

GRASSI, HISTORICITY, AND RHETORICAL PRESENCE
IN JOHN FORD'S *PERKIN WARBECK*

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FUFULLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

CATHERINE MURRAY, BA, MA

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 1997

Copyright © Catherine Murray, 1997

All rights reserved

To
my late mother, Catherine Ellis Speer,
author of *Bergson's Theory of Individuality and the Self*,
and my aunt, Camille Svensson, translator of
the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, and
the *Brahma Sutras*.

These brave women struggled
to achieve educations and careers
during the Depression of the 1930s and survived
to teach me the joy of learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my greatest appreciation to William E. Tanner who awakened my consciousness to Ernesto Grassi. He also encouraged my global methods of discovery and invention, and he guided me through the labyrinth of revisions and deadlines. I also thank Florence T. Winston who taught me that the essence of an education is the ability to take what I have learned experientially or academically and apply the knowledge to other areas experientially or academically. Both Dr. Tanner and Dr. Winston instilled in me a love of the Renaissance. Also, I wish to thank Joyce Palmer for her keen awareness of details. Only an eighteenth-century scholar like Dr. Palmer is likely to have such astute simultaneous awareness of mechanics and content.

For love, encouragement, and humor, I am grateful to my sister Jan Richter and my close friend Tracy Garvin.

ABSTRACT

GRASSI, HISTORICITY, AND RHETORICAL PRESENCE

IN JOHN FORD'S *PERKIN WARBECK*

CATHERINE MURRAY

MAY 1997

This research acknowledges history and drama as dynamic, not static. The reading or viewing audience takes an active role in rewriting or re-viewing what is read on print or seen and heard on stage. Every audience member brings to the book or the stage rhetorical presences which modify a person's experience of the book or performance. Also, every author, playwright, director, actor, and costume designer brings various rhetorical presences to the writing process or the performance which affect the rhetorical presences of audience members.

John Ford published *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth* in 1634. Despite naming the drama "a chronicle history," Ford took license and changed certain details about his title character that were established in published chronicles. Perkin Warbeck, who claimed the English throne in the 1490s, is presented as a likable character by Ford, not as the cowardly traitor like the Tudor chronicles' depiction of him.

Chapter 1 explores both the historical Perkin and Ford's imaginative representation of him. Quite possibly, Ford consciously intended each individual

audience member to choose for himself or herself which one of Ford's imaginative representations should rule as monarch.

Chapter 2 compares Perkin to his archrival, King Henry VII,¹ and to the mythical King Arthur. This chapter speculates on how the Caroline audience reacted to the language of Ford's imaginative representation of Perkin and the imaginative representation of Henry VII.

Chapter 3 presents Katherine, Perkin's great love, as the muse of *Perkin Warbeck*. Like a muse, Katherine inspires Perkin to his most exalted lines. Katherine also demonstrates superhuman qualities such as constant devotion to Perkin despite his change of fortunes and extraordinary beauty. Chapter 3 speculates as to how different Caroline audience members reacted to Katherine.

Chapter 4 summarizes the major findings of the study and suggests avenues for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER	
I. A HISTORY COUCHED IN A PLAY	1
II. FROM IMPOSTER TO ONCE AND FUTURE KING	40
III. KATHERINE AND THE LINK WITH THE OBJECTIVE	71
IV. MEDITATING RHETORICAL PRESENCE TO ENVISION	
OTHER TAPESTRIES	100
WORKS CONSULTED	110

CHAPTER 1

A HISTORY COUCHED IN A PLAY

——John Ford

Drama generates exciting strategies of rhetoric which involve both the written script and live performances. Each director, actor, costume designer, and sound director contributes sundry interpretations to a single play. Individual performances by the same director, actors, and stage crew have unique energies that evoke a transitional bonding between the audience and the artists. Drama is a dynamic art.

Despite the vibrant atmosphere surrounding live performances, critics of earlier drama periods often designate static appellations for plays that these critics have never seen. Sometimes such labels pertain to whole eras. The Caroline theater (1625-42) was deemed “decadent” by the Victorians. Martin Butler explains that early critics viewed the Caroline stage as “withdrawing into a world of escapism, fantasy and romance, designed to divert its courtly auditors from the reality of their impending doom” (1). The “impending doom” that Butler describes is the closing of the theaters by a puritan-swayed parliament and the launching of the English Civil War which later led to the execution of Charles I in 1649. Despite the national crisis in its midst, Butler maintains that the Caroline stage cannot be liable for its own demise, especially “since judgements of the quality of this drama depend crucially on beliefs about its responsiveness, or indifference, towards puritanism” (1). Butler observes that, rather

than showing an indifference to the rise of puritanism, the last decade of Caroline drama (1632-42) demonstrated a continuous political debate and that some of these “debates” leaned toward puritanism itself. Butler’s argument dispels the axiom that the Stuart theater was essentially protected and fostered by the court. Whether the plays could be labeled “opposition” or “puritan,” their political facets “frequently carry major levels of meaning” (1-2).

In light of the political dynamics noted by Butler, Caroline playwright¹ John Ford counterbalances the critic Butler with some observations of static performances among the plethora of plays that hit the Caroline stage. In his prologue to *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth*, Ford describes certain contemporary plays as “antic follies” that “want of truth in them who give the praise / To their self—love, presuming to out—do / The writer, or—for need—the actors too” (ll. 8—10). In contrast, *Perkin Warbeck* the “out of fashion” (l. 2) history play requires “clearer judgements” (l. 13) from the audience and lacks “Unnecessary mirth forced to endear / A multitude” (ll. 24—25).

Despite Ford’s rather harsh statement concerning some fellow playwrights, neither have written counterattacks been discovered nor has evidence pointed to the diminishment of Ford’s popularity with his last known extant play. An explanation for the apparent contemporary success of *Perkin Warbeck* may lie in John Ford’s ability to

¹ Critics disagree as to when Ford’s plays were penned. *Perkin Warbeck* entered Stationers Registry in 1633 during the Caroline period. This study focuses on the Caroline audience’s response to *Perkin Warbeck*. Since drama is a dynamic art, plays are modified frequently before the script is published.

create a text that translates history into dynamic imaginative representations rather than static records. Instead of a chronicle of mere past events, *Perkin Warbeck* unlayers events that have changed and are changing through the course of time so that reference can be made to the long destiny of British culture. History experienced as drama, poetry, or fiction affects an audience in a more personal manner than history experienced as a series of actions completed.

Although Shakespeare's dynamic history plays are precursors to Ford's, an audience experiencing any of the Lancaster-York dramas would not ask, "Who is the hero?" or "Who is the true king?" Surprisingly, Ford poses both of these existential questions in *Perkin Warbeck*, and thus he extends the dynamics of historicity. The king was the central figure in Renaissance consciousness, the earthly ruler who corresponds to God, the heavenly ruler. Many in the seventeenth century had commenced to question the divine birthright of monarchs. This uncertainty of divine birthright made possible the puritan rebellion, the Civil War, and the establishment of the Commonwealth. However, as the restoration of the English throne shows, the desire for a king was embedded deeply in the human heart and could not easily be eradicated. Since time immemorial, countless legends have been told and retold of ideal monarchs appearing mysteriously and discovering identities as lost sons of great kings. Rather than replacing an ineffective monarch with a less traditional figure, people hoped that a true king would reappear. Perhaps Ford's existential question regarding kingship explains the words "strange truth" in the full title: *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth*. The "truth" of the king's identity is

“strange” because of its indefiniteness and changeability. One audience member may choose Henry VII as the worthy monarch, another may choose Perkin Warbeck, and still another may have mixed feelings toward both the ruling king and the claimant in *Perkin Warbeck*. Although the chronicles available to John Ford were Tudor biased and thus more favorable to Henry VII, contemporary historians (like Ford) generate more questions than answers regarding Perkin Warbeck and his claim to the throne.

Italian humanists and twentieth-century philosopher Ernesto Grassi share Ford’s nonlinear view of history, a view out of fashion by the early seventeenth century. Grassi argues that chronicle history written in formal, unemotional language that contains no parables and few quotations fails to provide meaning for humans because the text is void of humanistic qualities. Explaining why he began his work *Rhetoric as Philosophy* with an autobiographical reference, Grassi states, “I believe it is always important to return to the personal situation out of which one’s own thought arises, in order to clarify the theoretical problems that concern one’s self” (4). Donald Phillip Verene editor of Grassi’s *Folly and Insanity in Renaissance Literature* demonstrates that philosophy can be turned into literature by centering philosophical thought on praxis, which Verene defines as “the particular human situation.” Literature, according to Verene, “is a way of forming a meaning without losing the details and emotions of an event.” Grassi’s editor reasons that “the fable, the tale, the narration has a universal meaning, but this meaning is achieved through the relating of particular events and qualities” (10).

Ford yokes the meaning to “particular events and qualities” when he declares, in the prologue, that *Perkin Warbeck* is “a history couched in a play; / A history of noble mention, known, / Famous and true, ‘cause our own.” Ford’s play was not “forged from Italy, from France, from Spain, / But chronicled at home” (ll. 14-18). Shakespeare, Webster, Middleton and Rowley, and even Ford, situated dramas in Italy or Spain so that British political and social problems spotlighted in the plays would be less likely to anger members of the audience and to raise the ire of the censors. *Perkin Warbeck*, set in England and Scotland, surrounds the delicate subject of an alleged impostor to the English throne. Unlike the Perkin Warbeck of the chronicles, Ford’s imaginative representation of the historical figure never confesses the alleged imposture, and Ford’s Perkin Warbeck exhibits supreme grace and noble rhetoric even moments before his execution.

Though the historical events on which Ford based his play occurred some 140 years previously, the precarious questions regarding kingship are not safely set in the past. Charles I in the audience would have created a powerful rhetorical presence that transcended the 140-year time span. Rhetorical strategy of presence provides details and emotions of an event. Members of an audience experience these details and emotions by connecting language, setting, action, symbolic action, or stage properties with unifying details or events intertextually or experientially. Chaim Perelman explains rhetorical presence in his statement: “Presence acts directly upon our sensibility. The presentation of an object—Caesar’s bloody tunic as brandished by Antony, the children of the victim of the accused—can effectively move the audience

or the jury” (35). Ford adjoined an individual playgoer’s sensibility by focussing on how to bring her attention to objects and ideas that are not immediately present. In the following statement, Perelman reaffirms the importance of rhetorical presence: “The tie which is established between the presence to consciousness of certain elements and the importance we give them has allowed us to see in rhetoric alone the art of creating this presence, thanks to the techniques of presentation.” Perelman identifies some major strategies of rhetoric : repetition, accumulation of detail, and accentuation of particular passages. (37)

For instance, the repetition of the word *king* in the play connects the two reigning kings with Perkin Warbeck, who claims the right to the throne. Caroline playgoers could also associate any of these three characters with Charles I or any other sovereign present. The Phoenix Theatre, not large during the Caroline era, required anyone attending performances at which Charles I was physically present to sit within a few feet from their king. Since the Caroline theater was externally under royal dominion, Charles I was rhetorically present even at the performances which he did not attend. Perhaps Caroline audience members asked themselves during a performance, “Would the king approve of this?” or “Will the king enjoy this?” or even “Does the king know this is aimed at him?”

Besides Charles I’s physical and judicial being, his lineage also provided rhetorical presence. The two reigning kings in *Perkin Warbeck*, Henry VII of England and James IV of Scotland, are direct ancestors of Charles I. If the historical Perkin Warbeck had reclaimed the throne from Henry VII, Charles I would be less likely to

rule England in the 1630s. Evidence shows the probability that certain members of the Caroline audience chose Perkin Warbeck over Henry VII as the true king and hero.

John Ford drew his imaginative representation of Perkin Warbeck primarily from Francis Bacon's *History of King Henry the Seventh* and also from the Tudor historians, Raphael Holinshed and Edward Hall. J. Le Gay Brereton asserts that the chronicles were rather derivative. Although Brereton states that the origins of some scenes or passages in *Perkin Warbeck* can be determined, "there is much in the play which might have been drawn as easily from one history of the period as another" (195). For example, Brereton points out that Holinshed added no original research to the story of Perkin Warbeck but that he merely condensed his version from Edward Hall's chronicles (194). Nevertheless, John Ford placed some of Holinshed's language into the mouths of Henry VII and his men. Referring to Margaret of Burgundy (a noblewoman who aided Perkin), *Holinshed's Chronicle* states that "she put hir irons afresh into the fier to set hir hatred foreward" (Brereton 196). Similarly, the Earl of Oxford vociferates in 1.1, "Margaret of Burgundy / Blows fresh coals of division" (ll. 118-19). Accordingly, any Caroline audience member who connected the Earl of Oxford's words to *Holinshed's Chronicle* could experience a rhetorical presence of Holinshed in *Perkin Warbeck*.

Ernesto Grassi clarifies the rather complicated concept of rhetorical presence by identifying it with *ingegno*, defined as "the recognition of connections and of similarities (similitudines) between the claims made upon us as beings and the possible ways in which we can interpret sense knowledge." Grassi further asserts that "only on

the basis of this metaphorical vision does the historical world unveil itself” (*Folly and Insanity* 115). Hall, Holinshed, and Bacon provided Ford with the “metaphorical vision” of people long deceased, and Ford adds new embroidery to transform Perkin Warbeck from an imprudent impostor to (in the minds of some audience members) a once and future king. Ford achieves such a feat by yoking the past and future with the present (here and now). In Grassi’s words: “the theater of world history proves to be a continuous metaphor” (*Folly and Insanity* 115). Ford weaves the metaphorical vision of the chronicles into his imaginative representation, though he does not unravel the chronicles’ static tone. Instead, Ford places the static, judgmental, authoritarian language of the chronicles into King Henry and his men, the static characters of *Perkin Warbeck*.

Contemporary historian Bruce Heyt doubts if the Flemish merchant known as Perkin Warbeck could actually have been who he claimed to be (the exiled Richard Plantagenet), but he does not dispel this possibility. Heyt points out that “the official story” of Perkin Warbeck relies on Hall and Holinshed, biased Tudor historians, who wrote from a press controlled by Henry VII (59). Despite Hall’s and Holinshed’s apparent loyalty to Henry VII, Heyt observes that the Tudor historians make some statements that encourage their readers to suspect the accounts’ reliability (61).

Audrey Williamson adds that history “becomes subject to the shifting patterns of human thought and memory, and of social and moral attitudes; to the dictates of its own time in propaganda and interpretation.” Years after it is made, history falls victim

to “gaps in documentation or the proliferation of conflicting material” (*The Mystery of the Princes* 9).

Despite the imperfect art of historicity, Audrey Williamson, Bruce Heyt, and others (such as John Ford) probe through remaining documents with a combination of intuition and logic to achieve a “truth.” Erasmus called this truth “folly.” Like Erasmus, Ernesto Grassi also praises the folly of humans seeking truth and identifies their folly as “a tradition which provides . . . a basis for questioning the primacy of rational thinking and speaking, and [one] which allows . . . [questioning] without being seduced into irrational or romantic thesis” (*Folly and Insanity* 15).

Although Bruce Heyt does not use the term “folly,” he admits the imperfections in historical “facts.” Acknowledging the possibility of flaws, Heyt pieces together the most probable versions of the Perkin Warbeck legend. If Perkin Warbeck is indeed heir to the throne, his story begins in 1483 with the natural death of his father, Edward IV. Two years later, Henry Tudor and his followers won power by slaughtering Richard III and other prominent Yorkists at Bosworth Field. Henry gained English support by spreading the already existing rumor that Richard III murdered his young nephews, Edward V and Richard, Duke of York. However, the Welsh usurper was able to produce neither bodies nor any other hard evidence that the young princes were indeed slain. Because either Plantagenet brother had a stronger claim to the English throne than Henry Tudor, ambitious individuals pounced to manipulate this contingency. Three claimants to the crown appeared during Henry VII’s reign and, as Audrey Williamson points out, “there remains the curious and indubitable fact” that

none of them “claimed to be the presumptive king, Edward V. Lambert Simnel seems to have been hailed briefly as Richard, Duke of York, before settling into the role of Edward, Earl of Warwick.” The other claimants insisted they were Richard, Duke of York, and none else. Of all three claimants, Perkin Warbeck was the most convincing (117). Perkin first invaded England with 300 troops, the same number of troops as Henry Bullingbrook (also spelled as *Bolingbroke*) had a century before. Yet, as Bruce Heyt points out, Perkin lacked Bullingbrook’s success because he was unable to sustain support from “some key noblemen” (59). Before landing at Kent, Perkin had been pledged support from Charles VIII of France, Margaret of Burgundy, the Archduke of Austria and his father Maximilian I, the Holy Roman Emperor, and had already been granted “official recognition” from Ireland, Scotland, and Denmark. Curiously, Perkin was unable to persuade Queen Isabella of Spain, who would be charmed by Christopher Columbus the following year. The Spanish queen stated that Perkin Warbeck was probably “no more a Plantagenet than Henry” (Heyt 60).

After the fiasco in Kent, Perkin experienced a zealous reception from James IV of Scotland, who married the claimant to his cousin, Katherine Gordon. According to Heyt, “theorists have cited this marriage as proof that James, at least, had no doubts to the truth of Perkin’s claim.” But, as Heyt argues, “James’s own subsequent marriage to Henry VII’s eldest daughter demonstrates his willingness to take advantage of fortuitous opportunities.” After Perkin Warbeck’s marriage to Katherine Gordon, the claimant “again tested the English waters in the company of a Scottish army of about 1,400 troops,” but he was again unsuccessful. Perkin returned to Scotland and was

chided and ridiculed by James IV, who had previously applauded him. Instead of continuing support to Perkin Warbeck, the Scottish king signed a truce with Henry VII (Heyt 60). Rather than accept defeat, Perkin landed in England for a third time, this time in Cornwall. The 1497 invasion was initially successful as Perkin's troops swelled from 100 to about 8000, but the new army was, according to Heyt, "unarmed and seemingly just a rabble enjoying the excitement of being roused" (61). Perkin and the Cornishmen fought a futile battle at Exeter before the claimant sought refuge at Beaulieu Abbey before surrendering to royal forces. Some historians affirm that Perkin willingly placed himself at Henry's judgement, while others maintain "that Henry enticed him from Beaulieu with false promises of a pardon" (Heyt 61). But as Heyt further points out, "Henry would have required neither a capitulation nor deceit to arrest Perkin, because the Church did not extend sanctuary to persons accused of treason" (62).

After Perkin Warbeck's surrender, royal troops escorted him to London and imprisoned him in the Tower of London. Probably under torture, Perkin "admitted" that he "was the son of a Flemish official of the town of Tournay" who was convinced by the Irish to assume the identity of the Duke of York because of "his resemblance to the Royal Plantagenets." After his "confession," Henry continued to confine Perkin in the Tower, but he ordered his execution after an escape attempt. Henry himself masterminded the escape attempt in order to generate an excuse to execute the claimant (Heyt 61).

John Ford's imaginative representation diverges from the chronicles of Edward Hall, Raphael Holinshed, and Francis Bacon. Ford creates at least one fictional character, combines events, reduces Perkin's three invasions to one, but most of all Ford establishes rhetorical presence which is unlikely to generate into a static chronicle. *Perkin Warbeck*, "chronicled at home" (l. 18), displays controversial action that historically took place only miles from the Phoenix Theater. Eighteen scenes compose *Perkin Warbeck*: Ford provides juxtaposition by alternating between the English and Scottish courts, and later, the English camp and the camps of the rebels.

The following detailed synopsis of *Perkin Warbeck* charts the fictive events in the order that John Ford presents them, and it facilitates perception of the analysis. An analysis of the scenes illustrating Ford's application of rhetorical presence follows the synopsis.

The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck. A Strange Truth opens in the Westminster royal presence chamber, where Henry VII and his advisors are discussing the continuous obstacles with royal pretenders. King Henry VII first mentions Lambert Simnel, now his falconer, who had earlier posed as the Earl of Warwick. The new alleged impostor Perkin Warbeck has recently claimed the English throne as Richard, Duke of York. Henry's men blame the sorcery of the elderly Duchess of Burgundy for both impostures. The Bishop of Durham rebukes the whole house of York for bloodthirsty ambition that incurred the deaths of ten English kings and princes and a quarter of a million English subjects in the Hundred Years War. As the first scene closes, King Henry decides to move his court to the Tower after privately

reading a letter handed to him. As all exit, the King assures his men that the newest impostor will also fall.

