



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Notes on the Perkin Warbeck Insurrection

Author(s): J. E. Cussans

Source: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 1 (1872), pp. 57-71

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Royal Historical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3677903>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 04:40 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Historical Society, Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

NOTES ON THE PERKIN WARBECK INSURRECTION.

BY J. E. CUSSANS, ESQ.,

Fellow of the Historical Society.

THERE are few subjects in our country's history which are so enshrouded in mystery as the so-called conspiracy which was designed to place Perkin Warbeck upon the English throne. It is with great diffidence that I present the following account, which I have collected from various sources, being well aware that the subject is one which has occupied and baffled many of our ablest historians.

In order to form a connected narrative, it will be necessary to consider the political state of England at the time when this formidable insurrection broke out. Henry VII. claimed the crown of England by three titles—descent, alliance, and conquest. By descent he was an illegitimate great-great-grandson of John of Ghent, which constituted, in itself, by no means a strong claim. As for conquest, he was liable to lose his crown by the same means that he had gained it. On his alliance, therefore, with Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., he based his strongest pretension. Notwithstanding their defeat, the Yorkists were still a powerful party in the State, and after the death of Richard III., without issue, would probably have declared for Edward, Earl of Warwick, nephew of Edward IV., or Elizabeth, widow of that king, had they not seen in Henry's union with the daughter of Edward, the fusion of the rival factions, and thereby a cessation of the sanguinary wars which had desolated England for so many years. It was a knowledge of this disposition on the part of many of his subjects, that probably induced Henry to keep the Earl of Warwick and the widow of Edward IV. so jealously guarded.

The first manifestation of discontent in the country was the in-

E

surrection in the north and west, headed by Lord Lovel and Humphrey and Thomas Stafford, which however was speedily quelled. This attempt was immediately followed by the more dangerous conspiracy of Lambert Simnel, who represented himself to be Edward, Earl of Warwick, then a prisoner in the Tower, which was as unsuccessful as the former insurrection. During a space of five years, no further demonstration was made in favour of the Yorkists; but in the year 1491, another aspirant to the crown appeared, claiming to be Richard, the younger of the two princes who were supposed to have been murdered in the Tower. Had he indeed have been the prince he represented himself to be, he would undoubtedly have possessed a better right to the throne than Henry; for, as we have seen, the latter based his chief claim on his marriage with Elizabeth, the prince's sister. Whether he were really the son of Edward IV., or but a clever impostor, is a point which will probably never be determined; but on this subject I shall have more to say hereafter. The best historian of the time, indeed the only one at all worthy of the name, was Polydore Vergil, an Italian, attached to the court of Henry VII., naturally biased in favour of the king, and not likely to make statements inimical to his interests. To him, and the writings of the poet laureat, Andreas Bernard, also a foreigner, and desirous of retaining his position, subsequent historians have been chiefly indebted for their accounts of the events connected with the Perkin Warbeck conspiracy.

Little doubt exists but that the young man was materially assisted in the development of his project by Margaret of York, sister to Edward IV., and widow of Charles, Duke of Burgundy; but that she was, as has been alleged, the prime mover of the plot, and that she had trained Perkin Warbeck to personate the young prince, is by no means conclusively proved. The following quotation from *Hall's Chronicle*, which was published in 1548, sufficiently shows the spirit in which the historians of that day wrote of this insurrection:—

“The duches of Burgoyne so norished and brought up in the sedicious and sclerate faccions of false contryvers & founders of discorde coulde never cease nor be in quyet (like a vyper that is ready to burste with superfluyte of poyson) except he should infest and unquyet y^e king of England. . . . And as the devell provydeth venemous sauce to corrupt banckettes, so for her purpose she espyed

