



# From the Romans to the Normans on the English Renaissance Stage

Lisa Hopkins



EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

From the Romans to the Normans  
on the English Renaissance Stage

EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

*Series Editors*

David Bevington  
*University of Chicago*

Robert Clark  
*Kansas State University*

Jesse Hurlbut  
*Brigham Young University*

Alexandra Johnston  
*University of Toronto*

Veronique B. Plesch  
*Colby College ME*

Medieval Institute Publications is a program of  
The Medieval Institute, College of Arts and Sciences



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

From the Romans to the Normans  
on the English Renaissance Stage

by  
Lisa Hopkins

Early Drama, Art, and Music

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS  
Western Michigan University  
*Kalamazoo*

Copyright © 2017 by the Board of Trustees of Western Michigan University

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data  
are available from the Library of Congress.**

ISBN: 9781580442794

eISBN: 9781580442800

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in, or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

## Chapter 1

# “Bisson Conspectuities”: Language and National Identity in Shakespeare’s Roman Plays

MOST NATIVE SPEAKERS OF English are aware that their language is a mongrel. To an extent, this awareness can be traced back to the early modern period, because one of the offshoots of the Renaissance was the beginning of philological enquiry. Many of the forms this took might now seem very quaint, such as Goropius Becanus’ declaration in *Origines Antwerpianae* (1569) that Dutch was the language originally spoken by mankind before the Tower of Babel because the Cimbri, whom he claimed as ancestors of the Flemish, had not been present at the event;<sup>1</sup> hence Surly’s question in *The Alchemist*, “Did Adam write, sir, in High Dutch?”<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, interest in the origins of languages was growing. In England, as Alysia Kolentsis observes, “Language reformers during the 16th century sought for English to realize its potential as a sophisticated and authoritative language that was capable of holding its own among the ascendant vernaculars of other nations such as Italy and Spain.”<sup>3</sup> In particular, Rebecca Brackmann points to the increasing Elizabethan sensitivity to the use of words of foreign origin.<sup>4</sup> Brackmann observes that “Cheke suggests that rather than venturing into other languages for loanwords, writers should revive outdated English words, and it has been suggested that by this he meant Anglo-Saxon ones” (she notes that Laurence Nowell compiled a *Vocabularium Saxonicum*).<sup>5</sup> Matters of diction could often be discussed in surprisingly emotional terms: Carla Mazzio notes that “The influx of thousands of new words from Latin, Greek, French, Spanish and Italian in the sixteenth century led to extensive debates about the presence of foreign and ‘barbaric’ elements within the national vocabulary” and cites Richard Sherry’s declaration that foreign words had become as acculturated “*as if they had bene of our owne natiue bloode*.” Mazzio also argues that Thomas Tomkis’ 1607 *Lingua, or the Combat of the Tongue and the five Senses for Superiority* “stages the mother tongue as ‘a common whore [who] lets everyone lie with her,’”<sup>6</sup> further exacerbating the impu-

urity and hybridity of English as a language. Such images suggest that this was a period not only of questions about the origins of words but of considerable sensitivity about the answers to those questions.

A sense of where words come from is, I think, something that we can expect early modern playwrights to have been increasingly aware of when they made lexical choices; certainly Lucy Munro suggests that it is significant that “Both *Hengist* and *The Birth of Merlin* ... contain references to language at the key moments at which the British first encounter the Saxons.”<sup>7</sup> In the case of a number of dramatists, including Shakespeare, awareness of choosing English words is likely to have been heightened by the fact that they were sometimes deliberately choosing words from other languages. Shakespeare’s residence in the home of Huguenot refugees visibly gave him access to very serviceable French; he may have known a little Italian; and he seems to have had at least one player in his company who spoke Welsh, which he might also have sometimes heard while growing up in Stratford-upon-Avon. However small his Latin and Greek, Shakespeare was thus aware of and perhaps able to recognize at least five other languages in addition to his native English, and he must thus have had at least a basic awareness of the etymological origins and cultural affiliations of specific vocabulary items. In this chapter, I discuss the implications of some of his choices in this respect, particularly in his Roman plays, in order to argue that the ways in which Shakespeare represents English as a language conditions the ways in which he represents early modern English and British identities.