The second scene contrasts with the first. As Henry and his men strongly imply the issue of royal blood in the first scene, the Scots openly discuss royal blood here. In the Earl of Huntley's Edinburgh house, Dalyell presents his suit to the Earl of Huntley for marriage to his daughter (Lady Katherine Gordon). Huntley immediately expresses his disapproval of such a match on the grounds that Katherine has royal blood whereas Dalyell does not. Then Dalyell admits his baseness to the woman he loves, but he points out that he descends from a Scottish knight whose daughter bore the patriarch of the Stuart line. Huntley admits some admiration for Dalyell, as the scene progresses, for his courage and sincerity in pursuing Huntley's daughter. Rather than sealing the match, Huntley tells the suitor that Katherine ultimately has the freedom to choose her own husband. When Katherine enters, her father tells her of this decision. She decides to wait before becoming engaged to Dalyell or any other suitor. Huntley praises his daughter's good judgement. At the end of the scene, the Earl of Crawford enters and informs Huntley that the Scottish king requests his council.

The third and final scene in act 1 moves to the Tower. The Bishop of Durham and Urswick (King Henry's chaplain) cajole Sir Robert Clifford into confessing the conspiracy to place Perkin Warbeck on the throne. After King Henry enters, Clifford first names the commoners Heron, John a—Water, Skelton, and Astley, then identifies Frion (Henry's former secretary) as Perkin's secretary. Henry wheedles Clifford, and Clifford names some noblemen including Worseley (the Dean of St. Paul's) and Sir

William Stanley (Henry's chamberlain). Henry becomes uncharacteristically emotional over Stanley's disloyalty. Henry relates how Stanley saved Henry's life in Bosworth Field as Henry fought Richard III. Lord Dawbeney enters and informs Henry that 10,000 Cornishmen are advancing toward London to protest Henry's taxes. The scene ends as Henry tells his men to trust in God.

Ford withholds the entrance of his title character until act 2 where he appears in the Scottish court of King James IV. Katherine Gordon and other ladies of the Scottish court worry about the claimant to the English throne, Perkin Warbeck. Katherine fears that Scotland will be ridiculed for King James's support of him. Katherine encourages the other ladies to observe Perkin and his men, but she admonishes the ladies neither to speak to them nor about them. King James enters with other noblemen and tells the group that a king is responsible for his own people and also for allies. The Scottish king remarks about the documented advocacy that Perkin Warbeck has already received from King Charles of France and Maximilian I of Bohemia. Dalyell escorts Perkin and his men into the presence chamber, Huntley presents him to King James, and then Perkin and James IV embrace. Perkin opens with praising salutation to the King and explains to him the circumstances of his survival from the diabolic Richard III. Perkin says that whereas Richard III's men murdered his older brother, the men felt pity on the younger Perkin, spared him, and allowed him to be secretly conveyed to Tournay. Raised by foster parents in Tournay, Perkin first taught himself to forget his past; as he grew older, he realized that he could disremember neither his royal blood nor the evil deeds of Richard III. Having

difficulty living as a peasant, he then contacted his aunt (Margaret of Burgundy) who helped him make the connections he needed to proceed with his claim. Perkin tells King James that (as king of England) he would “marry” England and Scotland together in an eternal relationship. The claimant’s marriage speech moves the Scottish King James emotionally, who then declares that Perkin must indeed be royal because of his majestic language and pledges his support for the English claimant. Katherine admits to the Countess of Crawford that she too is touched by Perkin’s words.

The Tower of London defines the atmosphere of 2.2. The Bishop of Durham informs King Henry that Stanley readily confessed his traitorous acts. The king exits after admitting that he fears that he would prevent Stanley’s execution if he faced him. Stanley is led in. Durham informs the accused that Clifford will speak to him in lieu of the king. Stanley tells the Bishop that, next to his own soul, the king will be the nearest subject of his last prayers. Stanley speaks of the past and tells Lord Dawbeney that he was once like him—hopeful, powerful, and close to the king. Clifford enters at this point and tells Stanley that he hopes his conscience is cleared. Stanley answers by lifting his finger to make a cross on Clifford’s face. Clifford verbalizes offense, and Stanley states that the cross is a holy sign and water will never wash it off. The accused reminds Clifford that Clifford is a state informer and others will be able to see through his character. Stanley implies that he himself will be exonerated in future chronicles. After Stanley is led off to his execution, Clifford asks the others present if he were called to be upbraided by a traitor. King Henry, entering the room with a white staff, reveals that he has been eavesdropping and tells Clifford that he gives

credence to all the information Clifford has disclosed. The king asks the informer if he is pleased that his words, and only his words, condemn Stanley to die. Clifford shows pleasure that his former friend will die. Henry VII dismisses Clifford from the court and allows him to go home, but advises him not to leave home unless he wants the king's men to find him and kill him. King Henry then tells his men that all griefs should die with Stanley. He gives his white staff to Dawbeney and tells him he is the new chamberlain, replacing Stanley. The king says that Oxford is the chief of the first battalia against the Cornish rebels, assisted by Essex and the Earl of Suffolk. The next division is assigned to Dawbeney. Surrey has the most difficult task, according to Henry. He is in charge of the army that will defend against Perkin Warbeck and the Scots. The final lines in 2.2 close with King Henry instructing his men to quit talking and begin taking action.

The next scene (2.3) opens as the Earl of Crawford and Lord Dalyell discuss Perkin Warbeck's influence over James IV and the courtly ladies. King James and the Earl of Huntley enter. Huntley pleads with James not to negotiate a marriage match between Perkin and Huntley's daughter (Katherine). James remains steadfast and ignores Huntley's feelings. Huntley refuses to bless the union. Toward the end of 2.3, Perkin's men discuss possible self-serving motives behind the Scotsmen's interest in Perkin. After the others exit, Frion (Perkin's secretary), in a soliloquy, belittles Perkin's soldiers.

In 3.1 Henry VII informs Urswick that he has a charm that will seduce James IV from Perkin. Dawbeney enters and announces that 2,000 Cornish rebels were

defeated by Henry's forces. Henry instructs his men to refrain from pursuing the misled Cornishmen who have escaped, but he orders the beheading of Audley and the hanging and quartering of a lawyer and a blacksmith.

Edinburgh provides the atmosphere for 3.2. Huntley predicts an unhappy marriage for Katherine and Perkin. King James and Perkin (and others) enter and speak optimistically about the upcoming English venture. At the last part of 3.2, all have exited except Katherine and Perkin. Katherine expresses desire to join her husband in England, but Perkin speaks of battle horrors. The Scottish princess reaffirms her love and devotion to Perkin and asserts that they both need to accept their preordained fate. In the last five lines of 3.2, Perkin reasons that it is foolish to fear and prudent to retain hope.

The next scene (3.3) takes place in the palace at Westminster. Henry VII and Urswick meet with Hialas, the Spanish ambassador sent by King Ferdinand and Queen Isabel. Hialas requests someone knowledgeable and experienced to accompany him to Scotland. Henry is outwardly courteous to Hialas and grants the ambassador's entreaty, but the king privately expresses caution to Urswick and plots a feasible political alliance between the English Prince Arthur and the Spanish Princess Katherine.

The English Castle of Norham sets the ambience for the final scene of act 3 (3.4). The Scottish camp meets the English Bishop of Durham before the castle walls. Durham attempts to persuade King James to abandon allegiance to Perkin Warbeck by mentioning Henry's willingness to exculpate the Scottish king. Perkin defends himself

and exclaims that if he were indeed the common pretender that Durham claims he is, Perkin's conscience could not abide the military atrocities that he and the Scottish have already inflicted upon the English people so that Perkin could win back the throne. Perkin's secretary (Frion) enters and announces that Henry's forces have overthrown Perkin's forces, and the Earl of Surrey was advancing with 100 knights and 20,000 soldiers. Moreover, Dawbeney's forces follow Surrey's forces, and Brooke progresses with a powerful navy. Perkin expresses disbelief over the news and asserts that the troops plan to join his endeavor, not fight against it. The scene concludes with James IV, instead of Perkin, commanding the troops.

News of Perkin's military setbacks continues in act 4. In the English camp near Ayton (on the English-Scottish border), the Earl of Surrey speculates on James IV's persistence despite their defeats at Cundrestine, Hedon, Edinton, Fulden, and Ayton castle. Marchmont (King James's herald) enters and announces James's provisions: if Scottish forces win, Surrey will endow the town of Berwick for his own ransom; if English forces conquer, King James will pay 1,000 pounds for his own ransom. Surrey answers that Berwick belongs to Henry VII and not to Surrey. Surrey then informs Marchmont that Henry is still willing to exonerate James if he surrenders. Marchmont departs with this information for James IV. Surrey predicts victory for the English forces.

In 4.2 Perkin laments his misfortunes to Frion. James IV has met with Hialas (the Spanish ambassador) and shows less amity toward Perkin. But Perkin affirms his perseverance and verbalizes his Plantagenet birthright. Instead of supporting Perkin,

Frion tells him that his goals are unsound. Perkin reminds his secretary that if he remains his confederate and helps him win, Frion will gain fiscally and socially. Frion ceases his criticism of Perkin and speaks of support from the Irish and the Cornish. Other allies of Perkin enter and attest their continued support in his campaign.

The next scene is situated in another part of the Scottish camp. Hialas divulges to King James that France, Spain, and Germany all consolidate in peace toward England. Scotland remains the only Christian nation that is unfriendly to England. Hialas mentions the political match between the English Prince Arthur and the Spanish Princess Katherine, and the English Bishop of Durham proposes to James a match with Henry VII's daughter Margaret. King James agrees to the negotiation with England and calls Perkin, his men, and Katherine to a meeting. James severs ties with Perkin but offers him reinforcements. Perkin's soldiers and Katherine reassert their fidelity to Perkin. Although Katherine's father disowns his daughter and dismisses her title, the Scottish Lord Dalyell promises to guard Katherine in Perkin's absence. Perkin praises Dalyell's friendship.

The following scene (4.4) returns to London. A messenger brings Henry VII the information that the English forces captured Frion. Henry praises the Bishop of Durham and orders Dawbeney and Oxford to advance the army into Salisbury. Henry sends a letter to the Mayor of Exeter.

The last scene of act 4 (4.5) sets Perkin and Katherine on the coast of Cornwall. Perkin, Skelton, and Astley predict victory in Exeter; Katherine has reservations, but she stoically avows strength will endure whatever her life unfolds. Katherine praises

her attendant (Jane), and Jane and Dalyell reaffirm their devotion to Katherine. The scene ends with Perkin's benediction of conquest.

Act 5 opens its first scene on St. Michael's Mount in Cornwall. Katherine tells Jane that they must accept destiny. When Jane suggests that Katherine return to Scotland, Katherine exclaims that she no longer has a country. The Scottish princess vows that Scotland will never see her hapless. Katherine explains that James IV, who joined her to Perkin Warbeck, has since banished them. Katherine advises Jane and a servant to return safely to Scotland, but the two women affirm their loyalty and concern for their princess. Dalyell enters and announces that the Cornish (who side with Perkin) had an unfriendly reception with Exeter citizens. According to Dalyell, Perkin withdrew from his camp when English forces approached him. Dalyell tells Katherine that Perkin acted upon wisdom, not cowardice, when he fled. Soon after Dalyell warns Katherine that the Earl of Oxford pursues her, Oxford enters and extends King Henry's invitation for Katherine to join his court. The Scottish princess agrees to accompany Oxford to meet with Henry, but she expresses that she will not be Henry's subject.

The next scene (5.2) is situated in Salisbury. King Henry speculates that although Perkin has escaped, the English forces will soon capture him. Turning the subject to James IV of Scotland, Henry asks if James offered to pay amends for the property damage inflicted on England by James's and Perkin's militia. After Surrey relates James's admission that he could not repay Henry, Henry praises James's knowledge of reality. As Dawbeney leads in the captured Perkin and several of his

men, Henry lauds Perkin's comeliness and polish, but he rebukes the claimant's pride. Perkin retorts that he himself upholds truth. Dawbeney then commands Perkin's men to kneel for Henry VII, and the men comply and plead for mercy. Henry orders Perkin and his men sent to the Tower of London. After Dawbeney escorts Perkin out, Oxford escorts Katherine in to meet with Henry. The English king attempts to woo the Scottish princess, but she counters him by stating her continued fidelity to Perkin.

The last scene of *Perkin Warbeck* (5.3) takes place on Tower Hill. The constable places Perkin into the stocks, and Urswick (King Henry's chaplain) attempts to elicit a confession from the claimant by reminding him that he has already been sentenced to death and by telling him that he is responsible for other men's executions. Perkin remains steadfast and reasserts that he is a Plantagenet. Lambert Simnel (a pretender who is now Henry's falconer) mentions a possible pardon from Henry, but Perkin expresses anger at the mention of a pardon. Simnel verbalizes that Perkin is insane. At the last meeting of Perkin and Katherine, Katherine pledges fidelity to her husband after his death; she announces that she will never remarry. Praising her constancy, Katherine's father bonds with her again. Perkin Warbeck shows joy at Katherine's continued devotion, and he exclaims that he does not fear death.

In the final scene, John Ford utilizes the Tower of London's sinister, but puissant, atmosphere. Even in the London scenes not directly situated on the Tower grounds, the ambient Tower dominates. The subconscious minds of the Caroline audience associated the Tower with dominance and loftiness as well as with order and security. On a more conscious level, the seventeenth-century audience knew the

history of the Tower as the site of battlement, condemnation, captivity, torture, and execution. Public executions were frequent on Tower Hill, and seventeenth-century crowds sought such macabre events as entertainment. Parents often brought children to executions to teach them the gravity of failing to follow authority. Undoubtedly, Ford's contemporary audience was acclimated to public executions.

For the Phoenix audience members that were heartened by Ford's imaginative representation, the executions ordered by Henry VII in *Perkin Warbeck* evoked a transitional bonding—a rhetorical presence between the stage and the audience. Perhaps Charles I's subjects thought of the ill-fated puritan pamphleteer Alexander Leighton when King Henry orders torture and humiliation of Audley: “Let false Audley / Be drawn upon a hurdle from the Newgate / To Tower-hill in his own coat of arms / Painted on paper, with the arms reversed, / Defaced and torn; there let him lose his head” (3.1.100-04).

Indubitably, the Tower's rhetorical presence (exemplifying horror and injustice) and the folklore surrounding the missing princes caused officials to infer that the mystery of Edward V and Richard, Duke of York, had been solved when workmen uncovered children's skeletons in 1674, some forty years after *Perkin Warbeck* ran on the Phoenix stage. The gruesome discovery occurred in the White Tower, not in the Garden Tower where legend reputes the burial, but the phenomenon of children's skeletons in the unconsecrated area of a staircase created enough rhetorical presence to infer that the remains were indeed Edward V and Richard, Duke of York (Kendall 317-18). A forensic physician examined the incomplete skeletons in 1933 and

reported no conclusive evidence regarding the identity of the bones, even so much as the gender. To this day, the bones rest in Westminster Abbey (Williamson 190).

Even though Ford's audience experienced the Tower of London setting in *Perkin Warbeck* before a discovery of skeletons could influence an opinion of either the historical Perkin Warbeck or Ford's imaginative representation, the Tower had already gained a reputation of innocent bloodshed. When Perkin is led to his execution in the final scene, his courage and steadfast assertion that he is indeed the true King of England juxtaposes the final lines spoken by Henry VII: "that public states, / As our particular bodies, taste most good / In health when purged of corrupted blood" (5.3.222-24). Hearing these words, Charles I's subjects wondered if Perkin Warbeck's blood was royal or indeed "corrupted."

The plight of other Tower inmates likely influenced the Caroline audience's view of Perkin. During James I's rule, the English people sometimes worshiped Tower inmates as heroes. Sir Walter Raleigh represents the most celebrated member of this group. Raleigh angered King James by conspiring to remove his rule in favor of James's cousin, Arabella Stuart (Wilson 148). To retaliate, King James incarcerated Sir Walter Raleigh and later executed him. The man who failed to discover gold, colonize Virginia, or explore the Orinoco basin gained fame in the Tower as the author of *History of the World*. Lady Arabella herself was imprisoned in 1611, guilty only of marrying the man she loved without the king's permission and innocently falling into the hands of the Countess of Shrewsbury, who plotted to get Arabella abroad and use her as a pretender to the throne (Wilson 157).

Besides Sir Walter Raleigh and Arabella Stuart, Sir Edward Coke truly earned the praise he received as an inmate. An eminent legal expert, Coke was thrown in the Tower “for persistently upholding the independence of the judiciary” (Wilson 160). He asserted that King James I could not make or change law by proclamation or quash common law proceedings by issuing a writ and upheld ancient privileges concerning debate. After nine months imprisonment, Coke was released because no charges could be proved against him (Wilson 160).

Although most of the Caroline audience was too young to remember Raleigh, Arabella Stuart, and Coke, legends kept these personalities alive; James I’s reputation merely became more villainous after the Stuart king’s death. Perhaps the Phoenix playgoers thought of Raleigh and Lady Arabella when John Ford’s imaginative representation of Perkin Warbeck sums up the horrors of the Tower. After hearing King Henry’s orders to lead Perkin and his men to London, the claimant exclaims, “the Tower,— / Our childhood’s dreadful nursery! (5.2.129-30). Whether or not members of Ford’s audience believed Richard, Duke of York, survived to become Perkin Warbeck, they knew part of the Duke of York’s childhood was spent imprisoned there. Perkin mentions his brother’s murder, carried out by the orders of Richard III (2.1), so Ford’s audience may have envisioned the remains of twelve-year-old Edward V, buried in the Tower. According to Renaissance folklore, both young sons of Edward IV were slain and buried in the Tower of London. Perhaps some of Ford’s audience recalled the lines from Shakespeare’s *Richard III* when the stripling

Edward V is told that he shall repose at the Tower for his “best health and recreation.”

Edward V answers, “I do not like the Tower, of any place” (3.1.67-68).

The London locus not only fuses brutal incarceration and execution in the audience’s minds, but it also surfaces the inquisition. Henry VII’s voice opens the play with the language of a witchhunt. Although the setting is in the Westminster royal presence chamber and not in the Tower, it is near the Tower’s environs. At the end of 1.1 Henry decides to move to the Tower. The first lines of Henry VII bring to mind the legacy of Charles I’s father, James I, who employed misogyny and fear of witchcraft for his own political purposes. Henry complains to his men, “Still to be haunted, still to be pursu’d, / Still to be frightened with false apparitions / Of pageant majesty and new—coined greatness, / As if we were a mockery king in state” (1.1.1-4). A few lines down, the Bishop of Durham asserts, “The rage of malice / Conjures fresh spirits with the spells of York” (15-16). Durham blames “the spells of York” not to the “ghosts of York” (6) but to Margaret of Burgundy, who, as Jean Howard points out, “is constantly evoked as the source of all of Henry’s troubles.” Interestingly, Howard further observes that an imaginative representation of Margaret never appears in *Perkin Warbeck*, and thus she cannot defend herself (266).

If the elderly Plantagenet had been portrayed by Ford, perhaps the audience could directly discern and intuit Margaret’s words and actions rather than relying on the hearsay from Henry VII’s men. But Ford limits his imaginative representation of Margaret of Burgundy to lines spoken by Durham, Urswick, and Oxford to create her with their own language. Playgoers may accept their conception of Margaret, or they

may question it. If the Caroline audience disbelieved the “spells of York” (1.1.16), claimed by Tudor loyalists, the playgoers may also have pondered the motives behind the men’s witch-crazed rhetoric.

Ironically, Henry’s usually rational men took their witch-crazed rhetoric a step further when the Earl of Oxford suggests that the elderly Margaret, barren in youth, had mated with a demon in order to bear a set of twins consisting of Perkin Warbeck and an earlier claimant, Lambert Simnel. Oxford rebukes Margaret: “In her age— / Great sir, observe the wonder she grows fruitful, / Who in strength of youth was always barren” (1.1.52-54). Oxford absurdly continues, “Nor or her births as other mothers are, / At nine or ten months end—she has been with child / Eight or seven years at least; whose twins being born /— A prodigy in nature” (55-58). Oxford asserts that Perkin Warbeck “Is fifteen years of age at his first entrance, / As soon as known I’ th’ world, tall striplings, strong, / And able to give battle unto kings” (1.1. 59-61).

The preposterous language opening *Perkin Warbeck* reflects James I’s treatise on witchcraft, *Demonologie*. Historian H. R. Trevor-Roper describes *Demonologie* as just another “encyclopaedia of witchcraft” that “seems to outdo the other in cruelty and absurdity” (151). Despite the nonsense in the Stuart king’s propaganda, Jean Howard explains that even James I “refers skeptically to such tales of monstrous births” (266). Why, then, does John Ford set his first scene in London portraying rational men speaking of spells and monstrous births? Howard argues that “this figurative lineage . . . undercuts whatever claims Perkin and Simnel might have to be

Edward's true heirs" (267). In other words, the tale of unnatural genesis that the Earl of Oxford vocalizes as an elaboration to Henry's allegations creates an imaginary evil that motivates the men to organize forces against. According to Howard, the rhetoric also "indirectly associates claims to the monarchy originating in a woman with the monstrous." Howard further observes that "the discourse of witchcraft thus helps to create a bogeyman—in this case an image of monstrous femininity—against which legitimate authority can define itself" (266-67).

