkin's confession is considered by Bacon, and very probably by Hall and other historians until the present time, as "a laboured *Tale* of particulars" with "little or nothing to purpose"<sup>43</sup> to such a degree as to discredit what Perkin says was his birth-place. No other historian has said that Perkin was born in London, son to a convert-Jew and godson to Edward IV, King of England. To complete the surmise, Bacon says that Perkin returned to Tournai with his parents when a child. In Flanders this youth roved a lot, in the words of Bacon, "liuing much in *English Companie*, and hauing the *English Tongue* perfect,"<sup>44</sup> until he was brought to the Duchess of Burgundy.

Enlarging on the much repeated story that the Duchess chose Perkin and instructed him diligently, Bacon exercises his free imagination and lists dozens of things that she instructed, or rather what Bacon thinks she should have instructed, the young man, while she had him secretly kept at her court.<sup>45</sup> Commenting upon Bacon's expanded account of the Duchess's training of Perkin, Gairdner says.

The statement that he was instructed by her comes from Polydore Vergil, a writer

who came to England in the days of Henry VII, though not till some years after Warbeck's death. And it may be true that he received some training from her; but clearly not until he had already made his debut as Duke of York in Ireland.<sup>46</sup>

Dismissing as untrue what Perkin says in his confession of how he came to impersonate the Duke of York, Bacon asserts that after reaching Ireland from Flanders Perkin immediately "took upon him the said Person of the Duke of York." Moreover, Bacon says the originals of the letters Perkin wrote to the Earls of Desmond and Kildare are still extant. In these letters Perkin asked them, according to Bacon, to come to his aid.<sup>47</sup>

As it can be inferred from the examples given, Bacon's account is very elaborate, colourful, picturesque and imposingly authoritative. Though the main facts are the same as in Hall, Bacon's *History* is more impressive and convincing. His imagination has filled in the details of the episodes: though all the details give the appearance of fact, some of them, as noted by later historians, are pure creations of his imagination. He has, in most cases, amplified the incidents and episodes in Hall. With his experience and insight of practical politics, Bacon's detailed analysis helps the reader to see the working of political minds. The picture of King Henry as a far-sighted and practical politician is enhanced by analyses such as the account of King Henry's motives for going to the Tower of London to anticipate Clifford's revelation of the names of conspirators.<sup>48</sup> Perkin's speech before the Scottish king finds the most expanded and eloquent version in Bacon.<sup>49</sup> Bacon makes Perkin say in the latter part of the speech how King Henry used all possible subtle ways and means to bring about his destruction, including falsely accusing him of being a counterfeit and spending great sums of money to corrupt other princes with whom Perkin had stayed. All these, Perkin says, prove that he was the true heir to the English throne. Further, in his petition for assistance from the Scottish king, Perkin observes,

But it seemeth that *God* above (for the good of this whole *Island*, and the Knitting of these two *Kingdomes* of *England* and *Scotland* in a strait *Concord* and *Amitie*, by so great an obligation) hath reserued the placing of mee in the *Imperiall Throne* of *England*, for the *Armes* and *Succours* of your *Grace*.<sup>50</sup>

It seems that Bacon has added something to this speech from hindsight also. Yet the Bacon version is much stronger, more effective, and more plausible.

Bacon also includes a long proclamation which Perkin made when King James in the company of Perkin invaded England.<sup>51</sup> This proclamation is neither in Hall nor in Gainsford. Though Gainsford refers to Perkin on this occasion “proclaiming the title of the Duke of Yorke . . . and promising . . .,”<sup>52</sup> it seems that the content is not the same as what is in Bacon. In the margin of Bacon’s text of the proclamation, Bacon says that the original of this document which he made use of “remaineth with Sir Robert Cotton”.<sup>53</sup>

When Hall is relating that Perkin had made proclamations in the name of Richard IV, he mentions Perkin’s three councillors:

And by the advise of his .iii. counsellors, Jhon Heron mercer a banquerupt, Richard Scelton a tayler and Jhon Asteley a Skreuener, men of more dishonestie then of honest estimation.<sup>54</sup>

Hall mentions Stephen Frion, “Stephyn Fryã” as it is in Hall, in Perkin’s confession, as the one who accompanied the French ambassador to Ireland to invite the counterfeit duke to the French court. In the same confession John a Water, “Jhon Water”, is one of those who in Cork, Ireland forced the impersonation upon Pekin, and also one of those Irishmen who joined in supporting the pretender against King Henry.<sup>55</sup> And this same “Jhon Awater, sometyme Mayre of Corffe in Irelande” was later arraigned and condemned, and eventually executed together with Perkin.<sup>56</sup>

John a Water, spelled as “John of Water”, is mentioned in Gainsford as one of the councillors: Perkin was at the time in Ireland and was about to land in Cornwall to join the Cornish,

... he had such poore Councillors . . . For his principall friends were now *Iohn Heron*, a mercer, and banquerout. *Iohn of Waters* sometimes Maior of *Cork*: *Richard Skelton* a Tailor: and *Iohn Asteley* a Scriuener; men in generall defame for dishonest actions, and in particular reproach, for vnderstanding nothing but what consorted to their own wilfulnesse, and outrageous appetites.<sup>57</sup>

In his version of Perkin’s confession, Gainsford makes the same references to “Iohn a Water” and “Stephen Frian” as Hall makes in his own.<sup>58</sup>

Shortly before the Duchess sent the newly trained pretender to Ireland, according to Bacon, Stephen Frion, King Henry’s secretary for the French tongue,

defected to her. This Frien had first fled to France and entered into the service of the French king. And then Bacon seems to be repeating what Perkin says in his confession: King Charles later dispatched this Frien with the French ambassador to invite Perkin to Paris.<sup>59</sup> However, Bacon adds more: in Paris Frien joined the cause of the pretender, and “followed his fortune both then and for a long time after, and was indeed his principall *Counsellor* and *Instrument* in all his Proceedings.”<sup>60</sup>

Bacon mentions Perkin’s councillors, as does Gainsford, when relating that Perkin had messages from the Cornish welcoming him to be their leader:

When Perkin heard this Newes, hee beganne to take heart againe, and aduised vpon it with his *Councell*, which were principally three; Herne a *Mercer*, that had fledde for Debt; Skelton a *Taylor*, and Astley a *Scriuener*: for, *Secretarie* Frien was gone.<sup>61</sup>

Bacon mentions that with Perkin was executed “the *Maier* of Corke . . . who had beene principall Abettors of his Treasons,” as in Hall and Gainsford.<sup>62</sup> Only Bacon mentions the fate of Perkin’s three councillors after his capture:

As for Perkins three *Councillors*, they had registred themselves *Sanctuarie-men* when their *Master* did. And whether vpon pardon obtained, or continuance within the *Priuiledge*, they came not to bee proceeded with.<sup>63</sup>

About Lady Katherine’s virtue and her subsequent treatment at the English court, Bacon says more than Hall or Gainsford:

. . . where the *Ladie* Katherin Gordon was left by her Husband, whom in all Fortunes shee entirely loued; adding the vertues of a *Wife*, to the vertues of her *Sexe* . . . . When she was brought to the King, it was commonly said, that the king receiued her not onely with *Compassion*, but with *Affection*; Pitie giuing more *Impression* to her excellent *Beautie*. Wherefore comforting her (to serue as well his *Eye*, as his *Fame*) hee sent her to his Queene, to remaine with her; giuing her very honourable *Allowance* for the support of her *Estate*; which she enjoyed both during the King’s life, and many years after.<sup>64</sup>

According to Bacon, Perkin Warbeck, after his capture near Taunton, was

brought to the king's court, "but not to the Kings presence; though the king (to satisfie his *Curiositie*) saw him sometimes out of a window, or in passage."<sup>65</sup>

Bacon does not include Perkin's confession. Hall says the text of the confession he gives is the very copy of Perkin's own confession written with Perkin's own hand.<sup>66</sup> However, according to Bacon,

... Perkin... was diligently examined; and after his *Confession* taken, an *Extract* was made of such parts of them... which was printed and dispersed abroad. Wherein the King did himselfe no Right. For as there was a laboured Tale of particulars... so there was little or nothing to purpose of anything concerning his *Designes*, or any *Practises* that had beene held with him; nor the *Duchesse* of *Burgundie* her selfe... so much as named or pointed at.<sup>67</sup>

Bacon seems to be saying that the confession as contained in Hall which Hall says Perkin read in public twice is the extract that he refers to, since the content of the confession corresponds with what Bacon says is in the extract. Apparently, Bacon does not believe this confession to be genuine, otherwise he would not tell the wonderful story of Perkin, being a Jew and godson of King Edward IV, beginning the impersonation under Lady Margaret's tutelage. When narrating how she dispatched the counterfeit duke to Ireland, Bacon gives the account of Perkin's confession that the impersonation was first forced upon him in Cork, but then repudiates it by giving the version inherited from Hall.<sup>68</sup>