Arthur Golding, one of Shakespeare’s favorite writers, is one of many early modern authors who deliberately prefers words from Old and Middle English to Latin ones,<sup>8</sup> and Shakespeare too pits English against Latin. It may seem almost redundant to remark that in early modern English plays about Rome, all the characters speak English. The use of English is, however, sometimes drawn attention to; in William Rowley’s *A Shoo-maker a gentleman*, for instance, Dioclesian says to the king of Vandals “Ile teach thee speake the Roman Language,”<sup>9</sup> and Julia Briggs suggests that in *Hengist, King of Kent*, which pits invading Saxons against residually Romanized Britons, “Hengist’s signal to begin the massacre, the Old English phrase ‘Nemp your sexes’ (4.3.52) (‘seize your daggers’), is a reminder of the Saxons’ foreignness, as well as a possible pun on their name,”<sup>10</sup> while Chris Butler argues that Jasper Fisher’s *Fuimus Troes* “may offer more to the modern reader as a dramatisation of the historiographical contest between native and classical (Latin) texts

for discursive eminence in the early decades of the seventeenth century than to the modern playgoer as an early modern representation of historical characters in conflict."<sup>11</sup>

There are also occasions when vocabulary choice in plays about the past is ostentatiously and pointedly modern and carries an unmistakable ideological charge. A particularly suggestive use of a loudly contemporary term comes in *Gorboduc*, where the word "reave" and its cognates recur with extraordinary insistence, beginning in the play's first scene when Videna warns Ferrex that his father will "bereave" him of his inheritance;<sup>12</sup> forms of it subsequently appear a further fifteen times.<sup>13</sup> Although the word was originally of Germanic origin, the idea of reaving (now usually spelled "reiving") had become distinctively associated with the perennial unrest on the Scottish Border, to the extent that families such as the Elliots and Armstrongs are now known customarily simply as "Border Reivers"; all *OED*'s earliest uses of "reft" are Scots. The use of the term "reave" thus offers further sly incrimination of Fergus, duke of Albany, whose attempt to profit from the power vacuum at the end of the play is a transparent warning about the dangers of favoring a Scottish succession over a Suffolk one.

The language of Border warfare is also used elsewhere in early modern drama. In Thomas Hughes' *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, another play about the forging of national identities, Gorlois soliloquizes "Thy murdered corse / And Dukedome *reft*" (my italics) and Gawin says to Mordred "Consider then your Fathers grieffe, and want: / Whom you *bereaue* of Kingdome, Realme, and Crowne" (my italics);<sup>14</sup> again the emphasis is an anti-Scottish one, since Mordred is clearly a version of Mary, Queen of Scots.<sup>15</sup> In *The lamentable tragedie of Lochrine* Albanact, whom his father Lochrine has made king of Scotland, commits suicide with the words "This sword shall reave his maister of his life,"<sup>16</sup> and we also hear of "Offarius the arme strong King of Gaules" (sig. A4v); "armestrong" is also found at sig. F4r, and points us clearly in the direction of the Border, where the Armstrongs were one of the most powerful of reiving families. In all these plays, then, discussion of the past formation of national identities is significantly inflected by an undertow of allusion to contemporary ones, in ways which work to position the English as more civil than their neighbors and as having a more hopeful destiny.

*Gorboduc*, *Lochrine* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* all left visible traces on the writing of Shakespeare.<sup>17</sup> I think this should alert us to the fact that we need to tease out the implications of the apparently simple phenomenon of characters speaking English in plays which are set