Did the allegations of a monstrous lineage truly undercut Perkin's claim to the throne of England? Could certain members of the Caroline audience see through the paranoid language and envision the setting, devoid of women, and dominated by the phallic Tower, where, without any reasonable evidence, a crone is labeled a witch, creating "idols of Yorkish malice" (1.1.62) and men are executed without trials? The seventeenth century embodied, paradoxically, both the European witch craze and the birth of modern science. Trevor-Roper explains that "Neither the Renaissance nor the Reformation nor the Scientific Revolution are, in our terms, purely or necessarily progressive. Each has a Janus-face" (90).

Despite the duality of thinking that permeated the Caroline period, it is likely that certain members of John Ford's contemporary audience adhered closely to the teachings of Robert Burton, Francis Bacon, and others who disputed what they considered superstitions of the medieval world view. Also, puritan pamphlets exposing the Inquisition circulated, and Charles I's court proved imperfect insulation

from the influence of puritan writings. Thus, some of Ford's audience may have viewed Henry VII more like a grand inquisitor than a good king.

Henry, like an inquisitor, displays undue injustice as he orders the execution of Stanley (his chancellor) after declining to converse with him face to face and choosing to rely only on Clifford's information. The executions of Stanley in 2.2 and of Audley in 3.1 foretell the ultimate execution of Perkin. The demise of Stanley and the other English noblemen incapacitate the efforts of Perkin and the Scottish noblemen. Without the intelligence, manpower, or fiscal aid from Englishmen, the claimant's struggle is doomed.

Once he is captured by Henry's forces, John Ford's imaginative representation of Perkin Warbeck, neither forced nor won by others, retains his dignity. He refuses to confess any of the alleged imposture to Urswick (King Henry's chaplain) or to Lambert Simnel (the confessed impostor turned royal falconer). The final scene (5.3), situated on Tower Hill, opens with the guards locking Perkin in stocks before leading him to the execution site. The Earl of Oxford endeavors to stir guilt in Perkin by parading his men who are also facing execution, but the claimant proclaims that his soldiers' courage is "a triumph over tyranny" (193). Perkin Warbeck further asserts, "Death? pish! 'tis but a sound; a name of air; / A minute's storm, or not so much" (204-05). His very last words declare, "illustrious mention / Shall blaze our names, and style us kings o'er Death" (212-13).

Henry's executions of Stanley, Audley, and Perkin Warbeck dispensed rhetorical threads that weave Henry VII into a tapestry that pictures the Caroline

audience's own Charles I. Charles I became the first reigning monarch who never visited the Tower of London (Wilson 161), yet he was not beyond sending his subjects to its cold, rat infested cells where starvation and torture were common. Two examples of brutality under Charles I involve John Felton (who assassinated the unpopular Duke of Buckingham) and the puritan propagandist Alexander Leighton. Charles I ordered Felton to be racked so that he would reveal any confederates. But after Charles's advisors informed him that torture was against the law, the King withdrew his order (Wilson 162). By 1629, King Charles had dissolved parliament, and thus he was free to utilize torture for his own political ends. Historian Derek Wilson details an inhumanity: "The puritan propagandist, Alexander Leighton was fined 10,000 pounds, and was sentenced to have both nostrils slit, and his face branded. That done, he was to be whipped, pilloried and imprisoned for life" (167n).

Although the Tudors and the Stuarts both utilized torture and capital punishment for political advantage, the three major Tudor monarchs roused charisma and awe that the Stuarts lacked. Henry VII, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth I accomplished rhetorical presence with the English people that neither James I nor Charles I could achieve. Nevertheless, royal poets and pamphleteers made efforts to link Henry VII with his great, great, great grandson, James I (Charles I's father). At James I's death in 1625, he was buried in the same Westminster Abbey tomb as Henry VII and Henry's queen, Elizabeth. Yet, despite the early efforts of royalists (including the young John Ford), James did not reign as a great king in the Caroline minds. Ford compares the rule of Henry VII with the rule of James IV by juxtaposing the London

locus with the Edinburgh locus in the first five scenes of *Perkin Warbeck*. This strategy contrasts the masculine with the semi-feminine, the Machiavellian with the feudal, and the realistic with the romantic. Compared to the London locus, the Edinburgh locus exhibits a happier, less threatening atmosphere. John Ford's imaginative representation of Edinburgh is more feminine than London, not just for its inclusion of women, but more feminine in the Jungian sense for its apparent esteem of human relationships, courtesy, intuition, and emotions including love. Although the women defer to the men, the men take notice of them. In Edinburgh, Huntley informs his daughter of her freedom to choose her own marriage partner: "Settle / Thy will and reason by a strength of judgement; / For, in a word, I give thee freedom; take it" (1.2.126-29). Katherine's true love match to Perkin Warbeck juxtaposes the two political negotiations for marriages discussed outside of Edinburgh, namely the proposed matches of the English Prince Arthur and the Spanish Princess Katherine, and also for James IV and the English Princess Margaret. In Edinburgh, not London, Perkin and Katherine fall in love, and King James IV believes and pledges support to a stranger (Perkin) who claims England's throne. James IV exclaims, "He must be more than subject who can utter / the language of a king" (2.2.105-06). James (who represents both Edinburgh and Scotland) trusts and honors Perkin; and by James's trust and honor, the audience associates Edinburgh with cities of ancient legends where intuition is respected. Only after venturing outside of Edinburgh, ironically to fight for Perkin's cause, does James IV betray Perkin.

Exceptions to the happy atmosphere of Edinburgh include Huntley's despair over Katherine's choice of Perkin Warbeck and King James's unwillingness to listen to Huntley's objection to the match and to James's support of Perkin's campaign. Also, the seeds of Frion's betrayal of Perkin are evident in Edinburgh. Although Huntley's grief and King James's failure to acknowledge Huntley's feelings measure less in affliction as compared to the anguish of Stanley and Perkin (when King Henry refuses to hear their defenses and orders their executions), James's insensitivity toward Huntley and Frion's disrespect toward Perkin foreshadows their later betrayal of Perkin.

Despite the joyous Edinburgh scenes displayed in *Perkin Warbeck*, Caroline playgoers may have sensed that happiness could not last in Edinburgh. According to the chronicles available to the seventeenth-century audience, Edinburgh's history is about as sanguinous as that of London, and thus Edinburgh's rhetorical presence is just as bloody as that of London. Lord Darnley, Charles I's grandfather, stabbed to death David Riccio, Queen Mary I's Italian secretary. The murder, incurred by jealousy, took place in Holyrood House in 1566 (Daiches 44). Edinburgh is also known for the burnings of accused witches, and many of these burnings were ordered by Charles I's father, James I (James VI of Scotland), when he was situated in Edinburgh (Daiches 53).

In 1633, the year *Perkin Warbeck* entered the Stationer's Registry, Charles I traveled to Edinburgh for his coronation as King of Scotland and was bent on forcing the Church of Scotland into the same pattern as that of the Church of England with

respect alike to church government, ritual, and the form of prayers (Daiches 54).

Despite his determination, Charles won only a small minority. The opposition organized a formal protest, and Charles made note of the rebels' names (55).

Unfortunately for Charles, his trip to Edinburgh incurred scorn and insurrection instead of fame and glory. Many anti-ritualistic Presbyterians who would later aid the puritans in the English Civil War remembered Charles's 1633 visit.

Any performances of *Perkin Warbeck* after King Charles's ill-fated venture were likely tainted by the episode. Considering the distinct possibility that some members of John Ford's audience may have entered the Phoenix Theater with negative associations of Edinburgh, it is interesting that Ford presents Edinburgh as a less threatening city than London. Ford's imaginative representations of Edinburgh and James IV depict a medieval city and a medieval king. The medieval Edinburgh esteems courtship, love, chivalry, and wandering princes "who can utter / the language of a king" (2.2. 105-06), quite the opposite of the Calvinistic, seventeenth-century Edinburgh. But the king that rules the medieval Edinburgh has too much power; the magical intuition (that James apparently believes he has because of his royal blood) overrides any other Scot's intuition or reason. The feudal James IV later joins forces with the Machiavellian Henry VII and symbolically discards all magic and intuition, as well as scruples. Ford implies that an ideal government is neither medieval, nor Machiavellian, nor electoral (antiroyalist). From John Ford's imaginative representations of James IV, Henry VII, and Perkin Warbeck, a member of an audience may perceive an ideal monarch as one with integrity and rhetorical presence

(like Perkin), but an exemplary ruler also exudes a Machiavellian understanding of human behavior (like Henry VII).

Whereas the London locus symbolizes Henry VII's authority and the Edinburgh locus exemplifies James IV's rule, four other settings suggest the type of reign that Perkin Warbeck would have generated if he had won the crown. The other locations, significant in the strategy of presence, include the Castle of Norham, the coast of Cornwall, St. Michael's Mount, and Salisbury.

The closing scene of act 3 (3.4) is situated before the Castle of Norham. Norham is a city of Northumberland on the once perilous Scottish border. Alfred Harvey reports that because of Northumberland's strategic position, during Norman times it was "the most thickly studded with castles" of any English county. Harvey also states that Norham Castle possessed "a Norman keep of the first rank" and along with other castles "guarded the high road to Scotland" (38). According to Harvey, "the square Norman keeps were self-contained fortresses, and possessed hall, chapel, and other domestic apartments" (66). The Castle of Norham, a stronghold for the Plantagenet kings, represents Perkin Warbeck, the Plantagenet claimant. However, Perkin fails to enter the castle gates and regain what he believes is his birthright. Ironically, Perkin's tenderness for the English people inhibits his puissance over Henry VII. After James IV commands: "Forage through / The country; spare no prey of life or goods" (3.4.54-55), Perkin counters: ". . . I had never sought / The truth of mine inheritance with rapes / Of women or of infants murdered, virgins / Deflowered, old men butchered, dwellings fired, / . . . Spare, spare, my dear, dear England!" (59-67).

The final scene of act 3 represents a turning point in *Perkin Warbeck*. As in Shakespearean plays, the last scene in act 3 (3.4) foreshadows the hero's outcome in the play. Perkin's reluctance to seize Northumberland by brute force, as his ancestors had done, hinders his ability to confiscate the crown Henry wears.

Apparently unaware of his own turn of fate, Perkin later stands at the coast of Cornwall and joyously invokes "our dear mother earth" (4.5.4) after the ordeal of "so many storms" (1). This scene contains Perkin Warbeck's rhetoric at its most majestic. For the first time, the claimant exudes masculine strength: "A thousand blessings guard our lawful arms! / A thousand horrors pierce our enemies' souls!" (4.5.47-48). A few lines down, Perkin demonstrates conviction in his mission: "O, divinity / Of royal birth! how it strikes dumb the tongues / Whose prodigality of breath is bribed / by trains to greatness" (56-59). Perkin further declares, "Princes are but men / Distinguished in the fineness of their frailty, / Yet not so gross in beauty of the mind; / For there's a fire more sacred purifies / The dross of mixture" (59-63).

Perkin delivers this exalted speech near the legendary city of King Arthur. Philip Edwards deems Perkin "an Arthur figure," one who appears "from the mists announcing that he is the dead past, newly come alive in order to bring succour to an ailing nation" (185). Edwards also recognizes in Perkin "a kind of beauty of being, . . . [which designates Perkin as] the guardian of the idealized, authentic, undivided life when truth and government were not separated" (185). Jean Howard sums up Edwards's argument: "both (Philip Edwards and Anne Barton) argue that disenchantment with Stuart and Caroline kings consciously or unconsciously led the

playwright to articulate a longing for the return of a legitimate king” (264). This legitimate king would be “an Arthur figure, who could provide the monarchy with the glory it had lost” (Edwards 185).

The next scene (5.1) is also situated in Cornwall, but specifically on St. Michael’s Mount. Caroline playgoers may have connected this setting with its alleged visions of St. Michael dating from the fifth century (Michell 185). When these visions took place, St. Michael’s Mount was surrounded by a forest, but around the twelfth century, the ocean flooded the surrounding woods and created an island (186). By the time the historical Perkin Warbeck lodged his wife there in 1497, the Mount had accommodated a priory, an abbey, a castle, and had served as a Lancastrian stronghold during the Wars of the Roses (186-87).

Perkin Warbeck does not appear in the scene depicting St. Michael’s Mount, but his presence is invoked by Katherine and Dalyell. Katherine receives word that her husband has fled his camp, and for the first and only time in the play, Katherine assumes Perkin has turned cowardly. But Dalyell assures her: “Impute it not to faintness or to weakness / Of noble courage lady, but to foresight; / For by some secret friend he had intelligence / Of being bought and sold by his base followers” (5.1.65-68). Dalyell informs Katherine of Perkin’s apparent use of rational judgement as she stands on an island sacred to St. Michael. In Cabalistic thought, the Archangel Michael governs Hod on the Tree of Life. According to religious historian Nevill Drury, Hod represents “the structuring and measuring capacities of the minds opposed to the emotional and intuitional aspects” (119).

Following the locations of Cornwall and St. Michael's Mount, the very next scene (5.2) takes place in Salisbury, site of the 4,000 year old temple, Stonehenge. Citing recent archaeological studies, John Michell asserts that "Stonehenge is beyond doubt a solar temple, and it is apparently related to the orbit of the moon as well" (100). Although Stonehenge is not mentioned in 5.2, its sacredness and desecration are symbolized in the scene. Perkin, the sacred prince, has been captured, and Dawbeney leads him before the Machiavellian King Henry. Henry jokingly exclaims to Dawbeney: "you were to blame / T' infringe the liberty of houses sacred: / Dare we be irreligious?" (5.2.44-46). Despite Perkin's plight, he answers to Henry that "my heart / Will mount till every drop of blood be frozen / by death's perpetual winter" (5.2.55-57). Perkin's next lines more closely correlate him to the solar (and possibly lunar) Stonehenge: "if the sun / Of majesty be darkened, let the sun / Of life be hid from me in an eclipse" that is "Lasting and universal" (5.2.57-60). Ford employs the universal image of the king as the sun (which appears recurrently in Renaissance literature) in Perkin's lines which resonate near the rhetorical presence of Stonehenge. Instead of allowing his imaginative representation to defend himself ludicrously (as an audience would expect of a royal claimant in a patriotic, historical drama of Shakespeare's), Ford gives Perkin lines that require thought from the audience and connect the claimant to Stonehenge. Gareth Knight reports Geoffrey of Monmouth's chronicles regarding Stonehenge as a shrine linked to Arthurian legends and legends of other heroes. According to Knight, the twelfth-century chronicler identified Stonehenge as built by King Ambrose Aurelius for Merlin. Geoffrey quoted the oral

tradition deeming Stonehenge as “a monument to all who had been slain in defence of their faith and their country” (142). Near Stonehenge, Perkin Warbeck vows that if Henry VII’s powerful forces avert “the sun of majesty” (5.2.57) or Perkin, the true king, Perkin will die and be remembered (with the other heroes) at the solar and lunar Stonehenge “in an eclipse / lasting and universal” (5.2.58-60). Perkin chooses to die like an ancient hero rather than survive as a servant of King Henry, like the earlier claimant, Lambert Simnel.

Although critics disagree as to the character and royalty of Perkin, many assert that Katherine’s love and faith in her husband redeem him. In the final scene of *Perkin Warbeck*, the condemned claimant deems his wife, “Great miracle of constancy” (5.3.89) and the “Fair angel of perfection” (128). Katherine vows to her husband, before his execution, “By this sweet pledge of both our souls, I swear / To die a faithful widow to thy bed— / Not to be forced or won, O, never, never!” (151-53). Katherine’s devotion to Perkin beyond the grave evoked transitional bonding with Queen Henrietta Maria and her feminine coterie. According to Dorothy M. Farr, “The Queen and her ladies had fostered an etiolated Platonic idealism which, expressed in the music and dancing of the masque and in drama . . . could titillate the consciousness with a moral sententiousness” (Farr 3). The Queen and her coterie brought romances back to the theater which had been all but absent from the Jacobean stage. Themes such as “heroic love, friendship, constancy in love and in marriage, [and] the never-exhausted topic of honour” were part of the Caroline stage and are several of many intricate threads of *Perkin Warbeck* (Farr 3).

Although John Ford probably refers to some of the Queen's romantic productions when he speaks of the "antic follies" that "want of truth" (ll. 8-9) in the prologue of *Perkin Warbeck*, Ford nevertheless understood the human need for love and beauty. Perkin's poetry creates a beauty in a macabre locus like Tower Hill. Phillip Verene would agree that Perkin's metaphors and cadences form "a meaning without losing the details and emotions of an event" and speak truth in "the particular human situation" (10). While locked in stocks, Perkin Warbeck refrains from self-pity and lauds Katherine: "Even when I fell, I stood enthroned a monarch / Of one chaste wife's troth pure and uncorrupted. / Fair angel of perfection, immortality / Shall raise thy name up to an adoration, / Court every rich opinion of true merit, / And saint it in the calendar of Virtue" (5.3.127-32). Like a twelfth-century troubadour, Perkin humbles himself to regard his lady as the "fair angel of perfection" who shall reign eternally while he himself will turn "into the self-same dust / Of which I was first formed" (5.3.133-34).

Perkin's poetic language, his imaginative representation as a whole, and other dramatic strategies of presence offer a defense of Perkin Warbeck that is not provided in the chronicles of Bacon, Holinshed, or Hail. John Ford (who was both an attorney and a playwright) presents a courtroom of diverse performances which allow the enormous and sundry jury (the audience) to decide Perkin Warbeck's integrity and his ability to rule. Ernesto Grassi would say that *Perkin Warbeck* enables the experience of "original meaning." According to Grassi, "in the unhiddenness which the poetic statement reveals to us, gods, things, and creatures appear with their original meaning"

(*Heidegger and the End* 25). The original meaning that Grassi acclaims is not a fixed, subjective absolute, but rather a changeable, personal concept. An audience of *Perkin Warbeck* can discover meanings in Ford's language, especially in the dynamic atmosphere of live performances.

CHAPTER 2

FROM IMPOSTER TO ONCE AND FUTURE KING

Drama evolved from prehistoric rituals. According to Aristotle, Greek tragedy sprang from choreic dithyrambs and hymns to Dionysus, the god of wine, fertility, revelry, love, and also death. Aristotle gives Thespis of Icaria the credit for inventing drama from ritual; Thespis wrote, directed and acted in the first plays. The first playwright observed the audience's need for a *hypokrites*, an archetypal imaginative representation who undergoes self-discovery and tribulation (like the shaman's ordeal or quest) in order to augment his wisdom. As the *hypokrites* realizes unforeseen truth, the audience also assimilates the new wisdom. The imaginative representation takes a similar role to the god or scapegoat by enduring the burdens of others. For instance, Oedipus (of *Oedipus the King*) suffers from his parents' hubris. At the conclusion of Sophocles's play, Oedipus agonizes knowing that his own hubris caused death and grief to his family and his people. The transactional bonding between the audience and Oedipus generates fear and pity from the hero's suffering. Aristotle names this process catharsis (emotional cleansing), because the playgoers' individual psyches undergo purging. Oedipus's self-blinding reveals the depth of his own guilt and shame, represents his earlier blindness to foresight, and corresponds to Tiresias's (the blind prophet's) blindness. Like Tiresias, Oedipus also gains wisdom after losing his eyesight. But most importantly, Oedipus's blindness signifies the god or scapegoat's

sacrificial death enacted in prehistoric rituals. As the god or scapegoat loses his life for the welfare of those observing the ritual, Oedipus blinds himself for the catharsis of the audience.

Oedipus's symbolic death and rebirth from his self-discovery correspond to earlier religious rituals that enacted the death of one god and the birth of another. Such observances took place between seasons, usually at the winter and summer equinoxes. At the equinoxes, the sun crosses the celestial equator causing daylight and darkness to have approximately equal hours. The winter god (represented by darkness) rules an equal twelve hours to the spring god (represented by light) during the winter solstice; and during the spring solstice, the spring god rules an equal twelve hours to the winter god. But before and after the solstices, the deities accept no equivalence of authority and vie for command. At the solstices, one god dies to allow the rule of another god and to permit the change of seasons. According to James Frazer, the dying god was killed "to save the divine life from the degeneracy of old age." If people allowed a god to become feeble, it was believed, the land would cease producing new plants. With no new plants to replace the dying older plants, plant life would disappear. With no plants for food, humans and animals would starve with the land. Since the dying archetype would be sacrificed anyway, "people may have thought that they might as well seize the opportunity to lay upon him the burden of their sufferings and sins, in order that he might bear it away with him to the unknown world beyond the grave" (*Golden Bough* 668).