Because of his involvement in Perkin's plot of escaping from the Tower of London, the Earl of Warwick, son to the Duke of Clarence, was beheaded soon after Perkin's execution. Hall, after recording this incident, says that the rumour had it that King Ferdinand of Spain would not conclude the marriage between his daughter Elizabeth and Prince Arthur of England so long as the Earl of Warwick of the House of York lived. It was the Spanish king's belief that England would never be rid of civil war with that earl surviving.<sup>69</sup> Gainsford repeats Hall's account but also gives a minor reason: that King Henry was glad of this occasion of getting rid of the Earl of Warwick "because as he had imprisoned him without a cause, he knew not what to doe with him without a fault."<sup>70</sup> Bacon has followed Hall's account, and has added more. After the conspiracy of Perkin and his keepers was disclosed before it could be carried out, Bacon says, "And in this againe the Opinion of the Kings great *Wisdom*e did surcharge him with a sinister *Fame*, that Perkin was but his *Bait*, to entrap the *Earle* of *Warwicke*."<sup>71</sup> Accord-

ing to Bacon, it was King Henry's envy that motivated the execution of the young earl, and the king arranged to have the king of Spain to write to him, demanding the removal of the earl in anticipation of the proposed marriage.<sup>72</sup>

## Chapter II. A Summary of the Source Studies on Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*

In reference to Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*, Gerard Langbaine writing in 1688, gives as a note, "*Plot from Gainsford's History, 4°.*"<sup>73</sup> In another note to the same play, Langbaine writes in 1691,

The plot is founded on Truth and may be read in most of the Chronicles that have writ of the Reign of King Henry the VII. See Caxton, Polidore Virgil, Hollingshead, Speed, Stow, Salmonet, Du Chesne, Martyn Baker, Gaynsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck*, etc.<sup>74</sup>

In still another work by Langbaine, when giving information of the plays by Ford, there is a note under *Perkin Warbeck*, "For the truth of the Story see Gainsford's *Hist. of Perkin Warbeck*, 4to, and our English Chronicles in the Reign of Henry VII."<sup>75</sup> So it is quite obvious that Lanbaine knows Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck* to be an important source of Ford's play. When Gainsford's work is mentioned with other chronicles dealing with Henry VII's reign, presumably Langbaine is refering to the plot in a very general sense since he has given the *History of Perkin Warbeck* alone in the two other instances. The list of chroniclers, as Miss Sargeaunt points out, is "not altogether accurate";<sup>76</sup> and but for the other two notes one would not know which chronicle Ford made use of. The strange thing is that Langbaine does not mention at all Bacon's *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* which was first published in 1622. It seems that Bacon's work was better known and more influential than Gainsford's rather obscure work.

The first person to identify Bacon's *Henry VII* as an important source, or rather, the main source, was Henry Weber, editor of the first collected edition of Ford's dramatic works published in 1811. In his brief introduction to the play, he says,

Ford's play is founded upon the chronicles of the reign of Henry VII, and parti-

cularly upon the history of that monarch by the celebrated Lord Bacon as appears from the beginning of the following dedication.<sup>77</sup>

The dedication to which Weber refers is that to the Earl of Newcastle signed by Ford, prefixed to *Perkin Warbeck*, in which Ford says, "Out of the darkness of a former age (enlighten'd by a late both learned and an honorable pen), I have endeavored to personate a great attempt . . . ."<sup>78</sup>

Next, William Gifford in a note in his 1827 edition of Ford's works also thinks that by "a late both learned, and an honourable pen" Ford refers to "That of the great Lord Bacon."<sup>79</sup> In 1888, Havelock Ellis in his introduction to the play says, "Ford founded it on Bacon's *Life of Henry VII*", and in a note also points out that Ford by "a late . . . pen" refers to Bacon.<sup>80</sup> Then in 1890, in his edition of *Famous Elizabethan Plays*, H. Fitzgibbon gives the same account of Ford's indebtedness to Bacon.<sup>81</sup> This emphasis on Bacon and ignorance or neglect of Gainsford has another expression in the title of Victor Gehler's dissertation of 1895.<sup>82</sup>

It was not until 1897, more than two centuries later than Langbaine's first mention of Gainsford's work as source of the plot of *Perkin Warbeck*, that Gainsford was again mentioned as a source of Ford's play. In a booklet of source studies of plays by Ford and others, Emil Koeppel gives Langbaine's remarks on the source of the plot of Ford's play, which mention Gainsford's work,<sup>83</sup> acknowledges Ford's indebtedness to Bacon; but he is mainly concerned with proving Ford's indebtedness to Gainsford, which he does by giving three parallel quotations from Ford's play and Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck*. This study firmly established Ford's borrowings from Gainsford in the writing of *Perkin Warbeck*.<sup>84</sup>

In 1899, in his revised edition of history of drama, A. W. Ward observes, referring to Koeppel's pioneering work, "On Bacon's book [*Life of Henry VII*] and on Thomas Gainsford's *True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck etc.* (1618) Ford founded his play."<sup>85</sup>

However, later literary critics and historians have not followed up this established fact. Writing in 1902 and again in 1908 Schelling says that Bacon's *Henry VII* is Ford's "acknowledged authority" and that the dramatist has followed Bacon "with fidelity" as far as the dramatic possibilities of *Perkin Warbeck* permit.<sup>86</sup> Though Schelling mentions that the sources of Ford's plays have been

“thoroughly treated” by Koeppel in his booklet, he is only remarking generally and does not even give the name of Gainsford or his *History* in connection with the sources of *Perkin Warbeck*.<sup>87</sup>

Nearly all the editors and critics of Ford have assumed, though without definite evidence, that Ford, by “a late both learned and honourable pen” refers to Bacon simply because the playwright has borrowed so much from the *Henry VII*. As both Bacon and his work are well-known, it is but natural for people to assume Bacon is the dramatist’s sole source.

In 1896 there was published in Sydney a new edition of *Perkin Warbeck* by J. P. Pickburn and J. Le Gay Brereton. In the copious notes of the edition the editors give quotations not only from Bacon’s *Henry VII* but also from Hall and Holinshed as sources of Ford’s play, with the conclusion that Bacon and Hall are the chief sources.<sup>88</sup> Then in the year 1911 Professor Brereton published his article, “The Sources of Ford’s *Perkin Warbeck*”<sup>89</sup> in which by means of long parallel quotations from Ford’s play, from Bacon, from Hall, and occasionally from Holinshed, he shows, as he claims, that the chief authorities for this play are Bacon and Hall. Being ignorant of Gainsford’s influence he thinks that the 1896 edition of *Perkin Warbeck*, of which he is co-editor, is the first work to reveal that Ford had another source, that is, Bacon, as he claims. Brereton points out that, though Schelling refers to the edition of 1896, he still clings to the tradition that Ford drew his materials for the play from Bacon’s work only. Presumably, the work by Bacon was referred to as the source, in Schelling’s *Elizabethan Drama*.<sup>90</sup> Though Professor Brereton’s article is limited in its merit, it has well documented the indebtedness of Ford’s play to Bacon’s *Henry VII*.

After reading Brereton’s article, Emil Koeppel published an article in the July issue of *Beiblatt zur Anglia* of the same year, entitled “John Ford’s *Chronicle Play of Perkin Warbeck* und Thomas Gainsford’s *History of Perkin Warbeck*.”<sup>91</sup> Referring to his own booklet published in 1897 and Ward’s *History of English Dramatic Literature*, both of which mention Gainsford’s *History*, Koeppel thinks that it is Brereton’s negligence not to have included Gainsford’s book among Ford’s sources. Here Koeppel gives many parallel quotations from Ford and Gainsford, and Brereton’s quotations from Hall and Bacon; this shows that the verbal similarities between Ford’s play and Gainsford’s *History* are far greater than those between the play and the accounts of Perkin Warbeck in Hall or Holinshed. So Hall is evidently not a major source as Gainsford is, and still less is Holinshed.

*The True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck* is the indubitable major source other than Bacon's *Henry VII*.

Fifteen years later appeared an article by Mildred C. Struble, "The Indebtedness of Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* to Gainsford".<sup>92</sup> Miss Struble points out that many of the details which Brereton attributes to Bacon, Hall and occasionally Holinshed are really from Gainsford's *History*. Brereton's article, she rightly points out, has exhaustively shown how much the dramatist is indebted to Bacon. She thinks that Gainsford's work is one of the two chief sources of Ford who seems to have drawn about equally from Bacon and Gainsford, though there seem to be also minor influences of Hall, Holinshed, and possibly Speed. Gainsford's work, Miss Struble maintains, was for Ford almost as up-to-date a historical work as Bacon's; therefore, the author made use of both. By giving parallel quotations from Ford's play and Gainsford's *History*, she convincingly establishes her point. Just like Koeppel before her, she clears up many of Brereton's wrong claims on behalf of Bacon, Hall or Holinshed. In some places, she thinks, the playwright has deftly fitted together two sources, as from Hall and Gainsford, in Act III, Scene 1, 48-54, of the Gifford-Dyce text (1869) of the play. The quotations from Gainsford that Miss Struble gives are many and very important, but they are fewer in number than those given in the booklet and the article by Koeppel. She does not mention Langbaine nor Koeppel nor other critics who had pointed out the work by Gainsford as a source of the play before her.