a certayne younge man, of visage beutiful, of countenance demure, of wit subtile crafty and pregnant, called Peter Warbecke. And for his dastard cowardnes of the Englishmen, in derision called Perkyn Warbeck, accordyng to the duche phrase, which chaunge the name of Peter to Perkyn, to yongelinges of no strength nor courage for their timerous hartes and pusillanimitie. . . . Therefore the duches thinking to have gotten God by the foote when she had the devell by the tayle, & adjudging this young man to be a mete organ to convey her purpose, and one not unlike to be y^e duke of Yorke sonne to her brother kyng Edward, which was called Richarde, kept hym a certayne space with her prevely, and hym with such diligence instructed, bothe of secretes and common affaires of the realme of England, & of the lignage, dissent, and ordre of the house of Yorke, that he like a good scholar not forgettyng his lesson coulde tell all that was taught him promptly without any difficultie or signe of any subornacion."—(Hall, fol. xxx.)

As soon as it was reported that the young prince was still alive, he was joined by many adherents of the Yorkist party, who supplied him with money and arms, to which doubtless the duchess contributed, and setting out from Portugal towards the end of the year 1491, he landed in Cork. He had not however been there long, before he received an intimation from Charles VIII. that if he would visit France, he should there find a safe asylum, and that assistance should be afforded him in recovering his rights. Perkin gladly embraced the offer of so powerful an ally, and on his arrival, was received with every mark of cordiality and respect. Charles, however, seems to have been actuated solely by a desire of serving his own interests, and held Perkin in a state of regal captivity, so as to secure a more advantageous treaty, then pending, with Henry VII. As soon as he was assured of a peace with England, he coldly dismissed his guest, who retired to Flanders. There the Duchess of Burgundy openly espoused his cause, and acknowledged him to be her nephew. According to the popular accounts, this was not his first visit to the court of the duchess; but, be that as it may, it was on this occasion that she publicly expressed her belief that he was Richard of York. Every day added increased strength to his cause. Already a powerful body of adherents in England were ready to assist him, and both Ireland and Scotland were favourably disposed towards him. His chief supporters in England were

Sir Robert Clifford ; Sir William Stanley, Lord Chamberlain ; Lord Fitzwalter ; Sir Thomas Thwaites ; Sir Robert Ratcliffe ; and William Barley, of Albury, Hertfordshire. Besides these, he was assisted, as appears by a *Controlment Roll*, in the Record Office (11 H. VII. m. 6), by William Dawbeney ; William Rysshford, of the Order of Preachers ; William Worsley, Dean of St. Paul's ; Robert Holborne ; John Ratclyffe ; Thomas Cressener ; Thomas Astwode ; John Stroys ; William Sutton ; and John Burton, all of London ; Sir Simon Mountford, of Coleshull, Co. Warwick ; and Thomas Powes, prior of the Order of Preachers, of King's Langley, Co. Herts. Of these, Sir Robert Clifford and William Barley were deputed to go to Flanders, and being probably furnished with money by his English sympathisers, were instructed to make arrangements for Perkin's descent upon England. It was at this time (1493), that he wrote from Dendermonde, in Flanders, to Isabella of Spain, whose daughter was betrothed to the Archduke Philip, to solicit her assistance. In this interesting letter, which is now in the British Museum (*Egerton MS.* 616, f. 3), and in an excellent state of preservation, he states that at the time of his brother's murder he was nine years of age, and that he was secretly sent out of England in the custody of two persons, and bound by an oath not to disclose his name and condition to any one, until after the lapse of a certain number of years. That one of those persons being dead, and the other returned home, he remained for a time in Portugal, whence he sailed to Ireland. Being invited by the king of France, he betook himself with his attendants to that kingdom, but Charles, failing to redeem his promise of assistance, he repaired to the court of his aunt, the Duchess of Burgundy. In this letter, he promises that if Isabella will use her influence with Ferdinand her husband, to assist him, he will, on the recovery of his hereditary kingdom, live in amity with Spain, and continue in closer alliance and friendship than ever his late father had done.