in ancient Rome and in the residually post-Roman cultures which succeeded it. By definition, the authors of such plays are participating in what Richard Helgerson considers as the common project of a loose group of Renaissance writers including Spenser, Coke, Camden, Speed, Drayton, Hakluyt, Shakespeare, and Hooker “To have the kingdom of their own language.”<sup>18</sup> There can certainly be no doubt that Shakespeare in particular was constantly alive to the expressive powers of English, and that his word choices deserve attention. In *A briefe discourse of royall monarchie* (1581), Charles Merbury alleges that “William the Conquerour sought to surpresse, and extinguish our English speeche, commaunding all our lawes to be written in his owne language, as it appeareth also by the termes of our pastimes (of hawking, hunting, karding, dycing, Tennis, and such like,) which for the most part doe yet remaine in the Normane tongue.”<sup>19</sup> However, English proved hard to kill, and words of Anglo-Saxon or Viking origin could (and can) be easily detected by sound, shape, and texture. It is notable that in both *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Henry V* we hear language-learning lessons where all the selected vocabulary items are markedly different from their Latin and French equivalents (even if Mistress Quickly does try to turn them into false friends). In *Merry Wives*, Parson Evans’ question “What is *lapis*, William?” receives the answer “A stone”;<sup>20</sup> in the years since the Romans left England, Latin *lapis* has given way to Germanic *stein*. In *Henry V*, Alice teaches a surprised Princess Katherine that the English words for parts of the body are completely different from those in Romance languages, starting with “hand” (Old Frisian) and “fingers” (Germanic).<sup>21</sup>

Shakespeare not only uses words which speak of England’s Saxon and Viking past, but tends to throw them into relief by pairing them with Latin ones, in what Scott Newstok calls “the curious prevalence of synonymous word pairs, collocated with an ‘and’ and coupling words of Latinate and Anglo-Saxon origins.”<sup>22</sup> A prime example of Shakespeare’s awareness of such differences was incidentally drawn attention to by Josie Rourke’s 2013–14 production of *Coriolanus* at the Donmar Warehouse in London, in which Mark Gatiss as Menenius replaced “bisson conspectuities” by “blind conspectuities.” This is understandable, since “bisson” has long since been consigned to the outer reaches of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but it disguised from the audience a particularly striking instance of Shakespeare’s delight in coupling words of Latin origin with words of English origin, for a sharp contrast obtains between the conspicuously Latinate “conspectuities” and “bisson,” meaning blind, which

is an Old English, specifically Northumbrian word, first found in the Lindisfarne Gospels, and present also in *Hamlet*, where the First Player speaks of Hecuba "*threat'ning the flames / With bisson rheum.*"<sup>23</sup> The effect is particularly insistent in the Roman plays, where Shakespeare seems to go out of his way to have his characters use words which are conspicuously Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian in origin, recalling the successive waves of invasion which had shaped the linguistic as well as the political history and contours of the British Isles and implicitly troubling the idea of a link between Britain and the power and authority of Rome.

*Cymbeline*, a play set in a Britain just coming to terms with Rome but which gestures too at Britain's immediately post-Roman moment, helps us to see some of the causes and effects of such vocabulary choices. Toward the beginning of the play, First Gentleman says of the hero, Posthumus Leonatus:

I cannot delve him to the root: his father  
Was call'd Sicilius, who did join his honour  
Against the Romans with Cassibelan,  
But had his titles by Tenantius.<sup>24</sup>

What we have here is Galfridian history—that is, history according to Geoffrey of Monmouth. Cassibelan is Geoffrey's Cassivelaunus, who supposedly fought with Julius Caesar and was the brother of Lud, after whom London was said to have been named; Samantha Frenée-Hutchins identifies him as "the first historically named British king,"<sup>25</sup> meaning that he is the first to be named by a historian other than Geoffrey. Cassibelan and Tenantius (Geoffrey's Tenvantius, son of Lud and thus nephew of Cassivelaunus) both combine Latinate names with the status of legendary icons of early Britishness. However, First Gentleman's admission that in the case of Posthumus "I cannot delve him to the root" acknowledges the fragility of this embryonic Britain and of Geoffrey's so-called British History. Geoffrey's account had been debunked by Henry VII's Italian historian Polydore Vergil, who had very reasonably pointed out that there was no evidence whatsoever for events in Britain before the arrival of the Romans and the writings of Caesar and Tacitus, and it is therefore slyly suggestive that Polydore is the name adopted by Guiderius, one of *Cymbeline's* two stolen sons. In Geoffrey, Guiderius fights against the Emperor Claudius at Portchester Castle, but here the choice of alias calls attention to the unreliability of Geoffrey and invites us to recognize the fictionality of the character. Similarly when Belarius says of himself and