The word *archetype* derives from the Greek word *arkhetupos* meaning both “original” and “exemplary.” Northrop Frye describes an archetype as “a communicable unit” which connects one poem with another and thereby “helps to unify and integrate [the audience’s] literary experience” (100). An archetype that links to another archetype forms what Frye calls an “associative cluster” (102). Frye points out that an audience most easily recognizes associative clusters in “highly conventionalized literature” (104). (Chapter 3 delineates the imaginative representations of Perkin and Katherine as associative clusters.)

Although *Perkin Warbeck* neither constitutes a highly conventionalized drama nor surrounds an immortal archetype, Ford’s mortal imaginative representation symbolizes the Arthurian archetype. Perkin displays quasi-magical traits corresponding to Arthur’s courtly attributes; Perkin delights some of Ford’s other imaginative representations with his eloquent language, and he moves some audience members with his almost saintlike compassion for other human beings. But unlike Arthur who extracts a sword from a stone and wins countless battles, Perkin emanates no magic as a warrior. Ford penned *Perkin Warbeck* in an era influenced by empiricism and rationality. The Caroline playgoers may have expected elements of the supernatural at romances or masques, but their sundry rhetorical presences were probably more attuned to realism for a play labeled as a “chronicle history.” Many Caroline dramas, such as those by Thomas Middleton or Richard Brome, feature comic but realistic plots. At the same time, *Perkin Warbeck* also reaches an audience who may uphold the title character as a quasi-magical once and future king who may

someday return and rule an England that understands him. Like Christ, Perkin is also sacrificed after a hasty judgement, and Perkin's parallel to Christ leaves open the idea that the claimant also dies for his people. Quite possibly, some audience members hold contrasting points of view toward Ford's imaginative representation. Akin to an immortal archetype, Perkin undergoes ordeals, but does he truly undergo the changes demanded of an immortal archetype?

When an archetype undergoes ordeals and changes, he becomes more exemplary to humans than he was before the ordeals and changes. But after the metamorphosis, humans recognize him as the original or same superhuman. Another way that an archetype can remain dynamic is by the retelling of a story or myth. Ernesto Grassi delineates this point in the light of Leon Battista Alberti's *Momus*. Alberti's fifteenth-century fable demythologizes the god Hercules and, in the process, demythologizes history itself. According to Grassi, "Hercules is traditionally regarded as the hero who cleared the primordial forest to provide the stage for human history" and the warrior who won all battles against monsters. "But Alberti turns this myth around," asserts Grassi. When Hercules comes to Fortuna's aid and vies against the monster, Fama (rumor), "Fama is not only not killed, she is even able to remove Hercules from the earth and [to] tow him on a mysterious flight to the realm of Olympus." Grassi explains, "it is not his [Hercules's] deeds that are divine and lead him to fame, rather it is the other way around. It is a monster, a deliberate deception like Fama, who makes it possible to speak of the divine nature of his deeds" (*Folly and Insanity* 74).

Alberti's retelling of Hercules's death and divine rebirth in *Momus* parallels John Ford's imaginative representation of humanism's death and divine rebirth in *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth*. When Perkin, the humanistic, romantic hero is executed, humanism dies with the quasi-magical king. Perkin's death reflects the changing world views during Ford's time-humanism's inundation under the growing influence of seventeenth-century rationalism. But John Ford's creation of the play and the audience's transactional bonding with Perkin and Katherine engender humanism in a dynamic process. Perkin dies so a new Perkin can be reborn. The impostor becomes the once and future king.

The sacrifice of John Ford's imaginative representation, Perkin Warbeck, may lead the audience to catharsis, evoke pity from the audience, or elicit questions and creative ideas from the audience. To some, Perkin represents the lowly scapegoat, one of the "ghosts of York" (1.1.6) with "corrupted blood" (5.3.25) that "haunted" (1.1.1) England and Henry VII, the king that God willed to rule England from 1485 to 1509. The audience members that view Perkin as a pretender perceive his death as a purification for England. This perception may be conscious, subconscious, or both. As a pretender, Perkin may be discerned as a type of antihero, a common man involved with an heroic quest that he has no chance of fulfilling. Perhaps someone (such as Margaret of Burgundy) led him to believe he was Richard, Duke of York. Perkin the antihero may be insane, melancholy, or simply dishonest. To other audience members, Perkin becomes the good king sacrificed by the malicious king. In other words, Henry is the pretender instead of Perkin. Still other playgoers may observe the potential

Perkin as the once and future Arthurian king whom prophesy had proclaimed will someday return and rule. Dispirited by his own king's desecration of parliament, a subject of Charles I may have revered Perkin's open leadership and his refusal to plunder and ravage the English people to augment his own puissance, but at the same time the individual may have admired Henry's statecraft and success.

Anthropologist Margaret Murray makes no mention of Ford's play, but she deems the historical Henry VII as a "Divine King" and she believes that Perkin died as the willing "Substitute Victim." Murray argues that the Tudor and the Plantagenet both adhered to a pre-Christian cult (*Divine King in England* 119) that doomed "the Divine King" (who was one and the same with "the Incarnate God") to a sacrifice "either in his own person or in that of his substitute, for the good of the subjects" (11). In other words, Murray propounds that Perkin Warbeck and Henry VII affiliated surreptitiously as devout members of the ancient faith and only pretended to be archenemies. According to Murray, the pagan cult survived "under a veneer of Christianity" and remained strong enough for many historical figures to die for their clandestine beliefs. Murray names the central male god of the pagan cult ("the god of the witches") "Dianus," who is somewhat akin to the Celtic horned god Cerunnus and the Roman two-faced god Janus. Dianus is both horned and double-faced. Besides Perkin Warbeck, other alleged Dianic sacrifices include William Rufus, Thomas à Becket, Joan of Arc, and Richard II (11). Although it is now widely believed that a small, evolved continuum of pre-Christian paganism survived the establishment of Christianity, Murray exhibits no hard evidence that supports her claim of the extensive

domination of the surviving cult. But whether or not Murray's questionable claim (that human sacrifice in England endured well after the establishment of Christianity) proves true, the powerful archetype of the divine king sacrificed for the benefit of the people began in time immemorial and remains in human hearts. John Ford gives no direct allusion that his imaginative representation willingly chose his own execution or that Perkin formed a covenant with Henry VII, but the archetypal significance of Perkin as the divine king prevails in both *Perkin Warbeck* and Murray's *The Divine King in England*. Both Ford and Murray challenge the authority of historical chronicles and, as Grassi observes from his translation of Dante, Dante claims that "the poetic word permits reality to appear in terms of historicity" (*Heidegger and the End* 21).

To most audience members, Perkin and Henry VII remain archenemies. Perkin's execution (by the Machiavellian forces of Henry VII) symbolizes humanism's execution (by the forces of seventeenth-century rationalism). The king (the central figure in Renaissance consciousness) and kingship (one of the major themes in *Perkin Warbeck*) entwine within Ford's text to focus the debate on who should reign. Perkin displays a chivalrous king's honesty, tenderness, gracefulness, loyalty, and courage. On the other hand, the rhetorical presence of Henry's final lines proclaiming England "purg'd of corrupted blood" (5.3.25) may have intensified the longing for a king that would bravely disentangle England from courtly sycophants, papists, puritans, or other contaminations perceived by an individual playgoer.

Although critics consistently point out Perkin's lack of military skills, no source consulted for this study mentions that Perkin faces doom only after Henry executes his chancellor Stanley for siding with Perkin. Stanley may have provided the claimant with intelligence, men, equipment, and monetary needs for victory, but Stanley was instead intercepted by other events. Henry's spies discover Sir Robert Clifford's allegiance to Perkin Warbeck, and Henry cajoles Clifford to name other noblemen who are aiding the claimant. Stanley, the most powerful Englishman to abet, is swiftly imprisoned and quickly executed. After Stanley's demise, Henry persuades King James of Scotland to cease fighting the English and to disregard loyalties to Perkin. Without military succor from either Stanley or James IV, Perkin Warbeck cannot capture the crown from Henry.

Whether or not members of Ford's audience perceived any warrior skills in Perkin, he nevertheless displayed other traits of leadership. For instance, Perkin's regal language elicits openness, Round-Table trust, and humanistic compassion. These attributes of openness imply the perception of a fair and scrupulous leader. As a ruler, Perkin would uphold tolerance, justice, and equality between the sexes and among the various social ranks. On the other hand, Henry's language indicates that subjects should be static—they should stay in their place. Like inanimate pieces on a chess set, Henry controls his subjects' upward or downward movements. Commenting on Henry's rhetoric, Joseph Candido shows that "witchcraft is fused with treason" (301), and "statecraft is compared to hunting and trapping, snarling and angling, and shrewd play at cards" (303). In 1.1, Henry's decision to move his court

from the more feminine royal presence-chamber at Westminster to the masculine Tower of London symbolizes trepidation, distrust, and a threat to imprison any challenge to Henry's *de facto* rule. The Tudor's act of incarcerating his court parallels that of the trapper instead of a statesman who would negotiate solutions instead of confining or limiting possibilities. His act, one of closure and regression, not of openness and vision, exhibits his passion for control. According to Jonas A. Barish, "the king who thinks of other men as animals of prey to be trapped or hooked does not endear himself to us as a human being" (163). At the same time, Henry VII delivers the final lines at the final scene and rules the English people at the end of Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*. Henry has the last word. The Tudor's strength undoubtedly appealed to the Renaissance sense of order.

Yet, as sequences of *Weltanschauung* supplanting another *Weltanschauung* occurred in seventeenth-century minds, the Renaissance sense of order fused with a yearning for freedom and discovery. This yearning for freedom and discovery quickens in both imaginative representations of Perkin Warbeck and Henry VII. Perkin seeks freedom and discovery to recover his own birthright and unites himself spiritually with the English people, whereas Henry manipulates the spirit of freedom and discovery to gain and retain control of others. Power, primary to Henry, slips secondary, if not tertiary, to Perkin.

Despite the antithetical natures of Henry and Perkin, they share the same type of Achilles tendon—neither man perceives his own, respective "folly." Ernesto Grassi's *Folly and Insanity in Renaissance Literature* examines the human

phenomenon, folly from the perspectives of Erasmus's satire *The Praise of Folly* and Leon Battista Alberti's allegory *Momus*. Grassi identifies folly as "a tradition which provides . . . a basis for questioning the primacy of rational thinking and speaking, and [one] which allows . . . [doing] so without being seduced into irrational or romantic thesis" (15). Grassi beholds a balance between the masculine rational and the feminine intuitive. By suppressing the irrational, emotional aspect of his nature, Henry becomes, in Ford editor William Gifford's words, "cold, calculating, stern, shrewd, and avaricious" (217). Perkin, on the other hand, puts too much faith in the emotional and intuitive; and he grasps, too late, his kindship to a Celtic king facing a Roman legion. Perkin suffers in a pragmatic sense, whereas Henry, whose worldly power increases through the course of *Perkin Warbeck*, deteriorates spiritually because of his failure to recognize his own folly.

Interestingly, such blindness to folly plagues the two major characters and also some critics of *Perkin Warbeck*. For instance, Winston Weathers claims that John Ford "created a play which is a study not simply of the melancholy man but of the whole psychological complex of the human mind as it struggles to maintain its sanity and reason in the face of aberrant and disordering forces" (217). Weathers frames his overall argument on the inferential premisses that Henry is the king and that Perkin is the impostor. Also, Weathers's argument overrides anything but the rational process. Although no one would argue that King Henry acts rationally throughout *Perkin Warbeck*, Weathers fails to consider any self-serving motives for Henry's behavior. The English king's callous deeds are dismissed as representing "some of the

characteristics of pure reason when detached, or isolated, from the emotional side of human personality.” Henry himself depicts “the reasonable part of the mind itself, the rationalistic, intellectual capacity that is responsible for holding body and soul together” (220).

Grassi would dispute Weathers’s argument by arguing that “rationalistic, intellectual capacity” is singularly incapable of holding “body and soul together.” Grassi explains that the rational process alone, without the balance of folly, is static, unyielding, and “no longer the predominant method or the predominant way of reaching knowledge.” Grassi further explains that “rational thinking consists in deduction from premisses which it cannot find by itself.” From these observations, Grassi asserts that “the rational way of thinking, therefore, is unable to lead to anything new.” In order to understand, discover, or create, one must uphold “the primacy of the act of finding over against the already founded act of deducing.” In other words, one must value “the inventive over the rational process” (*Folly and Insanity* 31).

Grassi maintains that since the rational process is static, it is unlikely that it could facilitate the awesome task of what Weathers terms, “holding body and soul together.” Because Weathers apparently does not follow Grassi’s philosophy that a scholar should counterbalance rational thinking with folly, Weathers’s study of the imaginative representation of Henry VII implies a priestly, almost sacred role for Henry when he states that “Henry’s task in the play is to rid the ‘state’ of any contamination.” Again, Weathers declines to mention any possible contamination by Henry. Instead, Weathers upholds the status quo, and he rests his argument on the

play's final lines which King Henry delivers: "public states, / As our own particular bodies, taste most good / In health when purg'd of corrupted blood" (5.3.223-25). Even if Perkin truly represents "corruption," the analogy of blood purging in Henry's final lines depicts a rational seventeenth-century solution seen as an erroneous solution in the twentieth-century. Bleeding a disease-ridden person will alleviate a few dangerous microorganisms, but it will leave the majority of them in the body, and, ironically, other harmful germs may enter the body through the unsterile, seventeenth-century purging methods. Finally, a purging subtracts blood cells and nutrients from a body that needs them. Ford, who lived and wrote in a century in which a Dutch lens craftsman discovered blood cells (and had few clues to their purposes), comes closer to an understanding of Perkin Warbeck as an imperfect but necessary blood cell than twentieth-century Weathers, who dismisses Perkin as an irrational organism that simply needs purging.

In short, Weathers fails to contemplate Ford's wondrous complexity. *Perkin Warbeck* cannot be summed up as "delusion fails, reason conquers; the kingdom of reason and the kingdom of emotion must coexist in peace" (226). John Ford shows deep contemplation about moral ambiguities, disintegrating world views, and various dilemmas common to human experience. Instead of telling his audience who is the king, who is the hero, who is right, and who is wrong, Ford's imaginative representation and sensitivity to assorted rhetorical presences leave an openness for individual discovery.

In earlier plays, Ford demonstrated that the good do not always win in the end; the status quo may conquer the pariah, but the status quo may exude and camouflage evils that greatly exceed those of the pariahs. In *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, Giovanni and Annabella commit brother-sister incest, a shocking depiction to any audience with the exception of the ancient Egyptians. Their wrongdoing, exacerbated by deception as the pregnant Annabella (advised by the Friar) marries an older suitor and keeps silent about her condition, becomes a web of moral ambiguity. As the truth unravels and the Cardinal and other opportunity-seekers gather like buzzards to the home of Annabella's husband, Giovanni, perhaps out of insanity, murders and cuts out the heart of the woman he loves. The lecherous Cardinal delivers the final lines: "Incest and murder have so strangely met. / Of one so young, so rich in nature's store, / Who could not say, 'Tis pity she's a whore?" (5.4.257-59).

Ford's audience in *'Tis Pity* can easily perceive deeper malice in the Cardinal who decries and persecutes Annabella and Giovanni for his own worldly advancement, confiscates their goods for the Church, and orders the live burning of Annabella's tutoress "for example's sake" (5.4.238). The Cardinal's obsessive pursuit of power parallels Henry VII's. Although John Ford's imaginative representation of King Henry (*Perkin Warbeck*) conceals his ruthlessness more cunningly than the Cardinal's (*'Tis Pity*), Henry's power is not any more righteous.

Part of Weathers's justification in upholding Henry (England) and James (Scotland) as the "natural, sane enemies within the self" (220) who "coexist in peace" at the end (226), lies in perceiving insanity within Perkin. According to Weathers,

Perkin portrays “an hallucination that splits, like lightning, down between the delicately balanced parts of self that ego and id are” (219). Weathers argues, “That Perkin is mad is made quite clear by what he says and what those around him say” (221). Weathers’s argument of clarity attempts to justify Perkin’s madness by quoting Perkin’s line to Frion, “You make me mad” (4.2.26), spoken after James IV betrays Perkin and Frion expresses disloyalty and an undeserved air of superiority: “You grow too wild in passion: if you will / Appear a prince indeed, Confine your will / To moderation” (19-21). Besides the lines of Henry and Frion, Weathers also cites the “bedlam” words of Lambert Simnel and Huntley to attempt proof that Perkin is insane. Weathers does not discuss Simnel and Huntley’s motives for dismissing Perkin. Instead, Perkin, as argued by Weathers, represents the Straw-Man fallacy—he is targeted by those that fear the loss of their own status by his claim to the throne.

Although evidence may suggest some neurosis in Perkin Warbeck’s character, the consistency in his actions overrules psychosis. John Ford demonstrates knowledge of Robert Burton’s *The Anatomy of Melancholy* by direct quotes from Burton in several other plays. Although Ford may have been familiar with the Burtonian documentation depicting cases of imagined glory resulting from severe “melancholy,” it is unlikely that the consistent Perkin suffered from such psychosis. Burton reasons that “if an ambitious man become melancholy, he forthwith thinks he is a King, an Emperor, a Monarch. . . .” Burton goes on to illuminate a case about a man thinking he was the pope and proceeded to give pardons and give other men the title of Cardinal. The seventeenth-century psychologist concludes his tales of feigned glory by

describing a man “that thought he was a King driven from his Kingdom, and was very anxious to recover his estate” (464).

Even if Perkin is not Richard, Duke of York, but instead a peasant suffering from a psychological aberration such as a fugue or multiple personalities, he nevertheless demonstrates what some Caroline audience members may have perceived as ideal kingship. By deeming Perkin as the “corrupted blood” of the state that needs purging, Weathers overlooks Perkin’s agape-like love for others. Perkin agonizes over killing fellow human beings in order to prove his right to the English throne. Also, Perkin’s marriage to Katherine represents a consolidation of neoplatonic twin souls. To Queen Henrietta’s neoplatonic coterie, the imaginative representations of the gentle Perkin and Katherine depicted evolved souls who struggled against the ruthless opportunism of others.

Neoplatonism began in Alexandria in the third century. As a philosophical system, neoplatonism revises Plato’s actual teachings to accord with Aristotelian, post-Aristotelian, and oriental doctrines. Many neoplatonists are pantheists and share the world view that all beings are emanations from the One. They believe that the soul has the capacity to rise and reunite with the One in trance or ecstasy. Since neoplatonism upholds the divine potential of every soul, many neoplatonists advocate more democracy for everyone. Other neoplatonists argue that some souls are more evolved than other souls and therefore should rule over the less matured souls. Neoplatonism influenced medieval writers of romances, and many of them portrayed the woman in a superior position to the man. Neoplatonists often praised women for their constancy

and chastity. Mark Stavig emphasizes that the most significant vicissitude between Queen Henrietta's earmark of platonism and Queen Elizabeth's earmark of platonism is that "Henrietta Maria emphasized that rationality and spirituality were essential if love were to escape contamination" (38). Charles I's queen instructed her coterie that celibate love was superior to coital love. Stavig points out that "one explanation of the increased stress on virginity in the code of [the Catholic] Henrietta Maria is the great veneration accorded to the Virgin Mary" (39). Although the Caroline neoplatonism had a tendency to advocate celibacy and the single life, and the Elizabethan neoplatonism had a tendency to encourage marriage and procreation, both have lineage from Ficino. Ficino argues that God advocates both spiritual love and physical love. Stavig translates Ficino's argument as: "there is a Love in each case: in the former, it is the desire of contemplating beauty; and in the latter, the desire of propagating it; both loves are honorable and praiseworthy, each is concerned with the divine image" (38-39).

Although the married and often pregnant Henrietta Maria advocated the single life and spiritual, nonphysical love as a superior, more rational state than the marital life and physical love, she did not find the marital state repugnant once she accustomed herself to Charles I and her new family. Moreover, since the strong-willed queen had difficulty adjusting to her marriage in the 1620s, Henrietta Maria appreciated that neither Ford's imaginative representation of Perkin nor Ford's imaginative representation of Katherine seeks power over the other. Perkin's lack of patriarchal demands contrasts Henry VII's obvious patriarchy toward his own absent and seldom-

mentioned queen. Lord Dawbeney deems Henry's marriage to Elizabeth of York "a blessed union" (1.1.39), but Elizabeth's absence from *Perkin Warbeck* and Henry's disregard of her speak otherwise. Instead of ignoring Katherine, Perkin exalts his "great miracle of constancy" (5.3.91), and upholds their own marriage by employing the metaphor of a loving marriage to statecraft in order to initiate rhetorical presence among the Scots and Perkin. Although Perkin does not generate rhetorical presence or trust between himself and all the Scots, he wins the trust (albeit temporary) between Perkin and James IV. While not all the Scots believed Perkin, the imaginative representation of Perkin Warbeck endears himself to many audience members by his marriage speech. Perkin explains to King James IV that he intends to "marry these two kingdoms in a love / Never to be divorced when time is time" (2.1.90-91).