Henry, though he affected to treat the claim of Perkin Warbeck with contempt, was very uneasy as to the result, and dispatched Sir Edward Poynings and Dr. Warham (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), to Philip, Archduke of Burgundy, grandson of Charles, late husband of the dowager duchess, demanding the extradition of the adventurer (Rymer's *Fæd.*, xii., p. 544). Philip, being under age, replied through his council, that he desired nothing more than to be

on terms of friendly alliance with the king of England, but that the Duchess of Burgundy being paramount in the lands of her dower, he could not interfere in her affairs, or prevent her from acting as she pleased (Hall, p. 34). Twice was Roger Machado, Richmond Herald, sent to the court of Charles of France, ostensibly on a friendly mission, but really, as appears from his letter of instructions, to sound the king. Warbeck is spoken of in the letter as "le garson," and the ambassador was directed, in case Charles should speak of him, to reply, that the king was perfectly at his ease with respect to the imposter, as every one knew who and what he was, and how worthless was his cause. (*Cott. MS.*, Calig. D., vi., ff. 18, 20b. Mus. Brit.)

No English monarch employed more *mouchards* in his service than Henry, himself one of the most astute. From these he learned the active part which Sir Robert Clifford took in Warbeck's preparations, whereupon he determined to use every means in his power to induce the knight to betray his associates. In this design the king succeeded, and by the assurance of a pardon and a substantial reward, Clifford returned to England in December, 1494, and disclosed everything to the king. By entries in the Privy Purse Book, quoted in Bentley's *Excerpta Historica* (p. 100), we find that Clifford valued his honour at £500, and that William Hoton and Harry Wodeford were paid £26 13s. 4d. for bringing him to England. The principal conspirators were seized and condemned to death: Sir Simon Mountford, Sir Robert Ratcliff, and William Dawbeny, were immediately executed. Lord Fitzwalter escaped for a time, but was captured by the servants of Lord Oxford (who received £10 for their services), and was shortly afterwards brought to the scaffold. William Barley was probably still in Flanders, as no mention is made of him at the time; and the others, whose names have been before mentioned, were pardoned. The manner in which Sir William Stanley was denounced and seized affords a striking example of that duplicity which was so characteristic of Henry. On the 4th of January, 1495, Stanley and others were summoned to attend a council to be held in the Tower, (Stow, p. 477); and when assembled, Clifford, who had already disclosed the whole scheme to Henry, entered, and acknowledging his connection with Warbeck, begged the king's forgiveness. This was granted, on condition that Clifford should confess all he knew of the matter, whereupon he

impeached, amongst others, Sir William Stanley, Lord Chamberlain, then present. Every one, except perhaps the king, was thunderstruck at the charge, for Sir William was brother of Thomas, afterwards Earl of Derby, who had married Margaret Tudor, mother of the king, and one of the principal agents in placing Henry upon the throne. The only charge made against him was that he had been heard to say that if he were sure that Warbeck were King Edward's son, he would never bear arms against him. Had he been guilty of a graver crime, Polydore Vergil and Andreas, the court chroniclers, would not have failed to have recorded it, in extenuation of the king's conduct. To declare a preference for the House of York over that of Lancaster, was, however, deemed sufficient to justify a charge of high treason. Later historians have not scrupled to assert that Stanley's wealth was one of his gravest offences in the eyes of the king, and that it was a desire to possess his vast estates which mainly influenced Henry in condemning his kinsman to death. (Bacon, p. 610.) On the 16th of February, 1495, Sir William Stanley was beheaded on Tower Hill, and by a privy-purse entry of the 20th of the same month, we find that Henry paid the sum of £10 towards the expenses of the execution, and a few days later, £17 19s. for his burial at Sion.

Apprehending no immediate danger from Warbeck, now that he had lost his principal supporters in England, Henry set out on the 25th of June, on a progress towards the north. Warbeck, probably apprised of his intention, fitted out an expedition, with the assistance of the Duchess of Burgundy, and made a descent upon the English coast. A portion of his troops landed at Deal on the 3rd of July, 1495, but Perkin himself remained on board until he had learned the disposition of the inhabitants. It was fortunate for him that he did so, for the Kentish men, instead of assisting him as he imagined, fell upon his soldiers, killing a great number, and taking about a hundred and fifty prisoners, all of whom were hanged. Henry continued his journey, and spent several days with his mother at Latham, the house of Thomas Stanley, Earl of Derby, whose brother, but a few weeks before, he had caused to be executed.