Later in the same year appeared Miss Struble's critical edition of *Perkin Warbeck*.<sup>93</sup> She has in this edition included substantial notes which comprise numerous quotations from Bacon and Gainsford, and sometimes from Hall and Holinshed. Gainsford's *History* is also appended to this edition; regrettably it is not the text of the original 1618 edition, but that of the *Harleian Miscellany*, the edition of which she does not specify. Miss Struble's notes have incorporated Mr. Brereton's documentation, and also enlarged on the documentation in her own article, of Ford's debt to Gainsford. Also included in her notes are the three examples of Ford's borrowings from Gainsford as pointed out by Koeppel in his booklet of 1897 which is included in her bibliography.<sup>94</sup> However, of the findings in Koeppel's 1911 article one is not contained in her notes.<sup>95</sup> Neither Koeppel nor Miss Struble had access to the 1618 edition of Gainsford's *History*, which being the only available edition in the seventeenth century was the one that Ford used. For both his booklet and his article Koeppel used the text in *A Selection*

from the *Harleian Miscellany of Tracts* published in 1793. It will be noted later that the *Harleian Miscellany* text, as is appended to Miss Struble's edition, has altered some of the original wordings and spellings of the 1618 text. Owing to this change, at least one borrowing by Ford from Gainsford is not discernible in Miss Struble's reprint text, as it is in the 1618 text.<sup>96</sup>

Miss M. J. Sargeaunt's important work on Ford was published in 1935. Her section in the play contains a quite comprehensive summary of Ford scholarship on *Perkin Warbeck* up to about the time of her book; however, she does not seem to know of Miss Struble's article nor her edition of the play. She is the first critic to give two of Langbaine's references to plot sources of Ford's play, which both mention Gainsford's *History*.<sup>97</sup> Koeppel before her has given only one of the two references.<sup>98</sup> Referring to Professor Brereton's claim that Ford has borrowed from Hall and even Holinshed besides Bacon, she considers that "Brereton's argument falls to the ground," because he was unaware of Ford's borrowing from Gainsford. She also gives two examples of Ford's borrowings from Gainsford to illustrate her point that all the Hall and Holinshed influences which Brereton claims to be in the play are all attributable to Gainsford.<sup>99</sup> Her ignorance of Miss Struble's work makes her argument a little too sweeping, as Miss Struble's edition of the play contains some examples, though very few, of Ford's indebtedness to Hall. Miss Sargeaunt does not seem to know of Koeppel's article, either. Of the two examples that she gives as an argument against Brereton's claim on behalf of Hall, the one concerning the spelling of "Sketon" has been pointed out by Miss Struble in her edition,<sup>100</sup> and the one about "scarcely four hundred" has been pointed out by Koeppel in his article.<sup>101</sup> Miss Sargeaunt is the first critic after Langbaine to have consulted the 1618 edition of Gainsford's work. She is the first one to quote from that edition too. To show how the dramatist borrows from Gainsford, following the original account and retaining Gainsford's wording as much as possible but giving a different colouring, Miss Sargeaunt gives a very long quotation from Gainsford to be compared with Ford's lines in the play.<sup>102</sup>

In a short article published in 1955, John O'Conner points out that Ford's play may have been influenced by William Warner's *Albion's England*. Referring to the source studies of the play, O'Conner says that it has been assumed that Ford's indebtedness is limited only to those parts of the play which are clearly historical, while the Scottish Scenes involving Katherine, Daliell and Huntley are

invented by the playwright, as the historical materials are either vague or silent. From *Albion's England*, O'Conner thinks, Ford might have derived the character of Katherine, and the person of Daliell, whereas previously the merits of the characterization of Lady Katherine Gordon and the creation of Daliell were attributed to Ford's original imagination.<sup>103</sup>

Ford's portrait of Katherine is very different from the colourless character in Hall or the vain shallow girl, in Gainsford, aspiring to a diadem and taken in by Warbeck's royal manners, and therefore easily giving in to the pretender's proposal of matrimony. Bacon's short reference to Katherine's love for Perkin in all his fortunes seems too slender a hint for Ford's elaborate portrait of a uniquely constant wife. Only Warner describes Katherine as a paragon of devotion and loyalty. No prose historian has mentioned any character equivalent to Daliell who loves Katherine and has doubts about the pretender's claim. O'Conner thinks these two portraits of Warner provide the inspiration for Ford's two interesting characters, for Warner's verse history is the only source available for them.<sup>104</sup>

However, O'Conner admits that though *Albion's England* helps to account for these points in Ford's play, it remains conjecture that Warner has influenced Ford because there are no obvious verbal resemblances. Yet Ford's play being a chronicle play, the playwright "was not striving for originality except within a framework of acknowledged fact", and this makes more likely that Daliell is not an original invention of Ford's. O'Conner thinks that "Ford obviously did a great deal of research in an attempt to rest his play upon a sound historical basis." Warner was considered as a historian by early seventeenth-century standards, and Ford would have been glad to use him as his authority for his Daliell, as all his other characters are historical.<sup>105</sup> This assumption of O'Conner's, however, is not very convincing. Since Ford presents the pretender in a very different way from that in the chronicles, at the expense of historical accuracy in many scenes, it is very doubtful whether Ford wanted any historical sanction for the introduction of the character Daliell. Moreover, Warner's account of Katherine is not quite historical; rather more romantic than historical. The bulk of Warner's Book VII is devoted to the narration of Katherine being wooed by her persistent lover and the allegorical tales they tell each other.<sup>106</sup> Therefore, one tends to agree to O'Conner's suggestion that the suitor in *Albion's England* gives Ford some idea of the character of Daliell, but not his contention that Warner has been followed to

give the character historical authority.

A recent edition of Ford's play is that by Donald K. Anderson, Jr., first published in 1965.<sup>107</sup> According to Mr. Anderson, Ford seems to have borrowed from the two histories of Bacon and Gainsford about equally: "more from Bacon in Acts II and V, more from Gainsford in Acts III and IV, and about the same from both in Act I,"<sup>108</sup> while six of the eighteen scenes do not seem to have borrowed from them at all. The Baconian influence is stronger in Ford, Anderson thinks, because of Ford's emphasis on ideal kingship:

In his emphasis, he follows Bacon more closely than he does Gainsford, especially in portraying Henry VII. Bacon surpasses all other chroniclers in his analysis of the king's character, and most of his conclusions are complimentary.<sup>109</sup>

The factual summary of Perkin Warbeck's career that Anderson gives is, as a whole, the account of modern historians. In relating Perkin's early life, the editor follows the version of Perkin's confession, which is the agreed version of modern historians. However, referring to Perkin's facility in language, when he first sailed to Cork, Anderson says, "having been acquired, very likely, under the tutelage of Margaret of Burgundy, sister of Edward IV."<sup>110</sup> In this remark, it seems, Anderson is following the story of Perkin as passed down from Vergil through Hall. Concerning Perkin's adventure in Cork, the account of Anderson is, "When asked if he was the Earl of Warwick, an illegitimate son of Richard III, or Richard, Duke of York, he denied the first two identities but claimed the third one."<sup>111</sup> According to Hall's version of Perkin's confession, the impersonation was forced upon him; Perkin did not exactly "claim" the title. It is the same story in Gainsford: "... so against my will made me to learn English, and taught me what I should do and saye. And after this they called me duke of Yorke, second sonne of kynge Edward the IV . . . ."<sup>112</sup> Anderson's account seems to be an over-simplification.

In his footnotes to the text of the play Mr. Anderson includes many important quotations from Gainsford and Bacon to show Ford's indebtedness to them. Mr. Anderson points out some borrowings from Gainsford, which other critics have not noticed. Mr. Anderson quotes from Miss Struble's reprint of the *Harleian Miscellany* version of Gainsford's *History* to illustrate Ford's borrowings. As it has been mentioned before, at least one borrowing from Gainsford is obscur-

ed because alterations of words are made in this text of the *Harleian Miscellany*.

The most recent edition of the play is by Professor Peter Ure.<sup>113</sup> This contains by far the most thorough discussion of the text, date, authorship, and the sources as well as a short critical history of the play. In the appendices are included, for the first time in any edition of this play, extracts from the 1618 edition of Thomas Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck*, which have influenced Ford's writing of the play. A biographical index of historical characters is also provided. There are also detailed annotations which, besides illuminating the meanings of words and phrases, touches on the dramatist's borrowing from or alteration of the facts according to the chroniclers. In the commentary Professor Ure has incorporated materials from the Pickburn and Brereton edition of the play.

Professor Ure thinks that Alfred Harbage's theory, supported by Sidney R. Homan, Jr., that *Perkin Warbeck* was written by Dekker and Ford in collaboration, "can be rejected with some confidence," though the question whether the play was written earlier than the traditional dating of 1633 is still open.<sup>114</sup> As to Ford's two main sources of the play, Professor Ure thinks that the dramatist comes to rely more and more upon Gainsford's work as the play proceeds, than upon Bacon's which does not have Gainsford's historical details and particular colour, though Ford is not much affected by Gainsford's clumsy attempts to improve and dramatize situations in the adventures of Perkin. The impression one gets, says the editor, is that Ford turns more readily to Gainsford, often as he consults Bacon. Frequently, however, has Ford interwoven the two sources, and this indicates that he regards them as having more or less equal authority.<sup>115</sup> In a very convenient table Professor Ure correlates the sequence of the scenes of the play with the sequence of the historical episodes, with the places and time specified. It is therefore very easy to see from this table how the dramatist has manipulated with the events, and sometimes departed from historical accuracy, especially about the Cornish rising and the decisive battle that follows.<sup>116</sup>