This metaphor undoubtedly caused Ford's contemporary audience to reflect both upon the politics of their own time and also upon their own lives. Although England and Scotland would not be officially united until the Act of Union in 1707, the same Stuart king ruled both nations. Metaphorically, the uneven affiliation between Caroline England and Scotland paralleled more of a forced and patriarchal betrothal than a loving relationship. When Henry VII bargains for two political marriages in *Perkin Warbeck*, the match that the King of Spain "resolves," according to Hialas, "For Katherine his daughter, with Prince Arthur" (4.3.8-9), and Henry's bribe of his own daughter for King James IV, the Caroline audience may have reflected upon the uneasy relationship of England and Scotland.

Interestingly, Ford alters the historical timetable in order to include the events of Henry VII's political bargaining of his son daughter in *Perkin Warbeck*. Such political betrothals epitomize the emotionless affiliations common to royalty, and the Caroline audience would rhetorically connect the patriarchal betrothals in *Perkin Warbeck* with the unhappy arranged marriages in other plays. Elizabethan, Jacobean, Caroline, and later Restoration dramas commonly portray unhappy marriages that were arranged rather than chosen by the man and the woman directly involved. Perhaps Ford employs marriage and statecraft together metaphorically and includes Henry's marital bargaining so that his contemporary audience could decide if the imaginary representation of Perkin or the imaginary representation of Henry would make the better king. Historically, the union between Henry VII's son, Arthur and the Spanish princess, Katherine proved tragic. After Arthur's early death, his widow marries his brother, Henry. As Henry VIII, Katherine's second husband divorces her for another woman, frustrated over what he believes is her inability to produce male progeny. If the Caroline audience compared the chronicles' depiction to Ford's imaginative representation of Henry VII, they perceived that both Henry VIII and Henry VII discerned women as mere servants of men and therefore expendable.

Ford may have intended his audience to perceive a rhetorical presence between his imaginary representation of Henry VII and Marlowe's imaginative representation of Tamburlaine. Ford's imaginative representation of Henry VII and Marlowe's imaginary representation of Tamburlaine disregard the freedom and dignity of others in order to facilitate successful use of regal action. Some of Charles I's subjects,

frustrated by a king who could rule neither with nor without Parliament, may have slighted Henry's obdurate ambition and longed for a king who was shrewd enough to protect his loyal subjects. Henry VII's first action in *Perkin Warbeck* (moving his court from Westminster Palace to the Tower of London) reveals Henry as the pragmatic king who will protect his leadership from rebels. Although the relocation proved unnecessary because neither the Cornish rebels nor Perkin's militia reached London, Henry and his men had no way of knowing how threatening the two insurrections might be. Even before the move to the Tower, Henry's Spartan court is devoid of women or merriment. Like any Machiavellian, Henry constantly scrutinizes others to ascertain whom he can trust and who may attempt to usurp his power.

Henry's decision to move to the Tower, to safeguard his kingship from dissenters, juxtaposes James IV's initial decision to defend Perkin Warbeck. From a practical point of view, James's first action nearly proves disastrous. By leaving Edinburgh with a militia to fight King Henry, James risks incurring Henry's wrath and losing his own crown. Fortunately for James, Henry demonstrates less revenge than diplomacy.

Henry's shrewd decision to relocate his court and his willingness to disregard James's earlier bond with Perkin Warbeck exhibit qualities that Niccolo Machiavelli affirms in *The Prince*. Machiavelli states in chapter 20 that "fortresses may be useful or otherwise, according to circumstances." He explains that "the prince who fears his own people more than he does foreigners ought to build fortresses, but a prince who is more afraid of foreigners than his own people can neglect them" (Adams 62). Henry

reflects Machiavelli's ideal prince as he utilizes the existing Tower of London as a buffer from some of Henry's own people, not from foreign powers. In act 4, Henry strengthens his affiliations with Spain and Scotland through political marriages, and thus he quells the threats of these countries and maintains the status quo. Fears of other foreign powers are only expressed in act 1 as fears of Margaret of Burgundy's witchcraft or rumors that Perkin Warbeck would be reinforced by Charles of France. However, Henry has reason to secure his power from the Cornish insurgents or Perkin's militia until both threats are stopped.

Besides Henry's belief in security, his single focus in negotiating with King James, also signifies Machiavellianism. Machiavelli advises against unnecessary friction between foreign or domestic segments in chapter 17 of *The Prince*, which begins with the counsel that "every prince should prefer to be considered merciful rather than cruel, yet he should be careful not to mismanage this clemency of his" (47). Machiavelli further asserts that the ideal prince should moderate his conduct "with prudence and humanity, allowing neither overconfidence to make him careless, nor overtimidity to make him intolerable" (47). Machiavelli explains that "when he [a prince] does have to shed blood, he should be sure to have a strong justification and manifest cause" (48). Henry wisely manipulates James in act 4, before shedding more blood, and thus reveals some discretion.

Despite Henry's prudence, he demonstrates a lack of humanity when he offers his own daughter as a wife to James in exchange for James's agreement to quell the Perkin Warbeck insurrection. Although the Caroline audience was acclimated to

forced marriages and absolutism in rulers, seventeenth-century England had already begun to ponder the philosophy of human rights. Henry's use of his daughter as a political ruse has the force of controlling or limiting behavior from his enemies and his allies and centralizes the power of kingship within his grasp.

The historical union of James IV and the English Princess Margaret (not to be confused with Margaret of Burgundy) provides the direct bloodline to Charles I. For the Fordian audience that sided with Perkin Warbeck, James's option of Henry's accord and Henry's daughter in exchange for loyalty to Perkin Warbeck may have reflected an unflattering light on the Stuarts. John Ford possibly had Machiavelli's "general rule about men" in mind while inventing the character of James IV: "they [men] are ungrateful, fickle, liars and deceivers, fearful of danger and greedy for gain". Machiavelli continues by explaining the effects a prince should expect by controlling subjects' behavior: "While you serve their welfare, they are all yours, offering their blood, their belongings, their lives, and their children's lives . . . so long as the danger is remote" (48). By act 4 King James becomes, in Perkin Warbeck's words, "dull / Frosty and wayward" (4.2.2-3) when the "danger" of fighting Henry becomes less "remote." The feudal king decides to cease fighting the Machiavellian and to consolidate with him.

Perkin Warbeck's worldly defeat by Henry leads Donald K. Anderson to compare Ford's Perkin Warbeck with Shakespeare's Richard II. Both men contested for the English throne and lost although Richard II had already experienced coronation and Perkin's crown simply remained on his rival's head. Both kings share the

birthname “Richard” and, as Anderson points out, the turmoil of the Lancastrian-Yorkist feuds (260). Anderson compares two long speeches, one by Richard II and the other by Perkin Warbeck. In both scenes comprising the speeches, the two Richards verbalize optimism to their troops despite their turn of fortunes. Although Richard II appears in act 1, he is absent from act 2, and his presence in 3.2 reveals the king for the first time as a contestant for the English throne. The rival, Bullingbrook (which is also spelled as Bolingbroke), has returned to England and has ordered the executions of Richard’s sycophants. Moreover, Richard’s Welsh supporters have already defected. In light of the realities indicating the contrary though, Richard II joyfully invokes the “dear earth” for divine intervention: “Dear earth, I do salute thee with my hand, / Though rebels wound thee with their horses’ hoofs: / As a long-parted mother with her child.” Richard II’s speech digresses for a couple of lines, then commands the earth, “Feed not thy sovereign’s foe . . . / Nor with thy sweets comfort his ravenous sense.” The troubled monarch desperately adjures, “But let thy spiders, that suck up thy venom, / And heavy-gaited toads lie in their way, / Doing annoyance to the treacherous feet / Which with usurping steps do trample thee.” Richard II’s continues his damning monologue: “Yield stinging nettles to mine enemies; / . . . when they from thy bosom pluck a flower, / Guard it, I pray thee, with a lurking adder.” Richard’s imaginary adder has a “double tongue with a mortal touch” who will “Throw death upon thy sovereign’s enemies.” Even Richard perceives some absurdity in his words, and he tells his men: “Mock not my senseless conjuration, lords” (3.2.4-23).

Perkin's speech that resembles Richard II's speech (according to Anderson) takes place just as Perkin lands off the coast of Cornwall. At this point (4.1), Perkin is apparently unaware that Henry VII has imprisoned and executed Stanley and other English noblemen who supported the claimant, but he does know that James IV of Scotland is now Henry's puppet. Two scenes earlier, Perkin explains to his men, "our cause and our courage are our own" (4.3.114). Two scenes later, as Perkin invokes "our dear mother earth" (4.5.4), his language mirrors Richard II's "gentle earth." But unlike Richard II's men, Perkin's remaining troops show support for their "king / of hearts" (33-34). Perkin answers his men: "A thousand blessings guard our lawful arms! / A thousand horrors pierce our enemies' souls! / Pale fear unedge their weapons' sharpest points!" Perkin proceeds with his wish to despoil his foe, "And when they draw their arrows to the head, / Numbness shall strike their sinews!" Perkin justifies his violent language: "Such advantage / Hath Majesty in its pursuit of justice." The claimant's next line is somewhat more fanciful as he speaks of "the proppers-up of Truth's old throne" that both "enlightens counsel and gives heart / To execution; while the throats of traitors / Lie bare before our mercy." Perkin's next lines reveal faith in the aphorism "good blood will tell": "O divinity of royal birth!" Perkin asserts that the "divinity" of royal blood "strikes dumb the tongues / Whose prodigality of breath is bribed / By trains to greatness!" Perkin's continues his speech with lines that reveal humility of himself as a prince: "Princes are but men / Distinguished in the fineness of their frailty" (4.5.47-64).

Anderson views similarities between Richard's weaponry diction which includes "toads," "nettles," "adders," and "stones", and Perkin's "less tangible aid" involving "horrors", "fear", and "numbness" (262-63). Anderson fails to notice that Perkin's vague words are also more descriptive of battlefield realities than the superstitious diction of "toads," "nettles" and "adders". Whereas both kingly contestants wish ill will on their enemies, while verbalizing optimism for themselves, Richard II's language sounds more like a desperate man's attempt to jinx than Perkin's rhetoric of winning. Perkin invokes "a thousand blessings" as well as "a thousand horrors." Whereas Richard II rants to himself, Perkin speaks encouragement to his men. Both Plantagenets have their troops as audiences.

Anderson also argues that neither Richard II nor Perkin Warbeck seeks "victory by practical means, such as manpower and money" (262). Even though Anderson's delusional picture of Richard II stands fairly accurate, his assimilation of Perkin disintegrates somewhat when details of Ford's play are examined. Shortly before Perkin's speech to his troops, Skelton tells his "king of hearts" that he should expect great manpower from the Cornish to replace the Scottish manpower: "The Cornish blades are men of mettle." They "have proclaimed, through Bodmin and the whole / county, my sweet prince Monarch of England: four / thousand tall yeomen, with bow and sword, already / vow to live and die at the foot of King Richard" (4.5.33-38). Perkin and Skelton are unaware that the Cornish have already been intercepted by Henry VII's men on their way to London, so Perkin's optimism does not necessarily reflect lack of pragmatism as Anderson claims.

Besides Skelton, Astley also voices news of English support for the claimant. Astley tells Perkin, “The mayor, our fellow-counsellor [probably the mayor of Cornwall], is servant for / an emperor. Exeter is appointed for the rendezvous.” Astley assures Perkin that “nothing wants to victory but courage and resolution” (4.5.39-41). At this point, Perkin’s humble, but devoted, men have no knowledge of Henry’s interception of Stanley and other English nobles who support Perkin.

Despite the “courage and resolution” from Perkin and his men, Perkin later loses all but his wife and his dignity to Henry Tudor. Similarly, Shakespeare’s imaginative representation of Richard II loses his throne to another Henry, Henry Bullingbrook (Bolingbroke). Tudor and Bullingbrook both exude Machiavellian realism in their command of leadership. Bullingbrook recognizes Richard II’s weaknesses—those involving the English people in needless wars, others exhausting resources, and his willingness to accept counsel only from favorites. But unlike Henry Tudor, Henry Bullingbrook has a conscience. Bullingbrook perceives that England could be swallowed by another king if Richard II continues to rule, but Bullingbrook still bears guilt and vows a pilgrimage to the Holy Land after usurping Richard II.

Other differences between Ford’s imaginative representation of Henry VII and Shakespeare’s imaginative representation of Bullingbrook (who later becomes Henry IV) lie in Henry Tudor’s language and actions that command stasis and Henry Bullingbrook’s language and actions that elicit openness. Even Bullingbrook’s speech before two men whose death he has ordered reveals a certain degree of openness and reveal a regard for women: “I will unfold some causes of your deaths: / You have

misled a prince, a royal king, / A happy gentleman in blood and lineaments.”

Bullingbrook characterizes Bushy and Green as “you unhappied and disfigured clean” because “You have in manner with your sinful hours / Made a divorce betwixt his queen and him, / Broke the possession of a royal bed,” and (Bushy and Green) also “stain’d the beauty of a fair queen’s cheeks / With tears drawn from her eyes by your foul wrongs” (3.1.7-15).

Shakespeare’s imaginative representation of Bullingbrook demonstrates more courage than Ford’s imaginative representation of Henry VII as similar scenes depict these men relating to other men whose lives are in their hands. Bullingbrook expresses his reasons and emotions by explaining to Bushy and Green why he chooses the extreme punishment of execution for them. In contrast, Ford’s Henry VII orders Stanley’s death without seeing his “bosom friend” (1.3.127) and without giving him a chance to justify himself. When Henry VII encounters his rival after Perkin’s recapture in Salisbury, Henry baits and labels Perkin rather than honestly informing him that he orders his death to augment his own puissance. Henry Tudor’s nebulous words and sarcasm contrast Henry Bullingbrook’s openness and sincerity. The Tudor patriarch begins beleaguering his rival with rhetoric of an inquisitor seeking a confession: “Turn now thine eyes, / Young man, upon thyself and thy past actions.” Henry deems Perkin’s noble efforts (which Henry aborted) as “revels in combustion through our kingdom / A frenzy of aspiring youth hath danced, / Till, wanting breath, thy feet of pride have slipt / To break thy neck!” (5.2.50-55).

Interestingly, this scene displays Henry VII's attempt at poetry. The Machiavellian's usually prosaic language evolves into metaphors as Henry deems Perkin and his followers as "a frenzy of aspiring youth" who dance rather than fight. In verbalizing that Perkin's pride has feet that slip, Henry asserts that even the claimant's pride is something ordinary and vulnerable. Instead of invoking images, Henry's metaphors remain static and one-sided; they are also brutal and ugly. Henry labels Perkin; Perkin is prosecuted without a defense. Henry defines the claimant as a "counterfeit" (5.3.1), and the autocrat's subjects must accept his words or keep their mouths shut.

Bullingbrook's metaphors are, on the other hand, open metaphors. The fusion of treason with divorce parallels Perkin Warbeck's metaphor of a loving marriage and statehood. Perkin's aspiration to "marry these two kingdoms [England and Scotland] in a love / Never to be divorced when time is time" (2.1.90-91) indicates Henry's dishonesty in accusing Perkin of treason. Bullingbrook's treason-divorce metaphor and Perkin's loving marriage-statehood metaphor infer the necessity for a neoplatonic symmetry between the masculine and the feminine, the rational and the intuitive, battlefield valor and human relationships. Bullingbrook and Perkin value women more than as mere breeders or as insignificant sexual objects; rather women are valued as beings with thoughts and feelings. Bullingbrook relates to Bushy and Green that their mutiny "stain'd the beauty of a fair queen's cheeks / With tears drawn from her eyes by your foul wrongs" (3.1.13-15). The beauty of Richard II's wife contrasts with the "foul wrongs" of the double-crossers who "misled a prince, a royal king" (3.1.8).

As Bullingbrook fuses treason with the deed of breaking a lady's heart, Perkin's loving marriage-statehood metaphor intertwines with the claimant's honor of his loving Katherine, his "great miracle of constancy" (5.3.32), who esteems her vows to him despite his incapacity to seize the crown from Henry.

Besides Katherine, two other noble heroes support Perkin Warbeck. Sir William Stanley loses his life for the claimant's cause, and Lord Dalyell loses his great love (Katherine) to Perkin and still remains Perkin's loyal friend. Until 1.3 of *Perkin Warbeck*, Stanley serves as lord chamberlain to Henry VII while he attempts to institute a clandestine militia for Perkin. In 1.1 Henry (who apparently does not sense any betrayal) exclaims, "we know thou lov'st us, and thy heart / Is figur'd on thy tongue" (102-03). Reflecting the teachings of courtly politeness and the rational tone of Castiglione's *The Courtier*, Stanley voices support for his king and deems Perkin's rebellion as "folly" and "madness" (1.1.99), but he refrains comment when Henry's other men rage over the alleged sorcery behind Perkin's aspiration. Playgoers who regard Stanley's initial behavior as counterfeit see a different Stanley when Henry's men tell Stanley that Henry will not see him. Stanley declares, "O the king, / Next to my soul, shall be the nearest subject / Of my last prayers" (2.2.71-73). After Clifford (who betrayed Stanley) mimics the degrading rhetoric of Henry's men, Stanley makes a cross on Clifford's face and exclaims, ". . . by this token think on me!" (87). He attempts to rouse Clifford's conscience as he explains, "I wet upon your cheek a holy sign,— / The cross, the Christian's badge, the traitor's infamy; / Wear, Clifford to thy grave this painted emblem; / Water shall never wash it off; all eyes / . . . shall read

there written / A state informer's character" (2.2.89-93). The nobleman who confronts his Judas with a cross meets execution without a trial, without an impartial jury, and without a chance to justify himself to his king.

Like Stanley, Dalyell also exudes dignity while encountering loss and hardship. When Katherine chooses Perkin for a husband instead of Dalyell, the Scottish nobleman discourages the angry ravings of Katherine's father toward Perkin. Dalyell urges the Earl of Huntley, "O, noble Huntley, my few years / Have learnt experience of too ripe an age / To forfeit fit credulity: forgive / My rudeness, I am bold" (3.2.46-49). Huntley pleads with the younger man to "teach [him] humility" (51), but he refers to Katherine as "a castaway, / And never child of mine more" (68-69). After hearing the verbal assaults on his great love, Dalyell answers to Huntley, "Say not so, sir; / It is no fault in her" (70-71). By 4.3 as Perkin's fortunes turn in favor of Henry and Huntley disowns Katherine, Dalyell again expresses his loyalty toward her: "I resolve, / Fair lady, with your leave, to wait on all / your fortunes in my person, if your lord / Vouchsafe me entertainment" (4.3.179-82). Perkin answers, "I accept this tender of your love / Beyond ability of thanks to speak it" (184-85). Dalyell continues his fidelity to Perkin and Katherine in 5.1. Dalyell explains to Katherine that her husband surrendered to Henry VII, not as a coward, but as a man wise enough to realize his foe's advantage: "Impute it not to faintness or weakness / Of noble courage, lady, but [to] foresight; / For by some secret friend he had intelligence / Of being bought and sold by his base followers" (68-71). Dalyell's great loyalty to his friends survives their marriage (which interferes with Dalyell's marital plans) and their fortunes (which

affect Dalyell's own fortune); moreover, Dalyell refrains from dishonesty or slander toward the man who married Dalyell's great love. Like Katherine, Dalyell does not bend to Henry VII's flattery, and he declines Henry's invitation to join his court.

Katherine's choice to isolate herself from Henry's court and to live as a chaste widow demonstrates the elevated fealty of any masculine Arthurian hero. Without the man she loves, or a Round Table court where thoughts and feelings are exchanged, Katherine chooses honest detachment rather than spurious camaraderie. J. Markale asserts that the Arthurian hero comprehends the necessity "to overcome the rift between the individual and society" (*King Arthur* 58). By isolating herself from the closed world defined by Henry VII, Katherine chooses her own identity as the chaste widow of a king sacrificed on the unchaste altar of unscrupulous power.