After his repulse at Deal, Warbeck again sought a refuge with Charles VIII. of France, but by the terms of a treaty concluded at London, between that monarch and Henry, on the 24th of February, 1496, he was unable to remain there longer, and once more turned

towards Ireland. There he was joined by Desmond and others, but the populace, who cared as little for Yorkists as for Lancastrians, received him but coldly. Having lost three of his ships in vainly endeavouring to capture Waterford,* he sailed for Scotland, where he was kindly received by King James IV.

So favourably impressed was James as to the genuineness of Warbeck's claims, that he bestowed upon him the hand of his cousin, Lady Catherine Gordon, daughter of George, second Earl of Huntley, by Jane, daughter of James I. It is extremely improbable that the Scottish king would have sanctioned the union of Warbeck with a member of his own royal house, were he not thoroughly convinced that Perkin was indeed the son of Edward IV., and moreover likely to succeed in his project.

For nearly five years Perkin had been a source of great disquiet to Henry. Though the snake had been scotched, it was far from being killed, and now showed stronger symptoms of vitality than ever. Richmond Herald was again dispatched to France, in order to discover the feelings of Charles on the subject of Perkin's claim. In the letter of instructions, in the British Museum (*Cott. MS.*, Calig. D., vi., f. 22), dated the 5th of March, 1496, Richmond is directed to thank the French king for the late visit of his two ambassadors; to express Henry's desire for a personal interview; to speak of a matrimonial alliance between the two countries; and to tell the king that he need not distress himself about repaying a loan which he had had from Henry, for another year. In the same MS. (fol. 28) is a fragment of further instructions, which Richmond probably received at the same time, and which constituted the real object of his mission. In these he is instructed, that should any inquiries be made respecting the "garson," to treat the matter with seeming indifference, and to say that that affair is one of the least cares the king has. But to show how utterly false this assumption of security really was, we find Richmond is ordered to adroitly bring the con-

* A *compotus* of William Hattelyffe and others, of expenses and receipts in Ireland at this time, is preserved among the Royal MSS. in the British Museum, (18 C., xiv.) It contains many interesting records connected with the landing of Perkin Warbeck, and would well repay a more thorough examination than I have been enabled to make. By one item in this book it appears that the three captured vessels were sold for £93 6s. 8d., from which we may infer that they were of no great size.

versation round to the subject, should it not be broached by Charles or his ministers, "Et si d'aventure on ne luy en parle point, qu'il se mette en devoir par tous bons moiens de doner occasion q'on luy en puisse parler." He was also to say that he had good reason to believe that the king of Scotland meditated an attack upon England, and to remind Charles that at a meeting held at Turin in August last, he had promised, in the event of such a contingency, to assist Henry.

Meanwhile the Low Countries had ceased to be a *point d'appui* for Perkin, for towards the close of the year 1495, the Emperor Maximilian of Germany resigned his guardianship over his son Philip, who however was still a minor. One of the first public acts of Philip was to send ambassadors to England, begging a renewal of the Treaty of Commerce, which Henry had broken off about two years previously, when Philip had refused to deliver up Warbeck. Philip's ambassadors found no difficulty in concluding their mission, and on the 24th of February, 1496, a treaty of peace and perpetual amity was signed at London. (*Act. Pub.*, xii., p. 576.) Not the least important article in the treaty was, that both sides engaged to give no assistance to the enemies of the other; Philip expressly stipulating to prevent the Duchess of Burgundy from harbouring any of the king's rebellious subjects, and that, in case she acted contrary to this prohibition, he promised to deprive her of all her possessions in Flanders.