Like others before him, Professor Ure also mentions that the master-stroke of invention in the play is that concerning the characterization of Perkin Warbeck, especially the quality of never wavering in his inward conviction and outward assertion of his being the rightful inheritor of the English throne, as contrary to all the sources. Ford, argues Professor Ure, simply seized his opportunity and invented the interesting character of Perkin; it is therefore idle to talk about the

dramatist getting the "germ" of the idea from a sentence of Bacon. Nor is it of any interest to try to establish whether Ford believed, as did Bacon and Gainsford, that Perkin was in fact a fraud. The mere fact that the character Perkin in the play has sane, noble and appealing convictions about his own nature makes it appear independent of anything in the sources. Ford's inventions in the characterizations of Katherine, Huntley and Dalyell are also touched on.<sup>117</sup> Professor Ure discredits Warner's *Albion's England* as the possible historical authority that Ford relies on for the character of Dalyell, as O'Connor suggests; however, he agrees with O'Connor that Ford may have noted Warner's emphasis on Katherine's loyalty and her gallant suitor that very faintly resembles Dalyell. Professor Ure says that it must also be remembered that in Gainsford, Bacon and Speed there are suggestions for a deeply affectionate and loyal Katherine too.<sup>118</sup>

It is doubtful, Professor Ure thinks, that King Henry in the play is a character so far improving on that found in the sources as to constitute an ideal king, as D. K. Anderson claims. Instead, in Ure's opinion, Ford's King Henry is basically that of Bacon, with some influence from Gainsford. King James in the play is, as a character, about as close to the sources as King Henry.<sup>119</sup>

Owing to the great number of cases where Ford derives his facts and his rhetoric from Gainsford and Bacon, Professor Ure recognizes Ford's great dependence on them and remarks, "He obviously worked with Bacon and Gainsford open on the table in front of him," but the dramatist "by a few handsome strokes of inventive insight" makes "all the drab dependence and crowding details glitter and cohere."<sup>120</sup>

In the discussion of the sources of the play, Professor Ure attributes to Miss Struble the merit of reviving the name of Gainsford as one of Ford's chief sources of the play in 1926,<sup>121</sup> after Gerard Langbaine first suggested it in 1688. As it has been mentioned earlier in the chapter, it was Emil Koeppel that first revived Gainsford's name in his 1897 booklet on the sources of the drama by Chapman, Massinger and Ford, wherein by means of parallel quotations from Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck* and Ford's play Koeppel shows beyond doubt that Gainsford is one of the main sources of *Perkin Warbeck*.

### Chapter III. Some Probable Borrowings by Ford from His Sources for *Perkin Warbeck*

The following is a short list of quotations from the play, each accompanied by a quotation or quotations from Ford's source books of the play. These quotations have not yet been mentioned by any of the source studies, but they seem to be the likely sources of the respective lines from the play, or as important sources as others. The text of the play used and the line numbers are those of Henry de Vocht's edition of *John Ford's Dramatic Works*,<sup>122</sup> which is a very faithful reprint of the 1634 quarto. The historical writings from which passages are quoted are Hall's *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke* (1550); Holinshed's *The Third Volume of Chronicles* (1587); Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck* (1618); and Bacon's *History of Henry VII* (1622). The page numbers of the above-mentioned editions are given even when reference is made to the quotations in the works of E. Koeppel, M. C. Struble and D. K. Anderson who used later editions and hence page numbers of them. The page number follows the abbreviated titles in the parentheses below.

#### Act I

560 naked out-lawes

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 124-25) gives quotations from Hall, Holinshed, Bacon and Gainsford, though Gainsford's account does not even contain the word "naked". P. Ure (*Edn.* 31) gives Holinshed only (780) but adds that Holinshed's remarks are derived from Hall. There is another passage in Bacon which might have been used by Ford. Bacon, (*Henry VII* 35): [referring to the Battle of Stoke] "neither did the Irish fail in courage or fiercenesse, but being almost naked men, only armed with Darts and Skeines."

563-64 By Stephen Frion, sometimes Secretarie  
In the French tongue unto your sacred Excellence

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 125) gives Gifford's note which contains a

quotation from Bacon, as an explanation. P. Ure (*Edn.*, 31) points out that the main reference to Frion and this spelling of his name is in Bacon. The passage in Bacon which is very close to Ford's lines above is, (*Henry VII*, 118) "... the Duchesse had also gayned unto her, a neare servant of King Henry's owne, one Stephen Frion, his Secretarie for the French Tongue."

574 Sketon a taylor

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 125) gives the *Harleian Miscellany* version of Gainsford's reference to Perkin's counsellors (eleven words are missing here, when compared with the text of the *Miscellany* in the Appendix of the *Critical Edition*. In the 1618 edition of Gainsford's *History*, the corresponding line is, (93) "Richard Sketon a tailer." As the *Harleian Misscellany* version appended to Miss Struble's edition gives the name as "Richard Skelton" (*Critical Edn.*, 202), Miss Struble does not see Ford's indebtedness to Gainsford for the spelling of the name. Miss M. Sargeaunt is the first one to point out that Ford's spelling of "Skiton" is borrowed from the historian. (*John Ford*, 218, n. 19, referring to Brereton's query.) Peter Ure (*Edn.*, 32) also refers to this borrowing in a note; in the text of the play Ure adopts A. Dyce's historical spelling of "Skelton".

## Act II

774-78      Take this for answer, bee what ere thou art,  
               Thou never shalt repent that thou hast put  
               Thy cause, and person, into my protection.  
               Cosen of York, thus once more We embrace thee;  
               Welcome to Iames of Scotland, for thy safetie.

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 128) gives a quotation from Bacon which seems to be the most likely source for lines 774-76. The account of Gainsford, however, is very close to Ford's lines also: (*History of Perkin Warbeck*, 66) "the King . . . cheered him, telling him plainly he would assist him, and whatever he was, or intended to be, he should not repent him of his coming thither . . . ."

772-73      *K.I.*: Hee must bee more then subject, who can vtter

The language of a King, and such is thine.

785-89

*Coun:* I have not seene a Gentleman

Of a more braue aspect, or goodlier carriage;

His fortunes moue not him--Madam yare passionate.

*Kath:* Beshrew mee, but his words haue touched mee home,

As if his cause concerned mee;

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 128) observes, "The impression Perkin had made on the spectators, and indicated in the remarks of James, the Countess, and Katherine, harmonizes with the comments of Bacon," and she thereupon gives some quotations from Bacon. Some of Gainsford's passages describing Perkin's royal manner might have also influenced Ford.

*History of Perkin Warbeck:* (33) For without any difficulty, or sign of subordination...he kept such a princely countenance, and counterfeted a maiesticall roialty, that all others firmly approued he was extracted out of the blood of *Plantaginet*, and obserued him accordingly. (41)...*Perkin*, who played the counterfet so exactly, that his words resembled forcible incantations.... For all men praised his vertues and qualities, with a resolved beleefe of his princelinesse.

### Act III

1227-29

for they supposing

(Misled by rumor) that the day of battaile

Should fall on Munday.

Miss Struble quotes Gainsford's account (83) in her article (*Anglia*, 1926, 84) and her Critical Edition (137), and she points out that for these three lines Ford was influenced by Gainsford. However, Hall's, Holinshed's as well as Bacon's accounts are quite similar to the account of Gainsford. Ford may have used Bacon's account only.

*History of Henry VII:* (170) It was... a *Saturday*... when the *Battile* was fought; though the King had, by all the Art hee could deuise, giuen out a false Day, as if hee prepared to giue the *Rebels Battaille* on the Monday following, the better to find them vnprovidd and in disarray.

*The Union of the two . . . famelies*: "Henry VII": (Fol.xliii) Some affirme the kynge appoynted to fight with the rebelles on the Monday, and anticipatyng the tyme by pollecie set on them upon the Saturday before, beinge unprouided and in no arraye of battaile, and so by that pollecy obteyned the felde and victory.

Holinshed's account (*The Third Volume of Chronicles*, 782) is almost the same as Hall's.

1250     Raled in ropes, fit Ornaments for traytors

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 137-38) quotes Gifford's note which contains a quotation from Bacon, in which there is the phrase "rayl'd in Ropes" (spelling of the 1622 edition of *Henry VII*); she points out that the same phrase also occurs in Stow's *Annals of England* (1592). However, in Gainsford's account of Perkin Warbeck's ill-fated landing at Kent, there is also this same phrase when Gainsford was referring to those followers of Perkin that were captured. P. Ure (*Edn.*, 65) says Bacon derived his phrase from Hall and it was also used by Gainsford in the same context. P. Ure does not give Bacon's spelling of the 1622 edition, nor does he point out that Gainsford's spelling of "raled" is the same as that in Ford's quarto text of 1634.

*History of Perkin Warbeck*: (62)" . . . the principall captaines . . . were all . . . so raled in ropes, like horses drawing in a cart, sent vp to London."

1638-39     K: Ia:     Forrage through  
The Countrey, spare no prey of life, or goode

In 1897 E. Koeppel (*Quellen-Studien* etc., 191) first points out that Gainsford's account of the first Scottish incursion is Ford's source; Gainsford's account is: *History of Perkin Warbeck* (72) "to forage my natiue countrey." Miss Struble does not seem to know of Koeppel's work but in her *Critical Edition* (143-44) gives Bacon's not dissimilar account of the first Scottish incursion. However, Bacon's account of the second Scottish incursion contains almost the same words as Gainsford's. *History of Henry VII*: (173) "sending the rest to Forrage the Countrie."

Act IV

1703-08

Can they

Looke on the strength of Cundrestine defac't?

The glorie of Heydonhall devastated? that

Of Edington cast down? the pile of Fulden

Orethrowne? And this the strongest of their Forts

Olde Ayton Castle yeelded, and demolished?