Perkin and Katherine's great love contrasts Guinevere's infidelity to Arthur. The claimant and the Scottish princess confirm a noble evolution from earlier romantic heroes. Perkin and Katherine's loving marriage represents their loyalty to the English people. Their neoplatonic union embodies openness and trust. Yet their separation (Perkin's execution) symbolizes that only through change can a hero become greater. Instead, Henry closes his court in a tower of perpetual death and commands his subjects to remain in their fixed places. At the conclusion of *Perkin Warbeck*, Henry rules while the audience psychologically awaits the reawakening or rebirth of England's true king. The subconsciousness weaves tapestries of an ideal court. Jean Markale elucidates the soul's longing for King Arthur: "For centuries we have been waiting for Arthur. We have given him the title of king because according to the Celts

the king maintains the balance of the world” (220). Likewise, in the hearts of Ford’s audience, in those that are sensitive to openness, Perkin Warbeck, “the king of hearts,” awaits rebirth.

Perhaps not every playgoer in Ford’s Caroline audience consciously or subconsciously connected with Perkin Warbeck as “the king of hearts,” the once and future Arthurian king, or the collective archetype. Yet, Perkin’s characteristics as a poet-king, a neoplatonic lover, and an aspiring uniter of people cannot be overlooked as Ford created his imaginative representation for an England dejected by an inept king and constantly shifting world views.

CHAPTER 3
KATHERINE AND THE “LINK WITH THE OBJECTIVE”

—Ernesto Grassi

John Ford shares with Philip Sidney and John Milton the realization that the muses constitute paramount significance to Renaissance poetic tragedy. Muses bring beauty out of tragic drama, sonnet sequences, and epics and unite audiences with stages or books. In “Astrophil and Stella,” Sidney’s persona acknowledges the muses in the first sonnet. The persona describes his agony in trying to write like others [i.e. the Italian poets] until his muse tells him, “look in thy heart and write” (l. 14). Earlier in the poem, the persona states, “Invention, Nature’s child, fled step-dame Study’s blows” (10). In other words, sans the muses, the learning process seems to transform into a cruel stepmother. Sidney’s persona describes his further frustration in his efforts to employ the poetical feet of other poets: “And others’ feet still seem’d but strangers in my way” (11). But after the muse reveals to the poet that the poems lie asleep in his own heart, the sonnet sequence proceeds. Sidney explains that the muses guide the poets to honest passion and invention, and as Sidney argues in “The Defence of Poesy” (published 1595), poets are the true “makers.” The Greek word for poet also translates as *maker* (12). Sidney further argues that as the makers, poets have a superior role to warriors, philosophers, and historians (12-14).

In the opening lines of *Paradise Lost*, the muse is not just acknowledged, she is invoked. The very first words of *Paradise Lost* invoke a universal muse that transcends any specific geographical domain such as the Greek mountain Helicon. Since the muse has an unfixed domain, she waters the poetic springs of both Greece and Israel: “Sing, heav’nly Muse, that on the secret top / Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire / That shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed / In the beginning how the Heav’ns and Earth / Rose out of Chaos” (6-9). Six decades before Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*, Sidney, who also had extensive knowledge of the classics and the Bible, established for the English a rhetorical presence of the muses as providers of familiarity [i.e. biblical historicity] and clarity as well as inspiration. Sidney, Milton and Ford would understand why Grassi deems the muses as “the link with the objective, which makes the original order of the human world possible, in the face of the arbitrary, the subjective, and the changeable” (*Heidegger and the Question* 14). Since change is essential to creativity and dynamic frenzy accompanies change, the muses guide the dynamic frenzy so that it is not destroyed by itself. Grassi concludes that “through the Muses, confusion, obscurity, and the like are cleared away and abolished” (15).

Although early Greek mythology differs as to the number of the muses, later Greek mythology settles on nine of them: Clio, Euterpe, Thalia, Melopomene, Terpsichore, Erato, Polyhymnia, Urania, and Calliope. The daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne (Memory) and the half-sisters of Apollo embody flute playing, comedy, tragedy, lyric poetry and the dance, love poetry, heroic hymns and mimetic art,

astronomy, and epic poetry and eloquence. The muses link the objective with every craft they bless. As Grassi discovers from the fourteenth-century humanist Albertino Mussato, “the poet’s Muse speaks in images that direct or point; it speaks in suggestive puzzles or ‘enigmas’” (*Heidegger and the Question* 61). Because of her archetypal nature, a muse renders mystery, but she also bonds the poet-playwright and the audience with the familiar—the rhetorical presence.

In *Perkin Warbeck*, Katherine serves as the muse for the ill-fated, but stouthearted, Perkin and also for audience members that perceive Katherine as a magical stream that engenders dynamic history (as opposed to static, chronicle history), tragedy (as opposed to pathetic melodrama), love poetry, heroic hymns, and eloquence to Ford’s drama. For the Caroline audience, the imaginative representations of Katherine and Perkin created rhetorical presences with other tragic lovers of the Jacobean and Caroline stages: Antony and Cleopatra, Isabella and Antonio (of John Webster’s *The Duchess of Malfi*), and Calantha and Ithocles (of Ford’s *The Broken Heart*). Ford’s imaginative representation of Katherine’s and Perkin’s love for each other and the one of Katherine herself supply what Grassi identifies as the link with the objective from the stage to the audience. John Ford leaves a few puzzles regarding Perkin, but Katherine is indubitably beautiful, gracious, self-sacrificing, and heroic. Perkin’s love for the Scottish princess uplifts him in the audience’s eyes, and as Jean Howard points out, “their marriage remains a central, not a peripheral, aspect of Perkin’s depiction” as compared to Henry VII’s marriage negotiations in *Perkin*

Warbeck (274). The political union that Henry VII orchestrates for his son resembles the generally passionless, arranged marriages in Shakespeare's history plays.

Like Cassandra, the mortal daughter of the king of Troy who spurns Apollo's sexual advances, Katherine declines Henry VII's courtship. Whereas Apollo's kindred relationship with the muses represents the creative aspect of Apollo (the god of light, reason, archery, music, and the arts), his relationship with Cassandra relays the destructive aspect of Apollo. Apollo falls in love with Cassandra and gives her the gift of prophecy. When the Trojan princess refuses to lose her virginity to the god, Apollo curses Cassandra's boon so that no one believes her prophecies. Thus, Apollo filches from Cassandra what the muses lovingly bestow upon Apollo—the link with the objective and a focus for the mania.

Besides enabling focus for the mania, the muses create the mania itself, which Grassi explains is “the origin of poetry and art.” According to Grassi, mania is easily misunderstood “if simply identified with psychologically conceived ecstasy.” Instead, one “should take into account that it concerns an important event in which something nonderivable and archaic comes to the surface.” A wise person must possess such “nondemonstratable archaic indications” which signify one's communion with the muses (15).

Such nondemonstratable, archaic indications descend archetypally from the earliest known mother goddesses of the Upper Paleolithic period. The names of these goddesses remain forgotten, but their surviving figurines attest to their exalted magnitude with early, matrilineal tribes. Such fertility figurines, made from stone,

bone, or clay, date from about 25,000 B.C.E. and have been unearthed in areas now known as Spain, France, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Russia.

Anthropologists believe that early humans revered women as magical beings due to their ability to create life; Upper Paleolithic humankind did not associate coitus with pregnancy and thus did not acknowledge a male connection with offspring.

Not all goddesses bear children, but all feminine deities share a unity through a triad identified as maiden-mother-crone, representing the three initiatory phases in a woman's life. Robert Graves deems this triad "The Mothers of All Living" (198) because like mothers, they teach, reward, and discipline the mortals in their domain. The maiden demonstrates qualities as innocent as Persephone and as shrewd as Athena. Often the mother goddesses displayed the dualities of kindness and cruelty, creation and destruction within themselves. Like the mother goddesses, the crones also provide and withdraw, extend and detach. Crones have deep experiential wisdom that can aid mortals with their most soul-searching dilemmas, but mortals often misunderstand them and believe their lessons constitute mere maliciousness. The crone blessed children at birth, but also decided their fates—their lots in life and the time of their deaths. Since the life-giving mother and the death-giving crone intertwined themselves in human subconsciousness, women themselves represented both angels and she-demons, saintly virgins or loathsome prostitutes. Christian priests usually blamed the woman for tempting the man into sexual sin (as Eve tempted Adam). Since Christianity teaches that sin is the cause of death, it was believed that women trapped men into death. By the seventeenth-century, sexual intercourse was

still referred to as diminishment—the little death. Barbara Walker explains that the misconception of the little death sprang from the fear that “sex allows a woman to consume some portion of a man’s vital spirit, so she is fed while he is deprived and brought a step closer to real death.” Not surprisingly, “this notion led to a thousand forms of asceticism and celibacy” (*The Crone* 18). Walker further explains that the fear and mistreatment of widows in patriarchal cultures generate from “the widespread belief that a woman who outlived her husband had somehow used up his life force and killed him, even if unintentionally” (18).

Henry VII’s words in the opening lines of *Perkin Warbeck* set the rhetorical presence of the feared, sorcerous crone: “Still to be haunted, still to be pursued, / Still to be frighted with false apparitions” (1.1.1-2). A few lines down, the Earl of Oxford personifies the crone in the play as “Margaret of Burgundy / [who] Blows fresh coals of division” (43-44). Oxford hints that Margaret has been (and perhaps still is) sexually active in her elderly years by what he alleges as her birth of the “twins” (57), Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel. By the end of *Perkin Warbeck*, the gentle Katherine replaces the rhetorical presence of the sorcerous crone in the minds of some audience members.

John Ford’s imaginative representation of the youthful Katherine corresponds to the mythic crone in that Katherine becomes a widow and chooses to live apart from Henry VIII’s court at the conclusion of *Perkin Warbeck*. Although Ford’s audience cannot conclude or even infer that Katherine precipitates Perkin’s death, her widowhood and her detachment from Henry’s court link Katherine with a sororial

bond to the crone. Her rejection of Henry's offer to be Katherine's "father, husband, friend, and servant" (5.3.158) parallels Katherine with another nubile crone-figure, the Celtic Ice Queen. The archetypal Ice Queen evolves from Durga the Inaccessible, a form of the Indian goddess Devi. Men misunderstand the Ice Queen, because she distances herself from men and allegedly rules them by withholding sexual union. The patriarchal mind does not permit the Ice Queen the right to choose whether or not to have a courtship or a sexual relationship. Perhaps some audience members view Katherine's isolation from Henry VII's court and her vow of chastity as more of an attempt to manipulate Henry than to honor Perkin.

The Renaissance mind believed that a woman had sexual dominion over a man. Paradoxically, she dominated him whether she yielded to him and consumed him in a little death, or if she declined his affections and allowed him to agonize over his desire for her. If the imaginative representation of Katherine had chosen to join Henry VII's court shortly after Perkin's death (as the historical Katherine had done), some audience members would perceive Katherine's action as a lack of respect for Perkin. Yet, few audience members would see Katherine as an opportunist. The lack of ambition that Katherine expresses when Perkin speaks of crowning her "empress of the West" (3.2.162) and the love Katherine shows toward the living Perkin would counterbalance any perceived lack of respect Katherine could show the executed Perkin.

Katherine shines as the "Unequall'd pattern of a matchless wife" (4.5.11). Katherine's "pattern" constitutes originality not in her devotion as a wife, but in the observation that she does not anger or frustrate Perkin. Even the exalted Stella of

Sidney's sonnets causes the persona to weep and lament over their disagreements. In the "Fourth Song" the persona asks Stella, "Sweet, alas, why strive you thus? / Concord better fitteth us; / Leave to Mars [the god of war] the force of hands" (ll. 43-45). Although Katherine does not frustrate Perkin as Stella thwarts the persona of Sidney's "Astrophil and Stella," Katherine and Stella both serve as muses—magical streams from which poetry flows. Perkin's most exalted lines spring from the fountain of sacred love that Perkin shares with Katherine. To Perkin, Katherine shines as the "fair angel of perfection" (5.3.128) who shall "court every rich opinion of true merit, / And saint it in the calendar of virtue, / When I am turned into the self-same dust / Of which I was first formed" (130-33). Not only does Katherine fail to frustrate her poet-lover, she also outlives him. For the audience members that perceive *Perkin Warbeck* as a tragedy, Perkin's untimely death—rather than an unearthly muse's untimely death—defines this tragedy. Like Hamlet's friend Horatio, Katherine survives to tell the central figure's story.

In 3.2. as Perkin prepares to leave for England and fight for his cause, he bids his wife a tender farewell and he describes their love as sacred: "Now, dearest, ere sweet sleep shall seal those eyes, / Love's precious tapers, give me leave to use / A parting ceremony; for tomorrow / It would be a sacrilege to intrude upon / The temple of thy peace" (139-43). Joseph Candido notes a rhetorical connection between Perkin's love invocation and John Donne's "A Valediction Forbidding Mourning," especially in Donne's lines: "T'were prophanation of our joys / To tell the laytie our love" (7-8). For instance, Ford's imaginative representation and Donne's persona both

affirm what Candido defines as “a mutual love that exists in a spiritual world of its own” (307). Donne’s word *laytie* relates rhetorically to another of Perkin’s lines, spoken as he awaits execution. The condemned claimant tells Katherine, “Coarse creatures are incapable of excellence” (5.3.69). Perkin’s phrase “coarse creatures” and Donne’s persona’s word *laytie* are both outside the spiritual world of love. *Perkin Warbeck* and “A Valediction Forbidding Mourning” both surround the romantic leitmotif of the religion of love. Yet, Perkin remains less exclusive of his love’s spiritual realm. Although Perkin’s and Katherine’s marriage belongs only to Perkin and Katherine, it symbolizes a microcosm to the macrocosm that Perkin wishes to build in 2.1. as he tells James IV of Scotland that Perkin will “marry” England and Scotland “in a love / Never to be divorced while time is time” (90-91). Judged by Perkin’s relationship to others, this proposed “marriage” will include English and Scottish people of all walks of life (including the baseborn men who bravely fought for Perkin Warbeck). Thus, Perkin’s “coarse creatures” constitute the adversaries of loving unions, whether these unions symbolize marriages or the loving statehood that Perkin imagines. The adversaries to Perkin’s nation occupy their ambitions so wholeheartedly that they cannot find time to esteem the beauty of women or to cherish human relationships.

By the late sixteenth century, the symbolism of a good marriage or a troubled marriage had significant rhetorical presence in the minds of Britons. Thus, by the 1630s, Perkin’s marriage and love metaphors undoubtedly carried great rhetorical weight for the Caroline audience. Starting in the mid-sixteenth century, epithalamiums

or nuptial poems surfaced from English presses. Although poems of marriage existed in biblical and classical times, the epithalamium blossomed in the Renaissance.

Virginia Tufte explains the argument of the epithalamium: “marriage, sanctioned by God and man, is a worthy institution offering fulfillment for womankind in particular, physical comforts for both man and wife, and a perpetuation of the family as a keystone of an orderly society” (2). As William who portrays Hymen (the god of marriage) concludes in *As You Like It*, “Wedding is great Juno’s crown, / O blessed bond of board and bed! / ‘Tis Hymen peoples every town, / High wedlock then be honored. / Honor, high honor, and renown / To Hymen, god of every town!” (5.4. 141-46). Hymen (with the muse-like succor from Juno) links the objective to the diverse couples in Shakespeare’s comedy as well as to the diverse audiences.

Hymen and Juno bypass Henry VII’s court, but their spirits inspire James IV’s court when Katherine and Perkin fall in love. The phenomena of courtly love all but disappeared from the Jacobean stage, but Queen Henrietta Maria reincarnated it on the Caroline stage. Courtly love enhances most of John Ford’s eight known independent plays, although few other Caroline romantic dramas survive for twentieth-century study. Examining the romances of the twelfth century, C. S. Lewis identifies the four characteristics of courtly love as “Humility, Courtesy, Adultery, and the Religion of Love” (2). All of these characteristics occur in *Perkin Warbeck* except adultery. Lewis elaborates on courtly humility as the abject lover’s “obedience to his lady’s lightest wish, however whimsical, and silent acquiescence in her rebukes, however unjust.” In other words, the “service of love . . . [models] the service which a feudal

vassal owes his lord. The lover is the lady's 'man'" (2). In order for a female to possess a male in her vassalage, the imaginative representation of the woman must possess more noble blood than the male imaginative representation.

Katherine breaks from the older tradition of romances by neither demanding nor desiring vassalic attention from Perkin. When Perkin first meets Katherine, she has a title as a Scottish noblewoman, but Perkin has only a claim to the English throne. Despite the class differences in Ford's imaginative representations, Perkin's veneration of the Scottish princess suggests that he could accept vassalage from Katherine if she permitted it. Soon after their marriage, Perkin speaks to Katherine of "such a heaven on earth as life with thee" (3.2.163), and he vows "to crown [Katherine] empress of the west" (167). Katherine pledges "constancy" and "duty" no matter what good or ill fortunes may ensue to Perkin and answers: "You must be king of me" (173). In other words, the Scottish princess prefers a position as Perkin's humble wife instead of as his courtly queen. In act 4, after King James abandons his military aid for Perkin, Katherine comforts and reassures her husband: "I am your wife; / No human power can or shall divorce / My faith from duty" (4.3.110-12). Perkin implies that Katherine's worth is greater than his as he exclaims, "Such another treasure / The earth is bankrupt of" (113-14).

Besides Perkin, Dalyell also shows humility and courtesy to Katherine. He loves Katherine and acknowledges the "unequal distance [that] lies between / Great Huntley's daughter's birth and Dalyell's fortunes" (1.2.26-27). Dalyell nevertheless expresses desire to marry the Scottish princess although he admits his "boldness" (82)

and his “feeble-winged ambition” (83). After Katherine chooses Perkin over Dalyell and her fortunes fall with Perkin’s fortunes, Dalyell stays by Katherine’s side while her husband is executed. Dalyell also denies Henry VII’s attempt to improve Dalyell’s social and material welfare.

Like Dalyell, Katherine also chooses not to succumb to Henry’s flattery or attempted bribing. For instance, Henry offers the Scottish princess an annual endowment of 1000 pounds and tells her: “Our queen shall be / Your chief companion, our own court your home, / Our subjects all your servants” (5.2.176-78). Katherine answers, “But my husband?” (179). Katherine’s refusal of Henry’s courtship protects her from his seduction. The absence of adultery in *Perkin Warbeck* contrasts the many Jacobean and Caroline dramas plotted around adultery. All major characteristics of courtly love (as defined by C. S. Lewis) have presence in *Perkin Warbeck* except adultery.

Adultery is interwoven in early romances (and many later ones) mainly because aristocratic marriages in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance constituted political alliances like those negotiated by Henry VII in *Perkin Warbeck*. Politics seldom engendered devoted unions. Thus, the romances allowed an outlet in which feelings could transcend duty and in which women could rule men. Some romances featured chaste liaisons where relationships were never consummated and where other romances portrayed outright adultery. Not until the sixteenth century (most notably with Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queen*) does the religion of love unite with marriage.

A major source of *The Faerie Queen*, Ludovico Aristo's *Orlando Furioso* presents a defense and an encomium of the female gender. Pamela Joseph Benson observes that "Aristo attempts to replace the romance conception of love and sexual relations with a model founded on the notions of woman developed by the defenders of womankind" (91). Themes in Aristo's epic mirrored the genres of defense and panegyric writings that appeared as a reaction against the excesses of romances-adultery and feminine manipulation. Such writings were often veneered as biographies of famous women, but as Benson observes, the authors abandoned historical biography to the propaganda of "the natural capacity of the sex to perform virtuous actions." Benson describes the defense as "contentious" and the panegyric as "less controversial." The panegyric did not chide women in general, but like the defense, had a rather patronizing tone (45). These two genres began in Italy with Bartolomeo Goggio's panegyric *De laudibus mulierum* (first published in 1487) and Agnostino Strozzi's *Defensio mulierum* (circa 1501). Panegyrics first appeared in England during the early sixteenth century with letters written by Sir Thomas More. Benson identifies Sir Thomas Elyot's *Defence of Good Women* as "the first native English work that fully and self-consciously participates in the Renaissance controversy about women in genre as well as in subject matter" (183). According to Benson, during the years between the publication of Elyot's *Defence* (1540) and the death of Elizabeth (1603), "humanist thought about womankind is clearly evident in the serious analysis of the relations between the sexes in marriage manuals, [and] in

the numerous long and densely argued tracts that were written in defense of Elizabeth's rule" (205).

Interestingly, panegyric and defense writings about women commenced around the time that the historical Perkin Warbeck vied with Henry VII for the throne of England and continued after the puritans closed the Phoenix Theatre in 1642. The sixteenth-century tracts defending Elizabeth (and Spenser's epic featuring Britomart, the imaginative representation of Elizabeth) sprang (in part) from Aristo's imaginative representation of the warrior-woman Bradamante, a prototype of fidelity and chastity. Ford's imaginative representation of Katherine also belongs to this virtuous circle of Renaissance heroines. Perkin rejoices over Katherine's fidelity to her marital state when he deems her "the great miracle of constancy" (5.3.102).