The king of Scotland, finding there was but little chance of foreign assistance, determined to make an incursion upon England at once. He accordingly marched, accompanied by Warbeck, into Northumberland, where he expected to be joined by a considerable number of Yorkists; but though he issued a proclamation in the name of King Richard IV., calling upon the people to support their lawful sovereign, none obeyed the summons.* James, having advanced so far into the enemy's country, thought it was too good an opportunity to be wholly lost; so, finding that it was impossible to enlist any

* In this proclamation Warbeck denounces Henry as an usurper, and says that Henry, well aware that he cannot hold his position much longer, is sending vast amounts of treasure abroad, for his future subsistence. He offers a reward of a thousand pounds, and an annuity of a hundred marcs in houses and land, to whomsoever will intercept the king in his attempted flight. (*Harl. MS.*, 283, fol. 183 b., *et seq.*)

sympathizers amongst the Northumbrians, he contented himself with carrying off everything of value belonging to them that he could sieze (Bacon, p. 616). Polydore Vergil relates, that on this occasion, Perkin, feigning to be moved at the distresses of the people, implored the king, in the presence of the court, to spare his miserable subjects: to which James replied, with a sneering smile, that he thought it very generous of him to be so careful of what did not seem to belong to him, for not a man had joined his standard.

As Scotland was now the stronghold of Warbeck, Henry was anxious to learn the future plans of James, and in order to accomplish this, he contrived to secure the services of John Ramsey, Lord Bothwell, who was attached to the Scottish court. Through his agency Henry learned all the secrets of the enemy, and there are extant two letters written by Bothwell, one dated in August, and the other in September, 1496. In the latter he informs the king that James and Warbeck,—or the “feynt boy,” as he calls him—at the head of 1,400 men, intended making another expedition against England on the 17th day of the month, and that two vessels, with sixty Flemings, under the command of Roderick de la Lane, had recently arrived. He tells the king that though James be his countryman, yet he is Henry’s servant, and “welbot schew y^e treucht.” He advises the king to make an immediate descent upon Scotland, and writes, that if he have a fleet of ships in readiness it would be a favourable opportunity to sail northwards, “for all y^e schipmen and inhabitants of y^e haven towns pass with y^e king beland and yus my^t all thar navy be distroyit and havin touns brynt. I past in y^e castell of Edinburght and saw y^e provision of Ordinance y^e quhilk is bot litill that is to say ij great curtaldis y^t war send out of France x falconis or litill serpentinis xxx cart gunnis of irne with chawmeris and xvi clos carts for spers powder stanis and odir stuf to yir gunnis longin.” (*Cott. MS.*, Vesp. C., xvi., ff. 152, *et seq.*)

Henry does not seem to have acted upon Bothwell’s advice, but endeavoured to temporize with the king of Scotland, in order to gain time, hoping thereby to wear out the patience and the purses of the Yorkists. He therefore commissioned Richard Fox, Bishop of Durham, to treat, as of himself, for a marriage between James and Margaret, Henry’s eldest daughter. Thomas Savage, Bishop of London, was also dispatched to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, to confirm his alliance with them, and to secure, by fresh engagements,

the marriage of Arthur, his eldest son, with Catherine, their third daughter.* (Rymer's *Fœd.*, xii., p. 636.)

Scotland was the only country from which any danger was to be apprehended, and negotiations having failed, Henry determined to prosecute the other alternative with vigour. He summoned a parliament on the 16th of January, 1497, the only purpose of which was to levy a subsidy of £120,000, and two Fifteens. The rigour with which this tax was levied produced much discontent among the people, particularly in Cornwall, where it was flatly refused. Thomas Flammock and Michael Joseph, of Bodmin, were particularly active in encouraging the people to resist the imposition, and induced them to take up arms in opposition to the king. A considerable body of the malcontents marched through Devonshire into Somersetshire, where James Tuchet, Lord Audley, assumed the command. They proceeded to Salisbury and Winchester, gathering fresh numbers as they went, and finally, to the number of sixteen thousand, as stated by Bacon (p. 619), encamped at Blackheath. Had there been any unity of action between them and the army of the king of Scotland, it might have gone hard with Henry; as it was, the southern insurgents were completely routed on the 22nd of June, 1497, and Audley, Flammock, and Joseph, being taken prisoners, were executed, (Hollingshead, p. 782): the others were permitted to return to their homes.