That Gainsford's account is apparently Ford's source of these lines has been pointed out first by E. Koepfel (*Beiblatt zur Anglia*, Vol. 22 (1911), 213), and then by Miss Struble (*Anglia*, (1926), 87 and *Critical Edition*, 146). Donald Anderson, Jr. (*Edn.*, 64) quotes the same passage from Gainsford, so does Peter Ure (*Edn.*, 88). However, the version of Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck* used by Koepfel is that in *A Selection from the Harleian Miscellany of Tracts* (1793); and the version used by Miss Struble is that of the *Harleian Miscellany* though she does not specify which edition it is that she uses and includes in the appendix of her *Critical Edition*.<sup>123</sup> D. Anderson quotes from the version of Gainsford as appended to Miss Struble's edition. This version of Gainsford is slightly different from that of the original 1618 edition: in the passage under discussion at least one word has been altered. As the Harleian version has changed the word "deuasted" which Ford borrowed to "demolished", neither Koepfel nor Miss Struble nor Anderson can see Ford's indebtedness to Gainsford for this word. P. Ure's edition has extracts of the 1618 edition of Gainsford included in the appendix, but he has not noticed this borrowing by Ford.

*History of Perkin Warbeck*: (86) ... the Earle of Surrey ... entred Scotland, defaced the Castle of Cundrestins, deuasted the Tower Hedonhall, vndermined the Tower of Edington, ouerthrew the Pile of Fulden, and sent Norey King of Armes to the Captaine of Haiton Castle, the strongest fortification betweene Barwick and Edinborough to deliuer the same ... that at last it was surrendered ... our Generall quite ouerthrew and demolished the same.

Act V

2302-06 Your husband marcht to Taunton, and was there.

Affronted by King Henries Chamberlayne.  
The King himselfe in person, with his Armie  
Advancing neerer, to renew the fight  
On all occasions.

Miss Struble (*Critical Edn.*, 153) quotes from Hall and Bacon; and she says, "The account of this adventure would appear to result from a combined influence of Bacon and Hall." However, Gainsford's main account is almost the same as Hall's, and in another portion Gainsford also mentions the King's chamberlain. Bacon's account is contained in Gainsford's account. Hall's account, though not completely contained in Bacon's, is all in Gainsford's. Therefore, Ford may not have used Hall at all and may have used Gainsford only.

*History of Perkin Warbeck*: (95-96) When *Perkin* ... retired his lowsie and distressed Armie to the next great Towne called *Taunton* ....

... the Kings Army approaching, of which the Lord *Daubney* ... was Generall: yet in the meane while had [many lords and knights] ... brought forward the forces of the countrey ....

... But when the King was advertized of their returning [of Perkin and his followers] to Taunton, he hasted thither ....

(97) When the King approached the towne og Tawnton .... Hee sent before him ... *Giles Lord Daubney* [and others] ... to giue the onset and beginne the battell, that hee with the rest ... might come to the reskue, if they were wearied and defatigated.

2306-09

But the night before

The battayles were to joyne, your husband privately  
Accompanied with some few horse, departed  
From out the campe, and posted none knowes whither

Miss Struble (*Critical Edition*, 153) gives Bacon's account, but Hall's account and Gainsford's account are verbally closer to Ford's lines than Bacon's. Gainsford seems to have been the source; Hall's account, being less close, may not have been used at all.

*The Union of the two ... famelies* etc., "Henry VII": (Fol.xlvii) For assone as Perkyn was enformed <sup>e</sup>y his enemies were ready to geue him battayle, he that no-

thyne lesse mynded then to fight in open felde with the kynges puissaunce, dissimuled all <sup>e</sup> day time <sup>t</sup> w<sup>t</sup> his company, as though nothing could make him afeard, and aboute mydnight beyng accompanied with .lx. horsmen departed frō Tawnton in poste to a sanctuary toune besyde Southampton called Beadeley.

*History of Perkin Warbeck:* (97-98) For poore *Perkin* (desperate of his fortunes, and quite exanimated to encounter with the Kings forces, in so warlike a manner and fearefull a preparation, contrary to all the motiues of a true Roman Honour, and without knowledge of his army) about midnight, accompanied with sixty horse, departed in Wonderfull celerity to a Sanctuary towne besides Southampton called Beudly. . . .

2389      Sir Rice ap Thomas, and Lord Brooke our Steward

Miss Struble (*Critical Edition*, 154) notes, "The names of Sir Rice ap Thomas and Lord Brooke are taken from Hall," though in the previous note she gives a quotation about Sir Rice ap Thomas from Lumby's edition of Bacon's Works. Gainsford's account is almost identical with Hall's and Bacon's. Bacon's account is quoted by Anderson (*Edn.*, 89); only Bacon does not mention in this context that Brook was the King's steward. In Hall and Gainsford, these two and the Lord Chamberlain were sent forward as vanguard when King Henry approached Taunton, after the siege of Exeter was raised, while Bacon says these two and the Lord Chamberlain were dispatched to the rescue of Exeter.

*History of Perkin Warbeck:* (97) When the king approached the towne of Tawnton. . . . Hee sent before him *Robert Lord Brooke* the Steward of his house, *Giles Lord Daubney*, and *S<sup>r</sup>. Rice app Thomas* to giue the onset and beginne the battell. . . .

Ford's spelling "Rice ap Thomas" agrees with that of Bacon, while both Hall and Gainsford spell "Rice app Thomas". Ford probably used Gainsford only, or Gainsford and Bacon. He may not have used Hall at all.

2446-50      *K: H:* A prettie gallant! thus, your Aunt of Burgundie,  
Your Dutchesse Aunt enform'd her Nephew; so  
The lesson prompted, and well conn'd, was moulded  
Into familiar Dialogue, oft rehearsed,  
Till learnt by heart, 'tis now, receiv'd for truth.

Miss Struble (*Critical Edition*, 155) quotes Bacon's account in connection with Line 2447. In Gainsford's account there is a passage which equally could have given Ford the suggestion.

*History of Perkin Warbeck*: (33) Thus she [the Duchess of Burgundy] kept him a certaine space priuily with her selfe, and vsed such diligencie and instruction concerning the house of *Yorke*, the affaires of *England*, and the lignage, descent, and order of her family, that by that time he came to repeat his lesson, she verily be- lieued he was the same she had supposedly contriued: and he quite forgot, that euer his first originally came out of the Dunghill: For without any difficulty, or signe of subordination (such a forcible impression hath the hope of honour and preferment. . . .) he kept such a princely countenance, and counterfeted a maiestically roialty, that all others firmly approved he was extracted out of the blood of *Plantaginet* . . . she againe grew proud of nothing so much, as the wonderment of her owne handworke. . . .

2612      A dunghill was thy Cradle

Miss Truble (*Critical Edition*, 157) quotes from Hall (Fol.vii), "suche a dongehyll knave and vyle borne villeyne." There are other examples of this word dunghill: one from Hall, another from Gainsford. *The Union of the two . . . famelies* etc., "Henry VII": (Fol.xliii) "This Mighell Ioseph, surnamed <sup>e</sup> y black smyth one of <sup>e</sup> y capiteins of this donge hill and draffe sacked ruffians."

*History of Perkin Warbeck*: (33) "... he [Perkin] quite forgot that euer his first originall came out of the Dunghill."

Therefore, Ford may have used Gainsford only for the word "dunghill" and not consulted Hall at all.

The source studies on *Perkin Warbeck*, as mentioned above, by Koeppe, Brereton, Miss Struble, Miss Sargeant, Anderson, and Ure, show that the preponderant evidence is that Ford borrows chiefly from Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck* and Bacon's *History of Henry VII*. Ford may have got his inspiration for the character of Daliell and the constant-lover Katherine from Warner's *Albion's England*. There are rather few evidences which can establish Ford's indebtedness to other chroniclers for the play. As Hall's account of the reign of Henry VII is the prototype of all the later versions of Perkin Warbeck's adventures,

including those of Gainsford and Bacon, it is only natural that there are many similarities between Hall's account and Ford's play. The annotations in Miss Struble's critical edition includes many quotations from Hall; in a few cases she thinks Hall directly influenced Ford.<sup>124</sup> However, most of what she thinks is Ford's debt to Hall has been rightly attributed to Gainsford or Bacon by Koeppel, Anderson, and Ure. A few of these passages are discussed in this chapter.<sup>125</sup>

Peter Ure gives four examples of what appeared to her to be the dramatist's direct borrowings from Hall.<sup>126</sup> Firstly, the word "scullery", as Miss Struble has pointed out, does seem to have come from Hall who is the only chronicler to mention that Lambert Simnel was serving in Henry VII's scullery.<sup>127</sup> The second example, "naked outlaws", is also mentioned by Miss Struble though she does not say it is a direct debt or not, since she also gives the accounts of Holinshed and Bacon; Bacon's passage contains the phrase "wilde and naked people" in reference to the Irish.<sup>128</sup> It has also been pointed out above<sup>129</sup> that in another passage Bacon again refers to the Irish as "almost naked men". The third example, from Perkin Warbeck's speech to King James at the Scottish court, referring to his being "fostered/By obscure means, taught to unlearn myself" is seen by Professor Ure as a direct link with Hall, which is not represented in the other sources; Ford may probably have got his inspiration from Hall's account.<sup>130</sup> The fourth one concerns Ford's source for saying that "he [Perkin] had intelligence / Of being bought and sold by his base followers". In the opinion of Professor Ure, a sentence in Hall's account of the episode, "... least his men should fersake hum" may have given Ford a hint for the "palliation" in these lines. As Professor Ure observes, Ford's lines go much further than any of his known sources. Gainsford condemns Perkin's flight as dishonourable.<sup>131</sup> In her note to these two lines from Ford, Miss Struble quotes from Hall and Holinshed, but her quotation from Hall does not include the sentence which Professor Ure considers as the probable germ of Ford's lines.<sup>132</sup>

To conclude, the evidences of Ford's direct borrowing from Hall are very few; some of them are rather assumed evidences. They point to the assumption that Ford did consult Hall's chronicle, but not at all frequently, and made very little use of it.