Katherine does not employ violence but like Aristo's Bradamante and Spenser's Britomart, her imaginative representation draws upon romances as well as defense and panegyric writings directed to women. In describing Katherine as a "miracle," Perkin implies that she is not only different from other women, but that she is also holy. Miracles came from God to devout people. Some of the Caroline audience may have had an oxymoronic perception of Perkin's use of the word *miracle*, but others may have discerned Perkin's diction as a true reflection upon Katherine. The word *miracle* also sets Katherine apart from other women; by the use of the word *miracle*, Perkin implies that women in general are not constant or that they would not be constant given Katherine's circumstances—loss of title, country, and finances because of her marriage to an accused pretender. Whether Perkin employs *miracle* as

an oxymoron or not, the word *miracle* sets Katherine aside from others (most likely other women) and links *Perkin Warbeck* to the defenses by including a minor (and implied) criticism of women.

Another instance that the Caroline audience may have experienced a rhetorical presence of the contentious defenses with *Perkin Warbeck* comes early in the drama when Henry VII's men demonize the absent Margaret of Burgundy. In the Renaissance, older women were especially vulnerable to the predisposition that women easily made pacts with the Devil. Lord Dawbeney describes Margaret as a "woman-monster" who "from the unbottomed mine / Of devilish policies, doth vent the ore / Of troubles and sedition" (1.1.50-53). The Earl of Oxford takes Dawbeney's calumny a step further by asserting that the elderly Plantagenet birthed Perkin and Lambert Simnel as twins. Oxford declares that Margaret was "barren" (56) as a young woman, but as an elderly woman "has been with child / Eight, or seven years at least; whose twins being / born,— / A prodigy in nature,—even the youngest [Perkin] / was fifteen years old at his first entrance" (1.1.58-62).

From Oxford's rhetoric, the seventeenth-century audience inferred that Oxford implies that Margaret of Burgundy mated with a demon to conceive Perkin and his twin. Many people in the Renaissance believed that a sinful woman could mate with an incubus (an angel that fell because of lust) and bring forth an evil child. Whether or not the Caroline playgoers believed in witchcraft, the inquisition language by Henry VII's men sets the mood for *Perkin Warbeck*. Since Henry and his men represent the status quo, their revulsion toward the absent (and silent) Margaret of Burgundy and

their later flattery toward Katherine possibly recalled the good woman-bad woman dichotomy in the minds of some Caroline audience members. Whether or not the Caroline audience acceded to such a mental dichotomy, many in the seventeenth century tended to label, rather than understand women. The verdict of the absent Margaret of Burgundy attests to the “Janus-face” which H. R. Trevor-Roper observes as symbolizing the Renaissance of witch trials and the Renaissance of scientific achievement (159). Coinciding with Trevor-Roper’s observation, Jeffrey Burton Russell points out that men burned witches “while Leonardo painted, Palestrina composed, and Shakespeare wrote” (79).

Although it is impossible to ascertain just how much the Caroline audience may have been affected by the witchcraft and witch-hunt language in *Perkin Warbeck*, the audience members brought a rhetorical presence of witch hunts to the Phoenix Theatre because of the witch hunts that took place on the Continent and in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1563, after hundreds of witches had been burned in France, Spain, and Germany, Queen Elizabeth I succumbed to pressure by clergy and made the Devil an acknowledged factor in the affairs of the state. Before Queen Elizabeth’s Statute of 1563, suspected witches were tried by clerical authorities and sentenced by secular authorities who had no political ties to the central members of the inquisition. Even after 1563, England remained humanitarian enough not to set flames upon condemned witches, but a largely female segment of the population became victims to often ludicrous charges. Women who were outside the status quo, whether by elderly age, religion, social class, race (i.e. gypsy), physical characteristics,

or eccentricities, were vulnerable to witch hunts. Margaret L. King declares that “the great European witch hunt was tantamount to a war raged by men, under the generalship of the learned and powerful, upon women” (144).

Although witch hunts continued throughout the seventeenth century, the debate on the nature of woman had, in part, evolved into the puritanical belief that the godly woman uplifted her husband as his helpmate. All over England, preachers resounded with Solomon’s lyric declaring that a discerning and prudent woman exceeds the value of pearls. Twentieth-century historian Antonia Fraser reports on Samuel Hieron’s printed sermons (1616) that describe marriage as “this sacred knot” and a “holy and sacred ordinance” instituted by God who always knew “that it was not fit for mankind to be alone” (41). Another minister, Dr. Anthony Walker was apparently so inspired by his own marriage and his wife’s devotion toward God that Walker wrote *The Holy Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Walker* (published 1622) depicting his late wife as “my crown and glory” (Fraser *The Weaker Vessel* 41).

With the more hopeful, but still patriarchal, attitudes that some men expressed toward their helpmates, marital sex gradually became uplifted from the Pauline doctrine which submerged the glory of the marital union to the more sanctified unmarried state. According to Fraser, church-sanctioned intimacy “was generally approved as leading to health and happiness of the husband.” Fraser adds that “the generally straightforward attitude of the time [from the early to middle seventeenth century] included the sensible notion that women too, once introduced to the pleasures of the marriage bed, could and would enjoy them” (51).

Ironically, while some puritans possessed “sensible notions” toward women and sexuality, other puritans did not hesitate to attack women for suspected sins. G. F. Sensabaugh asserts that groups of puritans attacked Queen Henrietta Maria’s coterie “as early as 1628” because of what the puritans saw as “parasitic ladies and fops wasting time in frivolous compliment” (141). Although Sensabaugh disagrees with Alfred Harbage, who argues that the queen’s coterie generally adhered to their particular neoplatonic ideal of chastity (Harbage 13), Sensabaugh maintains that it was mainly the queen’s Roman Catholicism, not the alleged libertine practices at court, that most infuriated the puritans. According to Sensabaugh, “the puritan’s main point was that popery tried to make wedlock appear unclean, even as the coterie code had attempted to do” (149).

The puritans who later closed the theaters in 1642 had vendettas against Queen Henrietta Maria and her alleged immoral coterie, but it may be assumed that the puritan-inspired members of Ford’s audience were not against performances (unless some were spies) and sided with the puritans that concentrated on the goodness in women rather than searched for evil in women. John Ford’s fusion of sensual but tragic romance with faithful marriage appealed to Queen Henrietta Maria’s coterie as well as to the more puritan-inspired faction of Charles I’s court. Generally speaking, the feminine members of the queen’s coterie saw Katherine as an unearthly muse, and the masculine members of Ford’s audience saw Katherine as a mortal but devoted wife. When Henry’s death sentence for Perkin interrupts Perkin’s and Katherine’s marriage and destroys Perkin’s hope for uniting England and Scotland in a loving

marriage rather than temporary political agreements, Katherine vows lifelong chastity to her husband's memory.

Whereas the romance of Perkin and Katherine presented a tender rhetorical presence for the Caroline audience, Katherine's pledge of chaste widowhood possibly generated diverse rhetorical presences among different audience members. Some Caroline playgoers may have compared Ford's imaginative representation with the historical Katherine who remarried twice after Perkin Warbeck's death. Other audience members, especially feminine and Catholic members of Queen Henrietta's coterie, may have admired the chaste Katherine for her fortitude and associated her with the Virgin Mary or other celibate saints.

Despite the admiration that the queen and her coterie found in Katherine, other contemporaries of Ford possibly found amusement in the "great miracle of constancy" (5.3.89) who will "die a faithful widow to thy [Perkin's] bed" (152). Caroline audiences included the cavalier poets Edmund Waller and Thomas Carew who would later publish typical cavalier poems with personas that attempt to persuade women to submit sexually to them. Although the exact tone of the poems cannot be ascertained, Waller and Carew quite possibly shared some of their personas' negative outlook on chastity and associated with the coterie in order to court the attractive women there. Or maybe Waller and Carew honored neoplatonic chastity at first but later abandoned its rules. Whatever the motives of Waller, Carew, and perhaps other cavalier poets in Queen Henrietta Maria's court, the cavalier personas generally expressed beliefs that were clearly opposite to the spiritual, nonphysical ideals that the coterie preached.

Cavalier personas usually maintain that a celibate wasted her youth, dissipated her happiness, and caused frustration for herself and her lover.

Waller's carpe diem poem "To Phyllis" features a persona that tries to persuade Phyllis that not only youth and beauty perish, but "Love hath wings, and will away. / Love hath swifter wings than Time; / Change in love to heaven does climb" (ll. 8-10). Waller's persona goes so far as to attempt persuasion by giving examples of the highest authorities: "Gods, that never change their state, / Vary oft their love and hate" (11-12). The persona also pleads that the planets support their love: "Leave it to the planets, too, / What we shall hereafter do" (19-20).

In contrast to Waller's "To Phyllis," Carew's droll lyric "The Rapture" more thoroughly delineates many of the cavalier themes such as sexual frustration, difficulty in communication between the lovers, carpe diem, the persona's belief that he deserves the lady's love and the persona's dramatic attempt to win the lady to his favors. "The Rapture" begins with the persona's determined words: "I will enjoy thee now, my Celia, come, / And fly with me to Love's Elysium. The giant Honor, that keeps cowards out, / Is but a masquer" (ll. 1-4). Love and honor constituted the customary themes of masques and romances. But since "the giant Honor" discourages Celia from becoming the persona's sexual partner, the persona situates honor and masquers in an undesirable category. According to the speaker, honor should not hinder love. As the poem progresses, honor, the "giant" and "masquer" is also deemed a "vast idol" (l. 6), "the huge colossus" (l. 8), "the grim Swiss [like the Swiss guards of the Vatican]" (l. 10), "the stalking pageant" (l. 15), "the monster" (l. 23),

“rude sounds” (l. 99), “jealous ears” (l. 100), and “envious eyes” (l. 103). The persona further assails honor by personifying it as a person (or persons) with no honor or with a code that is hypocritically righteous: “observing spies” (l. 101), the “bribed chambermaid” (l. 104), “the tyrant” (144), “this proud usurper” (l. 150), and “this false imposter” (l. 154). In the penultimate line of “The Rapture,” the speaker deems honor as “this goblin” (l. 165).

Carew’s persona goes so far as to alter the legends of virtuous heroines. Such alterations suggest the persona’s implication that virtuous heroines do not exist. The persona tells Celia: “The Roman Lucrece there [in the Elysian ground] reads the divine / Lectures of love’s great master, Aretine, / And knows as well as Lais how to move / Her pliant body in the act of love” (ll. 115-18). The historical Lucrece or Lucretia, daughter of the poet Lucretius and wife of Tarquinius Collatinus, committed suicide rather than facing cultural dishonor after Sextus raped her. Medieval and Renaissance poets (including Shakespeare) venerated Lucrece for her alleged devotion to honor and chastity. However, the sixteenth-century satirist, Pietro Aretino or “Aretine” (l. 116) attempted to tarnish the image of the Roman gentlewoman. Robert Burton also cites Aretine as an authority, but unlike Carew’s imaginative representation, the seventeenth-century psychologist quotes Aretine in a tone of moral disgust toward Lucrecia. In book 3 of *The Anatomy of Melancoly*, Burton states: “Aretine’s Lucretia sold her maidenhead a thousand times before she was twenty-four years old” (54). Besides Lucrece, the persona claims that Homer’s Penelope, Petrarch’s Laura, and “ten thousand beauties more, that died / slave to the tyrant

[honor] also enjoy sexual liberties in the Elysian ground.” The speaker aspires to transform the loyal Penelope to “The Grecian dame / That in her endless web toiled for a name / As fruitless as her work, doth there display / Herself before the youth of Ithaca” (ll. 125-28). In the same Elysian ground, Petrarch’s celebrated Laura “lies in Petrarch’s learned arms, drying those eyes / That did in such sweet smooth-paced numbers flow, / As made the world enamored of his woe” (ll. 139-42). The persona insinuates that foolishness reigns in “the world” that feels “enamored of [Petrarch’s] woe, when it can experience the joy of love devoid of “the hated name / Of husband, wife, lust, modest, chaste, or shame” (ll. 107-08). As the persona later explains, “We only sin when Love’s rites are not done” (l. 114).

Carew’s persona concludes his speech with a puzzling interrogation: “Then tell me why / This goblin Honor, which the world adores, / Should make men atheists, and not women whores” (ll. 164-66). Perhaps the persona says that since men disbelieve in the “goblin Honor,” they shun any alleged deity, but women embrace honor, despite its abnormal demands, and remain virgins. Quite possibly, Carew intended to ridicule the masculine persona more than the feminine object. Since the persona’s view toward chastity may not reflect Carew’s own attitude toward chastity, how did Carew, the other cavalier poets, and their readers interpret Katherine and her vow of chastity?

Bruce King does not speculate on *Perkin Warbeck*, but through his comments on Carew’s poetry as a whole, he indicates that Carew did not laugh at Ford’s imaginative representation of Katherine and may have perceived her poignancy and courage. King argues that “Carew treats courtship as a battlefield upon which most

problems of human relations are presented in microcosm. His poems attempt more intimate communication between people than manners allow" (43).

Aside from the cavalier poems whose personas seem obsessed with sexual opportunity, other cavalier poems uphold the object (woman) as a muse. For instance, Waller's "At Penhurst" features "Sacharissa" as the muse whose "presence has such more than human grace / That it can civilize the rudest place" (ll. 7-8). "At Penhurst" is based on the Sidney family estate and Waller's actual courtship of Sidney's niece, Dorothy Sidney, who appears in the poem as "Sacharissa." The persona continues, "Amphion so made stones and timber leap / Into fair figures from a confused heap; / And in the symmetry of her parts is found / A power like that of harmony in sound" (ll. 17-20). Like the classical muses, Sacharissa mysteriously produces harmony. Waller's persona pledges "his humble love" (30) to "this matchless dame" (21).

Since Katherine, who is also "matchless," declines to engage in courtship games of putting on airs or masking feelings, she has no need of a lover that treats courtship as a battlefield. For these reasons and others, the imaginative representation of Katherine may have won admiration from the cavalier poets. When Perkin lauds Katherine and vows "to crown thee [Katherine] empress of the West" (3.2.162), Katherine responds: "You have a noble language, sir; your right / In me is without question, and however / Events of time may shorten my deserts / In others pity, yet it shall not stagger / Or constancy or duty in a wife" (163-67). Katherine refuses to be deified: "You must be king of me, and my poor heart / Is all I can call mine" (168-69).

Katherine's humility combined with her extraordinary courage won admiration for her among Caroline audience members as diverse as Queen Henrietta's coterie, the puritan-inspired factions, and possibly the cavaliers. Katherine's modesty, valor, and ability to survive link her with what is objective in *Perkin Warbeck* and celebrate her as the most heroic among Ford's imaginative representations. The eight plays identified as Ford's independent work reveal Ford's feminine imaginative representations as generally more scrupulous and meritorious than their male counterparts. Even the incestuous Annabella (of *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*) learns from her mistakes, unlike her brother, and refrains from cruelty, unlike the cardinal. Of the eight plays representing Ford's independent work, the imaginative representation that resembles Katherine most closely in fortitude and goodness is Calantha of *The Broken Heart*. Like Katherine, Calantha radiates beauty and compassion, has noble blood, carries a Renaissance sense of duty and honor on her conscience, falls in love and loses her lover through violent death, and practices stoicism when tragedy strikes. But unlike Katherine, Calantha dies of a broken heart. Penthea, the sister of Ithocles (Calantha's lover), is less heroic than Katherine or Calantha but is nevertheless a tragic figure resulting from her separation from her own lover, Orgilus. Motivated by ambition, Ithocles arranges a marriage between Penthea and Bassanes, an older, possibly impotent man. Penthea lacks Calantha's sense of duty and dies of self-starvation and bitterness. (The name Penthea means complaint, whereas the name Calantha means flower of beauty.) To avenge Penthea's death, Orgilus kills Ithocles, Calantha's loved one. While dancing at the wedding of Euphranea (Orgilus' sister)

and Prophilus, Calantha hears of her father's death, Penthea's death, and Ithocles' death. Calantha forces herself to bear her shock and grief stoically. Her father's death makes her Queen of Sparta, and, as the new monarch, she announces Orgilus' death sentence without animosity: "We begin our reign / With a first act of justice: thy confession / Unhappy Orgilus dooms thee a sentence; / But yet thy father's or thy sister's presence shall be excus'd" (5.2.66-69).

Commenting on Calantha's cool demeanor, Bassanes remarks, "She has a masculine spirit; / And wherefore should I pule and, like a girl, / Put finger in the eye? Let's be all toughness, / Without distinction betwixt sex and sex" (96-100). But as Calantha's death proves, she is neither tough nor "masculine," and such qualities would actually diminish her heroic attributes.

Dorothy M. Farr identifies Calantha as "the ordering principle" of *The Broken Heart*. According to Farr, "When she [Calantha] makes her own marriage choice, not for advantage but for love, she cancels out Ithocles' fault." Farr further asserts that "it is Calantha's death, without protest and with a constructive acceptance of the situation, that frees the State for a new beginning" (84). Thus, Calantha becomes a sacrificial hero akin to the sacrificial hero that some audience members may perceive of Perkin. After Calantha's death, Nearchus, Prince of Argos and Calantha's cousin, takes power over Sparta and agrees to Calantha's wish to "retain the royalty / Of Sparta in her own bounds" (5.3.42-43) and convert it from what Calantha earlier described as "A nation warlike and inured to practice / Of policy and labor" (10-11).

As Katherine serves as the muse of *Perkin Warbeck* and the link with the objective, Calantha serves as the muse of *The Broken Heart* and the link with the objective. Both women win admiration from audiences for dignity and superhuman strength and do not submerge themselves in self-pity despite the horrors they face. But Katherine achieves valor a step further than Calantha's valor. Katherine's free will outshines Calantha's free will. G. F. Sensabaugh argues that "with the exception of *Perkin Warbeck* and *The Fancies: Chaste and Noble*, all Ford's plays have much of their meaning based upon the inevitability of passion" or the neoplatonic adage that "fate rules all lovers" (155). Although Katherine employs the word *fate* frequently in describing her hardships, she clearly practices free will in her choices to live apart from Henry VII's court and to live as a chaste widow to Perkin's memory.

In light of Katherine's inner strength and instinct for survival, some audience members may consciously or subconsciously intertwine the imaginative representation of Katherine with the archetypal Hestia, goddess of the hearth. Like Katherine, Hestia also lacks aggression and ambition, experiences cruel tribulations, and pledges eternal chastity. Hestia belongs to the first generation of Olympian gods, parented by the Titan siblings, Rhea and Cronos. Cronos, who had vied and won power over his own father, sought to nullify the prophesy that one of his children would overcome him. Trying to keep power for himself, Hestia's father devoured his children directly after birth knowing that their divinity would shield them from death, but their imprisonment in his belly would insure his authority. As the firstborn, Hestia spends the longest time

in her father's gut and allows her experience to mold her into the strongest emotionally of all the Olympian gods.

Consequently, Hestia represents the goddess of center, balance, and the eternal flame. Jean Shinoda Bolen identifies Hestia as "the Self, an intuitively known spiritual center of a woman's personality that gives meaning to her life." According to Bolen, Hestia refuses sexual relations with Apollo and Poseidon to continue to honor "this Hestian centeredness." Bolen explains that since the sun god, Apollo represents "logos" and "the intellectual life," a sexual relation with Apollo would subject Hestia's "inner, intuitively felt experience to scientific inquiry" (130). Although Poseidon, like Hestia, also represents intuition, Bolen believes that Hestia's shun of Poseidon prevents her from being "carried away by Poseidon," the god of the sea (131).

The Romans worshiped Hestia as Vesta, honored celibate priestesses who were dedicated to her, and for centuries kept vestal flames glowing in temples. Despite the shrewdness, materialism, and cruelty that often epitomized the Roman spirit, Romans saw the need for solitude, balance, and meditation. Besides the vestal rituals that took place in temples, new couples made rituals to Hestia or Vesta to sanctify their new homesteads. Katherine never has a chance to bless a homestead for Perkin and herself, but all audience members that sense her strength and goodness experience her blessing. Toward the conclusion of *Perkin Warbeck*, the imaginative representation of Katherine wisely chooses an uncertain solitary life that nevertheless enables her to make her own choices and to reflect upon her past and future. Accepting Henry VII's offer of his court to serve her as "father, husband, friend, and servant" (5.2.156) would

likely camouflage her inner self and desecrate the sacred memory of Perkin. She reunites herself with her father and retains the presence and devotion of her gentlewoman Jane and her old suitor Dalyell but Katherine, like Hestia, is most surrounded by her intuitive self.