The insurrection in Cornwall afforded James a favourable opportunity of making another incursion into England. He laid siege to the Castle of Norham, but on the news of the approach of the Earl of Surrey with twenty thousand men, he retired to Edinburgh, and shortly afterwards instructed the Earl of Angus to propose terms for a peace. As in these no mention was made of Warbeck, Henry refused to accept them; but unwilling to break off the treaty altogether, he dispatched Richard Fox, Bishop of Durham, in July 1497, to re-open negotiations. One of the stipulations was that Warbeck should be delivered up to Henry, "not for anie estimacion that wee

* Amongst the Egerton MSS. in the British Museum (616, f. 5), is a letter of Warbeck's, dated the 18th October, (1496). It is addressed to Barnard de la Forse, then in Spain, whose son Anthony was with Warbeck in Scotland. It does not throw any light upon his proceedings, but is extremely interesting, inasmuch as it bears the autograph, and I believe the only one extant, of Perkin Warbeck. He styles himself Richard, King off England, in a bold English hand, which shows plainly, that though educated in Flanders, he had an English tutor.

take of him, but because our cousen (James) . . . having been in his companie entered in puissance within our land . . . and less therefore may wee not do with our honor, than to have the deliveraunce of him, although the deliverance or having of him is of noe price or value (*Cott. MS.*, Vesp. C., xxvi. f. 21). The king of Scotland was on the horns of a dilemma: on the one hand, he was little disposed to provoke a war with England, in which the chances of success were much against him; and on the other, he was unwilling to betray Warbeck, whose safety he had guaranteed, and who was nearly connected with him by marriage. Henry's sagacity smoothed the difficulty:—there was then in England Pedro d' Ayala, envoy from Ferdinand of Spain to King James; and to him, as a neutral party, was committed the task of settling the terms of peace. Through his endeavours the embarrassing question was settled. It was arranged that James should honourably dismiss Warbeck, without prejudice—to use a legal phrase—and that afterwards the two kings should arrange terms for a treaty of peace, as though he had never been in Scotland. James accordingly represented to Warbeck that he had assisted him to the extent of his power; that he had twice invaded England on his account; and that as the English people showed no disposition to join him, he had better try his fortune elsewhere. Thus courteously dismissed, Warbeck took his departure from Scotland, and with his wife and a small band of followers, embarked for Cork, where he landed on the 26th July, 1497. The Irish proved less disposed than ever to espouse his cause, and as a last resource, he determined once more to try his fortune in England. Much discontent still remaining in Cornwall, thither he directed his course, and with a fleet of only three small vessels and a force of seventy men landed at Whitsand Bay, near the Land's End, on the 7th September, (*Stow*, p. 480). Having by liberal promises of reward assembled about three thousand men, he sent his wife to St. Michael's Mount for safety, and at the head of his undisciplined troops marched upon Exeter; where, contrary to his expectation, he found the gates closed upon him. Sir Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon; William, his son; Sir John Croker; Sir Edmund Carew; Sir Thomas Fulford; Peter Edgecombe, and others, collected a number of men in order to oppose his further progress. (*Hollingshead*, i., p. 784.) Hearing this, Warbeck, after a two days' fruitless attack, raised the siege of Exeter, and hastily retired to