As a whole, *Perkin Warbeck* is quite faithful to the historical facts of its source materials. Inevitably, a dramatist has to make alterations to turn his materials into a play. What follows is a brief synopsis of the plot of the play, with

the historical incidents and Ford's original creations indicated. The division of acts and scenes is that established by Weber's edition of Ford's plays in 1811, and followed by all later editors.<sup>133</sup>

## Act I

*Scene I:* King Henry of England is discussing the new pretender to the English throne, Perkin Warbeck, with his courtiers in the King's palace at Westminster when news comes that Sir Robert Clifford, one of Perkin's conspirators in Flanders, has defected and come back to England. King Henry thereupon commands to move the court to the Tower of London. (All Ford's source chronicles, i.e., those by Hall, Gainsford and Bacon.)

*Scene II:* In Scotland, Lord Dalyell is encouraged by Lord Huntly to court his daughter, Lady Katherine Gordon. The young lady tells the young nobleman that when ripeness of time and experience comes, she will consider Dalyell's proposal. (Ford's own creation.) Perkin Warbeck arrives at the Scottish court. (All Ford's source chronicles.)

*Scene III:* Clifford, in the Tower, confesses his wrongs and begs for the King's pardon. Then he reveals that Sir William Stanley, the Lord Chamberlain, is Perkin's chief conspirator in England, to the great surprise of the King. Stanley is put under arrest at once. (All Ford's source chronicles.) Daubeney brings the news that the Cornish, resenting the subsidies levied on them by the King, have risen in revolt. Ford here alters the chronology of his sources: the Cornish rising does not occur until after the first Scottish incursion on England.

## Act II

*Scene I:* Perkin Warbeck is warmly received at the Scottish court. He delivers an impressive speech before King James and the Scottish lords, claiming to be the Duke of York in distress. King James promises to take up his cause. (All Ford's source chronicles, except that the speech is based on Bacon's version.) Lady Katherine is greatly moved by Perkin's speech. (Ford's own creation, perhaps influenced by Warner's and Gainsford's accounts.)

*Scene II:* Stanley is condemned and then executed. 'Before he is led away to be executed, Stanley marks a cross on Clifford's face as a traitor's infamy. Daubeney

is made Lord Chamberlain. King Henry makes arrangements of his troops to cope with the Cornish rebels and the coming Scottish invasion which he foresees. (The episode between Clifford and Stanley, and the King's foreseeing the Scottish invasion are Ford's creation. The other incidents are based on his source chronicles.)

*Scene III:* In spite of the objection of Lord Huntley, King James commands Katherine to marry Perkin, and Katherine willingly agrees, to the dismay of Dalyell. Warbeck and his counsellors are all delighted at this connection. While preparing for some celebration with the other counsellors, Frion is annoyed at these vulgar simpletons. (Except for the marriage and the low social origins of three of Perkin's counsellors, which are in the source chronicles, Ford's imagination has put in the other details.)

### Act III

*Scene I:* The Cornish rebels meet brave resistance, instead of help, from the men of Kent. Then coming to Blackheath, the rebels are caught unprepared when the King's armies attack them on Saturday, when they expect to fight on Monday. After some resistance they are defeated. The leaders, Lord Audley, Flammock and Joseph are executed. King Henry allows the others to flee to Cornwall, and he continues to have the subsidies collected. (Ford's chronicle sources provide the facts, except that the Cornish rising is isolated without even the Scottish incursion (historically, the second one) mentioned yet. The Scottish actually invade again when King Henry is busy with the Cornish.)

*Scene II:* At the Scottish court Perkin and his newly married wife are entertained by King James with masques; while Huntley and Dalyell share their sorrow and sympathy. At the same time Scottish troops are gathered to attack England. King James and Perkin who has his proclamation ready are to join the troops. Perkin and Katherine pledge their love before departing. (The main facts are based on the source chronicles; Ford has put in the details of the emotion between Perkin, Katherine, Huntley and Dalyell.)

*Scene III:* Now the Spanish king sends his ambassador to Scotland, Pedro Hialas, privately first to King Henry, in order to arrange a peace between England and Scotland. Hialas requests King Henry to send an envoy to join him, when the time is ripe, to negotiate peace in Scotland. Hialas also makes it clear that King Ferdinand has sworn that the marriage between his daughter and King Henry's

son should never be concluded as long as the Earl of Warwick is living. (The mission of Hialas is in all the source chronicles, for the attitude of King Ferdinand toward the Earl of Warwick, Gainsford is the source.)

*Scene IV*; King James, accompanied by Perkin, invades England with his troops and besieged Norham Castle. The Bishop of Durham refuses to surrender but advises King James to shake off Perkin and make peace with King Henry. Perkin can make only vain protests since no English people have come, as he says they will, to his aid. Yet when King James orders his troops to forage through the country, Perkin weeping petitions him to refrain from damaging "his country" and slaughtering "his people". King James ridicules this foolish mercy. Then news comes that the Cornish rebellion has been pacified, and English troops under the Earl of Surrey are coming to raise the siege. James therefore retreats. (Ford has combined the two Scottish incursions into one. According to the chronicles, Perkin's proclamation, the Scottish foraging and Perkin's petition happen at the first invasion, and Norham Castle is besieged on the occasion of the second invasion. Only Gainsford clearly mentions that Perkin is with King James on the second incursion. The details, like the dialogue between James and the Bishop of Durham, are Ford's.)

#### Act IV

*Scene I*: After the Earl of Surrey's troops enter Scotland and destroy several castles in pursuit of King James, Marchmount, the Scottish herald, comes to deliver James's challenge to Surrey for single battle to save shedding of innocent blood. James asks for the town of Berwick as reward if he wins, and offers to pay Surrey one thousand pounds if he is defeated. Surrey replies that he is honoured by the offer. Because the town does not belong to him, he can only offer himself to James if defeated; if he wins, he will give the king liberty without any condition. The Bishop of Durham goes to Scotland with the herald to negotiate peace. (The Marchmount episode is not in Bacon, but in Hall and Gainsford. The Bishop of Durham is sent to Scotland to negotiate peace when Hialas gives King Henry notice of the Scottish King's willingness. Ford has altered this.)

*Scene II*: Owing to Hialas's effort, King James begins to treat Perkin with growing indifference. Perkin, feeling the adverse development, confers with his counsellors. Frion advises him to go to Cornwall since letters have come from

Ireland to Perkin, saying that the Cornish resent their last defeat and welcome Perkin to join them. The other counsellors all express their consent, in their usual, vulgar way. Thus they decide that they should go to Cornwall to try their luck after leaving Scotland. (Hialas's efforts to bring about a peace treaty eventually lead to James's demand for Perkin to leave Scotland. Also, the chronicles say, Perkin receives letters from the Cornish only when he reaches Ireland after leaving Scotland. Ford has altered the latter fact and created the counsel scene.)

*Scene III:* Hialas and the Bishop of Durham have eventually persuaded James to join other Christian countries in a league of amity with England. James expects to marry Margaret, daughter to King Henry, which Durham proposes to bring about. However, James refuses to deliver Perkin to the English, but insists on keeping his word and letting Perkin leave in safety. James promises to cease hostilities and send Huntley to England for negotiations. Then he tells Perkin why he must leave, and that his departure will be provided. (So far the facts are from the source chronicles.) Perkin thanks James in his stately and pompous language for the treatment he has been favoured with at the Scottish court; he asks to be allowed to take Katherine, his wife, with him. He soothes Katherine and sends Frion to Flanders to deliver the news. Huntley bids the couple farewell; Dalyell decides to follow Katherine to wait on her, and is welcomed by Perkin for his noble love. Then they depart. (This second part is chiefly Ford's creation, though the chronicles mention that Perkin thanks James; Perkin's speech is perhaps influenced by Gainsford's version which includes a long speech.)

*Scene IV:* In London it is learned that King James has failed to fight Surrey in single combat as he had offered. In the meantime, King Henry keeps close watch over the Cornish. After Frion is caught by Durham, King Henry, with great foresight, dispatches Dawbeney and Oxford with their troops to Salisbury; the King himself leading more troops follows up. A messenger is sent in haste to Exeter to warn them of the coming attack on the city by the Cornish. (Hall and Gainsford both say that King James does not fight the single combat as he offers to do: Bacon does not mention at all the challenge. According to all the source chronicles, King Henry does not dispatch troops to Salisbury until the Cornish, under the leadership of Perkin, attack Exeter. Ford has changed the fact.)

*Scene V:* After a sea journey, Perkin, Katherine and their followers reach Bodmin in Cornwall. The Cornish welcome Perkin as their leader and proclaim him Richard the Forth, monarch of England. Four thousand rebels are gathered.