Ford's imaginative representation of Katherine differs somewhat from the Katherine of the chronicles. Bacon writes that the historical Katherine Gordon (deemed White Rose for her beauty and virtue) became a lady in waiting to the English queen and accepted Henry VII's gift of "a very honourable allowance for the support of her estate, which she enjoyed both during the King's life and many years after" (289). Besides joining the court of her late husband's executioner and accepting pecuniary gifts from him, the historical Katherine also remarried twice after Perkin's death.

Despite the historical Katherine's alleged beauty and constancy to the living Perkin, Ford's imaginative representation of Katherine constitutes a far different character. Ford's imaginative representation of Katherine outshines the historical Katherine and any of Ford's other imaginative representations. Ford's Katherine constitutes a true, colossal hero—a Renaissance lady who chooses to live apart from a comfortable, secure court, and the only life she has ever known. Katherine chooses (as Hamlet puts it) "the slings and arrows of [uncertain] fortune" (3.1.57) for the honor of her late husband's memory and for her own intuitive self. As the muse of *Perkin Warbeck*, Katherine unites the audience with the objective; she combines the

patriarchal attributes of virtue and constancy and feminine attributes of modest grace and intuition.

CHAPTER 4
MEDITATING RHETORICAL PRESENCE TO
ENVISION OTHER TAPESTRIES

In an atmosphere of political sparks that would ignite the English Civil War a few years later, John Ford penned *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth*. Despite the words "chronicle history" in the title, Ford transcends the stasis of chronicle histories by weaving a dramatic tapestry that actors, directors, stage designers, and audience members may continue in years to come. Ford gathered threads for his imaginative representation from the chronicles of Edward Hall, Raphael Holinshed, Thomas Gainsford, and Francis Bacon. Ford wove the threads of the chronicles together with sundry and countless other threads including the universal and archetypal sacrificial king, tales of King Arthur, medieval romances, and legends of the classical muses. Ford realized that the Caroline audience constituted individuals rather than the alleged sycophants that Charles I attempted to insulate from political sparks and philosophical eclipses. For Caroline audiences and for audiences to come, Ford established cultural rhetorical presence as well as archetypal rhetorical presence for his audience. As part of the rhetorical presence of Ford's imaginative representation of Perkin Warbeck, Ford allows the character of Perkin to be open-ended—each audience member may decide individually if Perkin is the true king, is

possibly the true king, is a fool, is a mysterious character, or is the imposter that the chroniclers declare him to be.

Twentieth-century philosopher Ernesto Grassi provides acumen to Ford's dynamic treatment of history and to the open-ended character development of Perkin (although Grassi does not use Ford as an example). Drawing upon many sources including the Italian humanists, Grassi explains that "only on the basis of this metaphorical vision [rhetorical presence] does the historical world unveil itself" (*Folly and Insanity* 115). In other words a reader or an audience member comes to understand and perhaps to empathize with an historical figure (i.e. Perkin) by comparing and associating the imaginative representative's speech or actions with language or circumstances that more closely interrelate with the audience member's own culture or experiences. Grassi regards emotion, intuition, and the nonlinear creative process as integral ways of achieving knowledge together with the rational process. Grassi exemplifies the classical muses, Erasmus, and other sources to demonstrate that the "rational process is no longer the predominant way of reaching knowledge." One should seek knowledge by balancing the rational process with intuitive folly (13-14). Grassi cites Dante's discovery that static, exact language can neither move the passions nor convey the humanity of history. According to Grassi, "the language needed for this task must use images and metaphors because this is the only way that it can affect the passions" (*Rhetoric as Philosophy* 78-79).

Whether consciously or subconsciously, Ford understood that a rational conclusion is static and allows for only one supreme voice. Interestingly, while Ford

weaves the metaphorical vision of the chronicles into *Perkin Warbeck*, he does not entirely unravel the chronicles' static tone. Instead, Ford places the static, judgmental, authoritarian language of the chronicles into Henry VII and his men, the static characters of *Perkin Warbeck*. In examining *Perkin Warbeck* as a whole, an audience member may experience historicity by perceiving rationality in the imaginative representation of Henry VII and nonlinear understanding in the imaginative representation of Perkin. Also, the imaginative representation of Katherine Gordon serves as a muse to Perkin and to the play itself. The beautiful, loyal Katherine provides what Grassi identifies as "the link with the objective" (*Heidegger and the Question* 74) that contrasts with the more subjective character of Perkin. Grassi argues that the muses not only enable focus for creative mania, but that the muses also create the mania itself. Grassi identifies creative mania as "the origin of poetry and art" (15). Without Katherine or another focus to Perkin's creative frenzy, Perkin would be perceived as a less noble character. Without Katherine, the audience could never weave the language of Perkin's love to his wife with his marriage metaphor in which Perkin promises King James IV of Scotland that he will "marry these two kingdoms [England and Scotland] in a love / Never to be divorced when time is time" (2.1.90-91). Tragically, Perkin cannot fulfill his promise; he is executed by Henry VII.

The rhetorical presence of Perkin's and Katherine's marriage symbolizes the free expression that Ford grants to actors and audience members. As Perkin and Katherine remain individuals free from any dictates of each other after their marriage, Ford sets actors and playgoers free to continue weaving the tapestry. Any new

research on *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth* should continue the dynamic tapestry that Ford has set forth. Researchers may weave new discoveries or uncover older discoveries as long as the researchers honor Ford's script. If researchers choose to utilize the feedback of actors and audiences in live performances, the technique of acting that the actors employ may significantly influence the actors' and audience's perception of the imaginative representative. Also, the director of *Perkin Warbeck* should not hinder the creative process of the actors.

The Stanislavsky (also spelled as Stanislavski) method of acting encourages the creative process by esteeming what Konstantin Stanislavsky saw as natural laws: "the birth of a child, the growth of a tree, and the creation of an artistic image are all manifestations of a kindred order" (*Building a Character* 279). Stanislavsky, a Russian nineteenth- and twentieth-century actor and director observed actors with stilted movements and artificial speech approaching imaginative representations of Henrik Ibsen and Anton Chekhov. Stanislavsky realized that realistic drama merited natural movement and lines spoken as if the imaginative representation himself were speaking. The Russian director claimed to have discovered his "method" from nature; he claimed that the method could not have been invented. Stanislavsky believed that a great actor must care deeply about the imaginative representation he portrays; in order for the actor to emphasize with the imaginative representation, he must first care for humanity as a whole and constitute what Stanislavsky deems as a "full man." Stanislavsky defines a full man as "a man who is a creator in art, the sort of fighter for

beauty and love who would be able to transfuse into the hearts of his listeners the meaning of each word and sound he utters on the stage” (*Stanislavsky on the Art* 97).

One Stanislavsky technique of learning a role involves taking the imaginative representation that the actor will portray, placing him on the stage with an imaginative representation of another play, and encouraging the actors to improvise from their knowledge of the roles and from their own instincts. For instance, an actor studying the role of Perkin would encounter another actor portraying Shakespeare’s Henry Bullingbrook (also spelled as Bolingbroke) from *Richard II*. The actor gains insight into his role by experiencing the rhetorical presence of another character. An obvious parallel to Henry Bullingbrook is Ford’s imaginative representation of Henry VII. Both constitute strong, powerful leaders who vie with other claimants to the English throne. But Bullingbrook reveals more integrity and openness than Henry VII. When Bullingbrook sees the necessity of executing Bushy and Green in chapter 3, he confronts them with his reasons and thus treats the doomed men as reasonable beings: “I will unfold some causes of your deaths” (1.7). In contrast, when Henry VII encounters the recaptured Perkin in Salisbury, Henry baits and labels Perkin to further humiliate him and to attempt psychological authority over him: “A frenzy of aspiring youth hath danced, / Till, wanting breath, thy feet of pride have slipt / To break thy neck!” (5.2.52-54). Thus, when Ford’s imaginative representation of Perkin confronts Shakespeare’s imaginative representation of Bullingbrook, it is likely that Perkin would hear reasons and perhaps perceive understanding rather than abuse. For example, the actor portraying Bullingbrook would say, “Oxford informs me that you

are a merchant's son from Tourney. Did Margaret of Burgundy not teach you to play a king?" Since Bullingbrook seeks to inquire and inform rather than abuse, he encourages the imaginative representation of Perkin to reveal himself openly. From this openness, the actors may discover new threads of their imaginative representations and, from these rhetorical presences, portray richer and more believable characters. The actor studying the role of Perkin might counter, "Sir, I am the king. Allow me to see Elizabeth of York. She will recognize me as her brother." Bullingbrook's answer may reflect some of the words that Shakespeare gives Bullingbrook: "The gentle Elizabeth has not seen her lost brother since he was a child. Are you he? I don't know. I cannot stain her lovely cheeks with tears from the sight of her brother's counterfeit. If you are the impostor, how can you torture her with hope?" The actor studying the imaginative representation of Perkin could assert, "I only offer my sister my love, my honesty, and a few memories." The language of the contemporary actors will probably mix with the Renaissance language of Ford and Shakespeare.

After observing and listening to the improvisation of Perkin and Bullingbrook, the director and other audience members may question the actors' reactions to Perkin and compare them to their own reactions. The first question raised may be: "Is Perkin's improvisation consistent with Ford's imaginative representation?" If the actors and the audience give the first question a positive response, the next question may concern Bullingbrook's improvisation and Shakespeare's imaginative representation. If the actors and the audience generally agree that the Bullingbrook that Perkin encounters does not diminish Shakespeare's imaginative representation,

the group may then proceed to more discussion about the role of Perkin. The director may ask, “Does this improvisation uncover any new insight into the imaginative representation of Perkin?” Quite possibly, the audience may ask for more improvisation from Perkin and Bullingbrook, and the actors again proceed with the scenario.

The actor portraying Bullingbrook may ask Perkin, “Great Huntley warns me of your charm. You spun King James and the ladies of Edinburgh with your words. But now you speak the language of a man, not the poetry of a monarch.” Perkin might answer, “Noble Bullingbrook, I am battle-weary. I save my poetry for my lovely wife.” Considering the rationality and fairness of Bullingbrook, the actor portraying Bullingbrook may then interrogate Perkin about his childhood, his alleged escape from England, his experience with foster parents, and his alleged discovery that he is Richard, Duke of York in order to ascertain any inconsistency. One of Bullingbrook’s questions to Perkin may be, “What did you or your brother carve into the wall [in a room at the Tower of London]?” Perkin’s response could be, “On every feast day of the Holy Innocents, Edward and I recorded our heights. In the last winter, he ceased to grow.”

If the actors are accustomed enough to cameras so that they are not intimidated by them, skilled filming of the creative process by the actors while developing the inner character of Ford’s imaginative representation would preserve the creative process more completely than merely audio taping or taking notes. Researchers of live performances need motion film to capture movements, gestures, and facial

expressions. Also, films reveal and record multiple responses (i.e. the various body languages of 30 audience members) better than researchers' naked eyes and the researchers' memories.

But pondering the vast amount of reactions that films could capture, researchers would be overwhelmed with the plethora of information that films record if they do not limit their focus to a few intertwining threads. One example of such a focus would be to concentrate on the creative process of one actor. The researcher adeptly interviews the actor studying the role of Perkin for insight into his creative process. Since Stanislavsky method actors examine their own lives in order to penetrate the experiences of the imaginative representations, the actor studying the role of Perkin may associate Perkin's childhood ordeal in the Tower of London with the actor's own experience of being locked in a closet for eight hours. The actor may conclude that his childhood trauma made him stronger, and he may feel the same strength when he voices Perkin's lines. After a careful examination of Ford's imaginative representation, the actor ponders if Perkin is not Richard, Duke of York and may instead be a victim of false memory by the design of Margaret of Burgundy. The researcher does not agree with the actor, but instead of arguing with him, he instructs the actor to view a film on false memory. After viewing the film on false memory, the actor compares the victims of false memory interviewed in the film to Ford's imaginative representation of Perkin. The actor concludes that none of the victims are as consistent or as articulate as Perkin. The actor then comes to his own

discovery that Ford's imaginative representation of Perkin is indeed Richard, Duke of York.

Interweaving Stanislavsky's discovery about the inner life of a character with Ford's imaginative representation constitutes only a segment of the limitless possibilities for research that Ford's dynamic creation inspires. *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth* leaves unwoven threads so that readers and audiences can continue the magnificent tapestry. Ford weaves the tapestry with metaphorical language that Grassi identifies as "original language out of which human society develops" which is "imagistic and directive, not argumentative. It is the language created by the poet as orator and [it] *vates* who defines a historical area with his speech" (*Rhetoric as Philosophy* 80). Ford perceived the puissance of metaphors and images, although he wrote and revised in an intellectual atmosphere that began to denigrate the status of poetic language in favor of what many seventeenth-century thinkers viewed as the superior scientific language. After the interregnum and the restoration, men of science and the arts established the Royal Society by 1660 to advance their beliefs in science and to endeavor communication only in scientific language. In more recent years, however, many thinkers have discovered that once indisputable scientific facts, as well as once indisputable historical facts, are indeed disputable. Since thinkers can find fault in many scientific premisses, how can a language that is based on scientific language communicate truth more effectively than metaphorical language? Grassi concludes that static, scientific language only leads readers away from the truth, because such language is fixed—the language does not

encourage the reader to discover truth for herself. According to Grassi, a seeker of truth should accept “the folly of [human] existence.” This folly “is fundamentally metaphorical; by means of analogy, we transform that data which our senses provide into the human world. The theatre of world history is a continuous metaphor” (*Folly and Insanity* 115).

The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth continues the metaphor of world history. Perkin represents more than a figure in English history to most playgoers. To some audience members, Perkin depicts the universal seeker of truth. To other audience members, Perkin is simply the impostor that the chronicles judge him to be. Still other audience members have questions about the general character of Perkin, but Ford’s metaphorical tapestry inspires them to question and weave for themselves. Perhaps the “strange truth” that Ford alludes to in the title means that truth constitutes strangeness. Truth may appear obvious when it is concealed in the riddle of a tapestry. Truth may be near to the seeker, but it may not be fixed and immediately discernable. Grassi and Ford conclude that a seeker of truth should compare threads of the unknown with threads of the known to weave a rhetorical presence. The first rhetorical presence weaves other rhetorical presences, and the seeker of truth becomes an artist of the great tapestry.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Anderson, Donald K. "Kingship in Ford's Perkin Warbeck." *ELH* 27 (1960): 177-93.
- Bacon, Francis. "The History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh." *The Works of Francis Bacon*. Eds. James Spedding, et al. New York: Hird, 1869. Vol. 11.
- Baigent, Michael, Richard Leigh, and Henry Lincoln. *The Messianic Legacy*. New York: Doubleday, 1986.
- Barish, Jonas A. "Perkin Warbeck as Anti-History." *Essays in Criticism* 20 (1970): 151-71.
- Barton, Anne. "'He that Plays the King': Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* and the Stuart History Play." *English Drama: Forms and Development*. Eds. Marie Axton and Raymond Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977. 69-93.
- Barton, John. *Playing Shakespeare*. London: Methuen, 1989.
- Benson, Pamela Joseph. *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman*. University Park: Pennsylvania UP, 1992.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1941.
- Bolen, Jean Shinoda. *Goddesses in Everywoman*. New York: Harper, 1985.
- Bone, Quentin. *Henrietta Maria: Queen of the Cavaliers*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1972.
- Braun, Hugh. *The English Castle*. London: Batsford, 1936.

- Brereton, J. Le Gay. "The Sources of Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*." *Anglia* 34 (1911): 171-99.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancoly*. Ed. Holbrook Jackson. New York: Vintage, 1977.
- Butler, Martin. *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Candido, Joseph. "The 'Strange Truth' of *Perkin Warbeck*." *PQ* 59:3 (Summer 1980): 300-16.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology*. New York: Viking, 1971.
- Daiches, David. *Edinburgh*. London: Hamilton, 1978.
- Donne, John. *The Complete Poetry of John Donne*. Ed. John T. Shawcross. Garden City: Anchor, 1967.
- Drury, Nevill. *Dictionary of the Occult*. New York: Harper, 1991.
- Easty, Edward Dwight. *On Method Acting*. New York: Allograph, 1966.
- Edwards, Philip. *Threshold of a Nation*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Farr, Dorothy M. *John Ford and the Caroline Theatre*. London: Macmillan P, 1979.
- Ford, John. *The Works of John Ford*. Ed. A. Dyce. London: Toovey, 1869. 3 Vols.
- Freer, Coburn. "'The Fate of Worthy Expectation': Eloquence in *Perkin Warbeck*." *Concord in Discord*. Ed. Donald K. Anderson. New York: Ams P. 1986. 131-48.
- Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel*. New York: Harper, 1985.
- Frazer, Sir James George. *The Golden Bough*. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Grassi, Ernesto. *Heidegger and the Question of Renaissance Humanism*.

Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1983.

---. *Rhetoric as Philosophy: The Humanist Tradition*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1980.

---. *Vico and Humanism: Essays on Vico, Heidegger, and Rhetoric*. New York: Lang, 1990.

Grassi, Ernesto and Maristella Lorch. *Folly and Insanity in Renaissance Literature*.

Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986.

Harbage, Alfred. *Cavalier Drama*. New York: Columbia, 1943.

Harvey, Alfred. *The Castles and Walled Towns of England*. London: Methuen, 1925.

Heidegger, Martin. *The End of Philosophy*. Trans. Joan Stambaugh. New York: Harper, 1973.

Heydt, Bruce. "The Curious Career and Uncertain Past of Perkin Warbeck." *British Heritage*. Feb./Mar. 1993.

Howard, Jean. "'Effeminately Dolent': Gender and Legitimacy in Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*." *John Ford: Critical Re-Visions*. Ed. Michael Neill. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

Kelly-Gadol, Joan. "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. Eds. Renate Bridenthal, et al. Boston: Houghton, 1987: 174-201.

- King, Bruce. "The Strategy of Carew's Wit." *Review of English Literature* 5 (1964): 42-51.
- King, Margaret L. *Women of the Renaissance*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1991.
- Knight, Gareth. *The Secret Tradition in Arthurian Legend*. Northhamptonshire: Thorsons, 1983.
- Lewis, C. S. *The Allegory of Love*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Markale, Jean. *King Arthur: King of Kings*. Trans. Christine Hauch. London: Gordon, 1977.
- Michell, John. *The Traveler's Guide to Sacred England*. New York: Knopf, 1988.
- Murray, Margaret Alice. *The Divine King in England: A Study in Anthropology*. London: Faber, 1954.
- . *God of the Witches*. New York: Oxford UP, 1952.
- Perelman, Chaim. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1982.
- Randall, Dale B.J. "Theatres of Greatness": *A Revisionary View of Ford's Perkin Warbeck*. Canada: U of Victoria P, 1986.
- Richmond, H. M. *The School of Love: The Evolution of the Stuart Love Lyric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1964.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *The Prince of Darkness: Radical Evil and the Power of Good in History*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988.
- Sargeaunt, M. Joan. *John Ford*. New York: Russell, 1966.
- Sensabaugh, G. F. *The Tragic Muse of John Ford*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1944.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Eds. G. Blakemore Evans, et al.

Boston: Houghton, 1974.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Ed. Forrest G. Robinson. Indianapolis:

Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.

Stanislavski, Constantin. *Building a Character*. Trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood.

New York: Theatre Arts, 1949.

---. *Creating a Role*. Trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts,

1961.

Stanislavsky, Konstantin. *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*. Trans. David

Magarshack. London: Faber, 1940.

Stavig, Mark. *John Ford and the Traditional Moral Order*. Madison: U of Wisconsin

P, 1968.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Harper,

1968.

Tufte, Virginia. *The Poetry of Marriage*. Los Angeles: Tinnon-Brown, 1970.

Verene, Donald Phillip. Preface. Ernesto Grassi and Maristella Lorch. *Folly and*

Insanity in Renaissance Literature. Binghampton: Medieval & Renaissance

Texts & Studies, 1986.

Walker, Barbara. *The Crone*. San Francisco: Harper, 1985.

Weathers, Winston. "Perkin Warbeck: A Seventeenth-Century Psychological Play."

SEL 4 (1964): 217-26.

Weston, Jessie. *From Ritual to Romance*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1983.

Williamson, Audrey. *The Mystery of the Princes: An Investigation into a Supposed*

Murder. Gloucester: Sutton, 1987.

Wilson, Derek. *The Tower 1078-1978*. London: Hamilton, 1978.

Woodman, Marion. *The Pregnant Virgin: A Process of Psychological*

Transformation. Toronto: Inner City, 1985.