Taunton, which he reached on the 20th of September. There he encamped, as though he intended to await the forces of the king, but the same night, he, and several of his principal followers, fled to the monastery of Beaulieu in Hampshire, where they took sanctuary. Warbeck's followers, now without any leaders, were forced to submit without striking a blow: a number of them were hanged, and the rest were heavily fined for their delinquency.* (Rym., *Fœd.*, xii., p. 696.) The monastery of Beaulieu was strictly watched to guard against Warbeck's escape, and a detachment of troops was sent to seize his wife, lest, should she give birth to a son, another claimant should arise to the crown, (Hollingshead, p. 784). Henry was much perplexed how to obtain possession of Warbeck. He durst not allow him to remain where he was, however securely he might be guarded; and he was unwilling to violate the privileges of a sanctuary. He therefore sent a proposal to Warbeck, promising him a full pardon on condition of his acknowledging himself to be an imposter. Warbeck, finding all hope of escape cut off, embraced the offer of the king, and surrendered himself at Taunton on the 5th of October. On arriving in London, which was not until the 28th of November, he was sent as a prisoner to the Tower, from whence he made his escape, and took refuge in the monastery of Shene, in Surrey, (Hall, f. xlix.) Again the king promised him his life if he would leave the sanctuary, but on doing so he was placed for a whole day in the stocks in Westminster Hall, and on the following day (14th June, 1499), was compelled to read, from a scaffold erected in Cheapside, what purported to be a full confession of his crimes, and a history of himself. This document, though somewhat lengthy, is of such an extraordinary nature that I have transcribed it as printed in the Chronicle of Grafton, (p. 929):—

“I was borne in the towne of Turney in Flanders, my father's name is John Osbeck, which sayde John Osbeck was Comptroller of the said towne of Turney, and my mother's name is Catherine de Faro. And one of my groundsires upon my father's side was named Diryck Osbeck which dyed, after whose death my graundmother was maryed unto Peter Flamme, that was receaver of the forenamed towne of Turney, and Deane of the Botemen that rowe upon the

* The total amount of fines collected in the counties of Somerset, Dorset, Wilts, Hants, and a portion of Devon, amounted to £9665 10s., besides a large sum which was levied in Cornwall. (*Cott. MS.*, Calig. D., vi., f. 22.)

water of ryver, called Leschelde. And my Graundsire upon my mother's side was Peter de Faro, which had in his keeping the keyes of the gate of St. John's within the same towne of Turney. Also I had an uncle called Maister John Stalyn, dwelling in the parishe of Saint Pyas within the same towne, which had married my father's sister, whose name was Jone or Jane, with whome I dwelled a certayne season. And after I was led by my mother to Andwerp for to learne Flemmishe, in a house of a cousyn of mine, an officer of the sayde towne, called John Stienbeck, with whome I was the space of half a yere. And after that I returned agayne to Turney, by reason of the warres that were in Flaunders. And within a yere followyng I was sent with a Marchant of the sayde towne of Turney named Berlo, to the marte of Andwerp where I fell sick, which sicknesse continued upon me five moneths. And afrer this the sayde Barlo set me to borde in a Skinners house, that dwelled beside the house of the Englishe nation. And by him I was from thence caryed to Barowe marte, and I lodged at the signe of the olde man, where I abode the space of two moneths. And after this the sayde Barlo set me with a Marchant at Middelborough to service for to learne y^e language whose name was John Strewe, wyth whome I dwelled from Christmas till Easter, and then I went into Portyngale, in the companie of Sir Edward Brumptones wyfe, in a ship which was called the Quenes ship. And when I was come thither, then I was put in service to a Knight that dwelled in Lushborne whiche was called Peter Vaez de Cognia, wyth whome I dwelled a whole yere, which sayde knight had but one eye. And because I desyred to see other countries, I tooke licence of him, and then I put my selfe in service with a Briton, called Pregent Meno, the which brought me with him into Irelande, and when we were there arrived in the towne of Corke, they of the towne, because I was arayed with some clothes of Silke of my sayde maisters, came unto me and threped upon me that I should be the Duke of Clarence sonne, that was before time at Develin. And for-as-much as I denied it there was brought unto me the holy Evangelists and the crosse by the Maior of the towne, which was called John le Wellen, and there in the presence of him and other I tooke my othe as the truth was, that I was not the foresayde Dukes sonne, nor none of his blood. And after this came unto me an Englishe man, whose name was Stephen Poytron, with one John Water, and layde to me in swear-