They march on to Exeter to besiege the city. This is the first attack that Perkin actively takes part in. He invokes the blessings of heaven and the divinity of royal birth to help him. (The incidents are based on the source chronicles, except for Perkin's invocation for help which is only hinted at. Also, Perkin has come to Bodmin from Ireland, not from Scotland directly.)

## Act V

*Scene I:* Katherine, Dalyell and her servants, while on their way to the ships, are captured by the Earl of Oxford. Just before this, Katherine has learned that the Cornish have been repulsed by King Henry's armies. From Exeter Perkin leads the troops to Taunton, still pursued by the royal troops. Then the night before the battle, with a few followers, Perkin flees, closely followed by Daubeney's horsemen. Katherine and Dalyell are escorted by Oxford politely to see King Henry while Oxford conveys the King's admiration for Dalyell. Katherine is duly treated as a Scottish princess. (The incidents are from Ford's source chronicles except for the part of Dalyell's involving in this episode.)

*Scene II:* King Henry learns that Perkin has escaped, but he is sure that the pretender cannot steal out of England. In the meantime a treaty of peace has been concluded between England and Scotland. King Henry thanks the people of Exeter for their brave resistance and also rewards his loyal lords. Then, Perkin and his few followers, after surrendering themselves from sanctuary to Daubeney, are brought before the King. Perkin, Henry thinks, is a handsome youth, but not much to wonder about. Despite King Henry's satirical mockery, Perkin does not waver in the belief of his royal birth. He is willing to meet execution rather than admitting to be a counterfeit, requesting mercy only for his followers. Even King Henry thinks that he is brave. Eventually, his followers all beg for mercy. Perkin and his followers are all conveyed to London to be put in the Tower of London. The King hopes that time may restore their wits because he thinks that "the custom of being styled a king" has fastened in Perkin's thought that he is such. Then Katherine and Dalyell are presented to the king. King Henry treats her with great favour and promises to keep her at his court with a great pension, before he goes back to London. (Of Ford's three sources, only Gainsford says that Perkin is brought before the King and that the King, thinking he is only superficially instructed, does not wonder at him. The sources say that Katherine is brought to

the King before Perkin's surrender; and that only Bacon says the King gives "very honourable *Allowance*" (1622 End., 184). Ford has put in the other details.)<sup>134</sup>

*Scene III*: Now in London Perkin is being tried for twice escaping from the Tower of London. He is sentenced by a jury to death by hanging. He is first put in the stocks to be shown to the public. Urswick taunts him, tries to persuade him to clear his conscience, and also blames him for having brought about the death sentence of the Earl of Warwick by involving him in Perkin's attempt to escape. Perkin is urged to confess his true parentage. Lambert Simnel is also on the scene to ridicule Perkin, and says that Perkin's pedigree--son of a Jew, Osbeck of Tourney--has been published. Perkin Warbeck, however, does not even admit King Henry as the king of England, but calls him Duke of Richmond. Simnel advises Perkin to confess and hope for pardon, yet Perkin dismisses this thought as not possible in him. Katherine comes to bid Perkin farewell, in spite of Oxford's charge that it is a shame unworthy of her status. Perkin and Katherine pledge their love for each other, and she vows to die a faithful widow to his bed. At this moment, Huntley, the Scottish ambassador, comes; he glories in Katherine's constancy though he wishes he were not present. He also bids Perkin a farewell of pity. Katherine, fainting, is taken away by Dalyell, before Perkin and his followers are hanged. Perkin, to the last, defies his executioners, and attributes his death and that of the Earl of Warwick to the will of heaven. He encourages his followers to spurn cowardly passions, so that they will have illustrious names after death. (According to the source chronicles, Perkin is put in the Tower after his first unsuccessful attempt. After the ill-fated attempt to escape from the Tower is discovered, he is tried, put in the stocks again to read his Confession which reveals his true humble origin, and then hanged, together with John a Water and his son. The noble pledge of love performed by Perkin and Katherine, the presence of Simnel, Huntley, etc. and Perkin's faith in his noble birth and his spirit of defiance are all Ford's own creation. Simnel's claim that Perkin is son of a Jew, is, of course, drawn by Ford from Bacon's mistaken account. That the death of the Earl of Warwick is caused by his being involved in Perkin's plot to escape is also in all the three sources.)

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (1951), II, 635.

<sup>2</sup> See Henry Weber, ed., *Dramatic Works of John Ford* (Edinburgh 1811), II, 3-4; Mildred C. Struble, ed., *A Critical Edition of Ford's Perkin Warbeck* (Seattle, 1926), 31, 36-7; G. E. Bentley, ed., *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (Oxford, 1941-56), III, 455.

<sup>3</sup> Wilhelm Busch, *England under the Tudors: Vol. I. King Henry VII* (1895), Tr. Alice Todd, 336.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 336. See also James Gairdner, *Richard the Third* (1898), 272. Gairdner says Vergil first stated that Perkin was instructed by the Duchess of Burgundy.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 396.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 398.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 336. See also Gladys Temperly, *Henry VII* (1917), 158-59, 420-21; Gairdner, 263-336; G. R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* (1957), 24-6.

<sup>8</sup> Edward Hall, *The Union of The Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke* (1548), "Henry VII", Fol.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Fol. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Hall, Fol. xxx-li.

<sup>11</sup> Hall, Fol. xxx; Grafton, *A Chronicle at Large and Meere History etc.* (1569), 191-92; Holinshed, *Chronicles, The Third Volume of*, (1586), 776; Stow, *The Annales* (1615), 477; Speed, *The Historie of Great Britaine* (1623), 750, gives Andre's version of Perkin being son of a converted Jew and his early abode in England, but the same story as in Hall of how he began the impersonation; Gainsford, *The True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck* (1618), 33; Bacon, *Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh* (1622), 113-18. See also William Warner, *Albion's England* (1612), 168-69, Warner's account is that Perkin was first persuaded by rebels in Cork to impersonate the Duke of York, and then sent to the Duchess of Burgundy who trained him for the adventure.

<sup>12</sup> Gainsford, 106, Grafton, 929-30, Perkin's confession.

<sup>13</sup> Holinshed, *The Third Volume of Chronicles* (1586), 786, Perkin's confession.

- 14 Hall, Fol. xl; Holinshed, 781; Gainsford, 72-73; Bacon, 160.
- 15 Warner, 169, 170.
- 16 Hall, Fol. xxxix; Holinshed, 780; Stow, 479; Speed, 753; Gainsford, 68-70; Bacon, 153.
- 17 Warner, 170.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 177.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 185-86.
- 20 Hall, Fol. xlvii; Holinshed, 784; Stow, 481; Speed, 756.
- 21 Speed, 749. "Ber. Andr. MS" is given in the margin as source.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 750.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 750v.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 752v.
- 25 Gainsford, 106.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 33.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 68-70.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 101.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 102-103.
- 30 Hall, Fol. xlixv-1; Grafton, 930; Holinshed, 786; Gainsford, 106-08.
- 31 Gainsford, 107.
- 32 *Ibid.*
- 33 Hall, Fol. 1; Gainsford, 108.
- 34 Gainsford, 108.
- 35 Hall, Fol. xlv.
- 36 Gainsford, 108.
- 37 Busch, 416-17.
- 38 Bacon, 114.
- 39 Speed, 749.
- 40 James Gairdner, "The Story of Perkin Warbeck from Original Documents" appended to *History of the Life and Reign of Richard III* (New and Rev. edn., 1898), 270-72.
- 41 Bacon, 114-15.
- 42 Hall, Fol. xlixv.
- 43 Bacon, 187.
- 44 Bacon, 115. See also Busch, 419.
- 45 Bacon, 115-16.

- 46 Gairdner, 272.
- 47 Bacon, 117-18.
- 48 *Ibid.*, 132.
- 49 *Ibid.*, 148-53.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 152.
- 51 Bacon, 154-60.
- 52 Gainsford, 71-72.
- 53 Bacon, 154.
- 54 Hall, Fol. xlvi.
- 55 *Ibid.*, Fol. 1.
- 56 *Ibid.*, Fol. 1i-Fol. liv.
- 57 Gainsford, 93.
- 58 *Ibid.*, 108.
- 59 Bacon, 118.
- 60 *Ibid.*, 119.
- 61 *Ibid.*, 179.
- 62 Bacon, 195; Hall, Fol. li; Gainsford, 111.
- 63 Bacon, 195.
- 64 *Ibid.*, 184.
- 65 *Ibid.*, 187.
- 66 Hall, Fol. xlixv.
- 67 Bacon, 186-87.
- 68 *Ibid.*, 117.
- 69 Hall, Fol. liv.
- 70 Gainsford, pp. 111-12.
- 71 Bacon, 193.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 195-96.
- 73 Gerard Langbaine, the Younger, *Momus Triumphans or the Plagiaries of the English Stage* (1688), 9.
- 74 Gerard Langbaine, the Younger, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (1691), I, 221.
- 75 Gerard Langbaine, the Younger, *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets* (1699), 62.
- 76 M. Joan Sargeant, *John Ford* (Oxford, 1935), 113.
- 77 Henry Weber, ed., *The Dramatic Works of John Ford* (Edinburgh,

1811), II, 3-4.