yng grat othes, that they knew well that I was King Richardes Bastard sonne : to whome I aunswered with like others that I was not. And then they advised me not to be afearde, but that I should take it upon me boldly, and if I would do so they would ayde and assist me with all their power agaynst the King of England, and not only they, but they were assured well that the Erles of Desmond, and Kildare, should do the same. For they forced not what parte they tooke, so that they might be revenged upon the King of England, and so agaynst my will made me to learne Englishe, and taught me what I should do and say. And after this they called me Duke of Yorke, second sonne of King Edward the fourth, because King Richards bastard sonne was in the hands of the King of England. And upon this the said John Water, Stephen Poytron, John Tiler, Hughbert Burgh, with many other, as the foresayde Erles, entered into this false quarell. And within short time after, the French King sent an Ambassador into Ireland, whose name was Loyte Lucas, and mayster Stephyn Fryam, to advertise me to come into Fraunce. And thence I went into Fraunce, and from thence to Flaunders, and from Flaunders into Ireland, and from Ireland into Scotland, and so into England."

After reading this confession, he was confined once more in the Tower, where he conspired with four servants of Sir John Digby, the lieutenant, to escape in company with the unfortunate Earl of Warwick, after first murdering Sir John, (Hall, fol. l.) There can be little doubt but that the means of devising this plan were intentionally provided through the instrumentality of the king, so as to afford him a pretext for taking Warbeck's life without breaking his former promise. Perkin was brought to trial on the 16th of November, and being found guilty, was executed on the 23rd of the same month.

The Lady Catherine, his wife, seems to have been kindly treated by Henry and his queen, who assigned her an ample allowance which she enjoyed until her death. In the expenses of the Privy purse are many entries of money paid to the *White Rose*, as this lady was usually styled. After Warbeck's execution she was married to Sir Edward Cradock, Knt., and was buried with him in St. Mary's Church, Swansea.

Whether Warbeck were really the prince he claimed to be, or not, is a most difficult question to decide. It certainly is extremely improbable that the life of Edward the Fifth's brother should have been

spared at the time the king was murdered ; and it is still more improbable, that even if it were spared, the young prince should not have been more carefully guarded than he was. We find too, that when Warbeck besieged Exeter, the Earl of Devon, and William his son, were actively engaged on the side of the king. Now William Courtenay married Catherine, sister of the supposed prince ; it is therefore only reasonable to suppose that William Courtenay looked upon his claim as fraudulent. On the other hand, the confession is of little value as evidence, for it was made under fear of death ; and though, as the early historians affirm, it was written by himself, it is clearly false, for no allusion is made to the Duchess of Burgundy, and the part which she took in the matter. Again, it is stated in that document that it was not until after his arrival in Cork that he was forced against his will to learn English. It would have been utterly impossible for him to have acquired the language so thoroughly that when Clifford spoke with him in Flanders the following year, he should not have betrayed his foreign birth by his accent ; and yet no such defect was ever charged against him. Why was he never confronted with his supposed mother, who was securely lodged in a nunnery at Bermondsey ? Surely she could have set the question of his identity at rest. There is a little uncertainty respecting the date of the young prince's birth : according to some accounts he was born in 1472, and according to others, two years later. In the letter to Isabella, before referred to, he is said to have been nine years old in 1483. Now Margaret of York married Charles, Duke of Burgundy, in 1467, which was five or seven years before the prince's birth ; and from that time she never returned to England. It is difficult to imagine, therefore, how the duchess could have instructed young Perkin in the occurrences at the English court, which she herself could only have learned from others. In attempting to decide on the justness of the claims set up by Warbeck, it should ever be borne in mind that the only cotemporary accounts we have of him were written by his avowed enemies, who naturally suppressed every circumstance which seemed to favour his pretensions.

* * * In *Add. MS.* 5485, fol. 230 *et seq.*, Mus. Brit., will be found a transcript from an older document, giving an account of a plot against the king's life, to which Warbeck was said to have been privy, and in which the principal person inculpated was John Kendal, prior of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. As John Kendal enjoyed the king's favour until the time of his death, which did not take place until five years afterwards, it seems probable that the whole account is false.