<sup>78</sup> Henry De Vocht, ed., *John Ford's Dramatic Works* (*Materialien zur Kunde des Alteren Englischen Dramas*, New Series, First Volume, Louvain, 1927), 163. Later references of the text of the play are also to this reprint of the 1634 quarto edition.

<sup>79</sup> William Gifford, ed., rev. A. Dyce, *The Works of John Ford* (1869), II, 111. Gifford's original edition was published in 1827 and Dyce has not added anything to the note in question.

<sup>80</sup> Havelock Ellis, ed., *John Ford* (The Mermaid Series, 1888), 378, 380.

<sup>81</sup> H. Macaulay Fitzgibbon, ed., *Famous Elizabethan Plays* (1890), 367.

<sup>82</sup> Victor Gehler, "Das Verhaltnis von Ford's 'Perkin Warbeck' zu F. Bacon's 'Henry VII'" (Halle, 1895).

<sup>83</sup> Emil Koepfel, *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's und John Ford's* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, LXXXII, Strasbourg, 1897), 188, n. 2.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 189 ff.

<sup>85</sup> A. W. Ward, *A History of English Dramatic Literature* (New and Rev. Edn., 1899), III, 85.

<sup>86</sup> Felix E. Schelling, *English Chronicle Play* (New York, 1902), 262; and *Elizabethan Drama* (New York, 1908), I, 305.

<sup>87</sup> *Elizabethan Drama*, II, 535.

<sup>88</sup> J. P. Pickburn and J. L. G. Brereton, ed. *Perkin Warbeck* (Sydney, Melbourne, 1896), v-xxv, 93-145.

<sup>89</sup> J. L. G. Brereton, "The Sources of Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*" (*Anglia*, 1911), 194-234.

<sup>90</sup> Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama*, II, 535.

<sup>91</sup> Emil Koepfel, "John Ford's *Chronicle Play of Perkin Warbeck* und Thomas Gainsford's *History of Perkin Warbeck*", *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, Vol. XXII, 1911, 212-16.

<sup>92</sup> *Anglia* (1926), 88-91.

<sup>93</sup> Mildred C. Struble, ed., *A Critical Edition of Ford's Perkin Warbeck* (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, III, Seattle, 1926).

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 212.

<sup>95</sup> Koepfel, "John Ford's *Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck und Thomas*

- Gainsford's *History of Warbeck*, 212.
- 96 See Struble.
  - 97 *John Ford*, 113.
  - 98 See Footnote 83.
  - 99 *John Ford*, 218, n. 19.
  - 100 *A Critical Edition of Ford's Perkin Warbeck*, 125.
  - 101 Koeppel, "John Ford's *Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck* und Thomas Gainsford's *History of Warbeck*", 212.
  - 102 Sargeant, *John Ford*, 113-16.
  - 103 John J. O'Conner, "William Warner and Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*", *N and Q*, new series, II, 6 (1955), 233-35.
  - 104 *Ibid.*, 234.
  - 105 *Ibid.*, 235.
  - 106 Warner, 177-84.
  - 107 Donald K. Anderson, Jr., ed., *Perkin Warbeck* (Regents Renaissance Drama Series; London, 1966).
  - 108 *Ibid.*, xi.
  - 109 *Ibid.*, xi.
  - 110 *Ibid.*, xii.
  - 111 *Ibid.*
  - 112 Hall, Fol. 1; Gainsford, 107-08.
  - 113 Peter Ure, ed., *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck* (the Revels Plays Series, London 1968).
  - 114 *Ibid.*, xxx-xxxv.
  - 115 *Ibid.*, xxxvii.
  - 116 *Ibid.*
  - 117 *Ibid.*, xl-xlii.
  - 118 *Ibid.*, 180.
  - 119 *Ibid.*, xliii.
  - 120 *Ibid.*, xliv-xlv.
  - 121 *Ibid.*, xxxv.
  - 122 Henry de Vocht, ed., *John Ford's Dramatic Works* (Louvain, 1927).
  - 123 *The Harleian Miscellany* was published in London, in 1744-46, 1808-11, and 1803-13.
  - 124 Struble, *Critical Edition*, 117-57.

- 125 Koeppel, *Quellen-Studien*, etc., 189-92; article in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XXII, 212-16. Anderson, *Edn.*, 45, note to III, i, 5-7; 46, note to III, i, 20; 74, note to IV, iii, 65-7; 89, notes to V, i, 20, 25-28; 90, notes to V, ii, 29, 40-2. M. Sargeaunt, *John Ford*, 114-16. Ure, *Edn.*, 64, note to III, i, 52-3. This paper
- 126 Ure, *Edn.*, xxxvi.
- 127 Ure, 16; M. Struble, *Critical Edn.*, 119.
- 128 Ure, 31; M. Struble, *Critical Edn.*, 124-25.
- 129 This paper, 47.
- 130 Ure, 40.
- 131 *Ibid.*, 118, note to 67-8.
- 132 Struble, *Critical Edn.*, 153-54.
- 133 Weber, ed., *The Dramatic Works of John Ford*, II,
- 134 Professor Ure says in one place (*Perkin Warbeck*, (1968), 120, note to location of Act V, Scene ii) that Hall says that Warbeck was brought before Henry at Exeter; but subsequently he makes it clear that Hall does not in fact say that (122, note to V, ii, 31).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Jr., Donald K. ed. *Perkin Warbeck*. London, 1966.
- Andre, Bernard. *De Vita atque gestis Henrici Septimi*. London, 1500?.
- Bacon, Francis. *Historie of the raigne of King Henry the seventh*. London, 1622.
- Bentley, G. E. ed. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*. Oxford, 1941-1956.
- Brereton, J. L. G. "The Sources of Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*", *Anglia*, 1911.
- Busch, Wilhelm. *England under the Tudors (Vol. I. King Henry VIII)*, London, 1895.
- De Vocht, Henry. ed. *John Ford's Dramatic Works*. Louvain, 1927.
- Ellis, Havelock. ed. *John Ford (Five Plays)*. London, 1888.
- Fabyan, Robert. *The New Chronicles of England and France in Two Parts*. London, 1516.
- Fitzgibbon, H. Macaulay. ed. *Famous Elizabethan Plays*. London, 1890.
- Ford, John. *Perkin Warbeck*, London, 1634.
- Gainsford, Thomas. *The True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck*. London, 1618.
- Gairdner, James. *History of the Life and Reign of Richard the Third*. 1898.

- Grafton, Richard. *A Chronicle at Large and Meere History of the Affayres of England*. London, 1568.
- Greg. W. W. *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, London, 1951.
- Hall, Edward. *The Union of the two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*. London, 1548.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*. 3 Vols. London, 1587.
- Koeppel, Emil. "John Ford's *Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck* and Thomas Gainsford's *History of Warbeck*," *Beiblatt zur Anglia* Vol. XXII. 1911.
- . *Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's und John Ford's*. Strassburg, 1897.
- Langbaine the Younger, Gerard. *Momus Triumphans or the Plagiaries of the English Stage*. London, 1688.
- . *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*. London, 1691.
- . *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*. London, 1699.
- O'Conner, John J. "William Warner and Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*", *Notes and Queries*, New Series, II, 6 (1955).
- Pickburn, J..P. and Brereton, J. L. G. eds. *Perkin Warbeck*. Sydney, Melbourne, 1896.
- Sargeaunt, M. Joan. *John Ford*. Oxford, 1935.
- Schelling, Felix E. *English Chronile Play* New York, 1902.
- . *Elizabethan Drama*. New York, 1908.
- Speed, John. *The History of Great Britaine*. London, 1611.
- Stow, John. *The Annals of England*. London, 1592.
- Struble, Mildred C. ed. *A Critical Edition of Ford's Perkin Warbeck*. Seattle, 1926.
- Ure, Peter. ed. *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck*. London, 1968.
- Vergil, Polydore. *Anglicae Historiae*. London, 1516.
- Ward, A. W. *A History of English Dramatic Literature*. London, 1899.
- Warner, William. *Albion's England*. London, 1612.
- Weber, Henry. ed. *The Dramatic Works of John Ford*. Edinburgh, 1811.

## 文學院 英語系

滕 以 魯

### 〔中文摘要〕

英國劇作家約翰·傅德（一五八六～一六四〇）係英國文學中燦爛輝煌之伊莉莎白時代最後一位重要劇作家。他著有戲劇十餘部，現仍流傳者有獨力著作劇本八部。此八部中「普欽·吳貝克」為其唯一之歷史劇。此劇描述英國國王亨利第七時代，僭位者普欽·吳貝克，受舊王朝遺民嗾使，自認為英國真命天子。希圖奪取英國王位，爭取外援，興兵作亂，而終於被擒正法的故事。此劇結構謹嚴，劇情進展暢達緊湊，人物刻劃深刻，感人良深，久為批評家所讚譽。

本論文「約翰·傅德運用「普欽·吳貝克」出處素材之藝術」係就此劇之歷史來源、文辭出處作一研究。根據此一研究，傅德此部名劇之主要情節及部份辭句皆根據當時歷史作品。但傅氏天才橫溢，亦多有改動、增益及獨創之處。總之，此劇史實、創意皆備，無怪乎其享譽甚久也。本論文共分下列五部份：

#### 導言

第一章：英國史書中之普欽·吳貝克故事沿革。

第二章：關於傅德「普欽·吳貝克」來源研究之綜合評述。

第三章：傅德在此劇中取材自史書部份及獨創部份詳述。

#### 附註

書目（共三十餘種重要參考書）