his adoptive sons (really the kidnapped sons of Cymbeline himself) “In Cambria are we born” (5.5.17) we know that in fact they were not: according to John Weever in *Ancient Funerall Monuments*, Cymbeline’s palace, which is presumably where the two princes were born since that was where they were stolen from, was in Maldon in Essex,<sup>26</sup> not Wales. Wales had a special place in the story of Brutus, since his bloodline supposedly survived there and eventually produced the Tudors. These princes, however, were *not* born in Wales, and the very name of Polydore implicitly contests the Brutus myth in the first place; ultimately, then, the characters can only guess that “This youth, how’er distress’d, appears he hath had / Good ancestors” (4.2.47–48), because the name of Posthumus forces us to recognize that no one will ever be able to delve anyone’s ancestry to the root, and that we do not really know anything about our own early past. A desire to assert a connection to Rome may have been one of the things that brought the Renaissance to England in the first place, but ironically the Renaissance, in the shape of Polydore Vergil, had struck at the foundations of the supposed connection.

The same tension between a fetishized latinity and an inescapable modernity is evident in *Cymbeline* at the level of both plot and language. On the one hand, a sense of at least two crucial historical moments is firmly created, for though the reference to Cassivelaunus invites us to think of the moment of first contact between Romans and Britons during the lifetime of Julius Caesar, we also note that Innogen has in her bedroom a tapestry showing the story of Antony and Cleopatra, which puts us rather later in Roman history. There are also distinct evocations of Rome’s later decadence. First Senator says “the legions now in Gallia are / Full weak to undertake our wars against / The fall’n-off Britons” (3.8.4–6), evoking the tentative early stages of the Roman conquest but also simultaneously reminding us of the last phase of the empire in which the legions had to be recalled from the provinces to defend Rome itself. In similar vein, Guiderius while still disguised as Polydore says “Nay, Cadwal, we must lay his head to the east, / My father hath a reason for’t” (4.2.25–26), giving an impression of a culture already in collapse, observing practices which it has inherited from its elders but no longer understanding them. (I will think more about the implications of this later.) Most evocatively, Lucius (whose name echoes that of the first Christian king of Britain, according to Geoffrey) says of the headless trunk of Cloten “The ruin speaks that sometime / It was a worthy building” (4.2.354–55). We catch here a glimpse of what was surely the most

important single fact of life in Britain after the withdrawal of the legions: the survival of massive buildings—Bath, the Hadrian's Wall forts, the walls at Silchester, the amphitheater at Caerleon, to name only a few—which the native population could now occupy but did not know how to maintain, so that they gradually fell into disuse and decay, as poignantly recalled in the great Anglo-Saxon poem called simply "The Ruin," preserved in the Exeter Book, which speaks of a Roman site, almost certainly Bath, crumbling away because everyone who could have repaired it is dead.

Pitted against this, however, are insistent reminders of a much more modern world. We have the distinctively post-Latin vocabulary of Iachimo's reference to "Her andirons" (2.4.88), andirons being a word of Old French origin; Innogen's declaration that she is "not so citizen a wanton as / To seem to die ere sick" (4.2.8–9), where "citizen" and "wanton" are both Middle English and "die" is Old Norse; Arviragus' reference to his "clouted brogues" (4.2.214), where "clouted" is Middle English and "brogue" Irish; and his acknowledgement to Posthumus that "You help us, sir" (5.5.42–43)—"help" being a residue from the fact that "help" is a Germanic strong verb. Even Rome itself is already not what it was: Iachimo is "Siena's brother" (4.2.241), clearly signaling an Italian peninsula no longer united under Rome but fragmented into the semi-independent city-states of the Renaissance. The play's language insistently reminds us that the story of Britain is far more than a simple story of subjugation by Rome, and indeed Caesar himself is made to speak not Latin but English when the queen declares:

A kind of conquest  
 Caesar made here, but made not here his brag  
 Of "Came, and saw, and overcame." (3.1.23–25)

It is hard to know who could possibly be unaware of Caesar's conquest of Britain and of his celebrated declaration "Veni, vidi, vici," but the queen's translation confutes it doubly, not only denying (correctly) that it was said in Britain but also implying (incorrectly) that it was said in English. In *Cymbeline*, then, we see both England and English as simultaneously Roman and not-Roman, in ways that imply that the early modern English language and early modern English identities are both fundamentally hybridized.

The irony of the queen's denial of Roman triumph is foreshadowed in *Antony and Cleopatra* by Cleopatra's fear that:

Antony  
 Shall be brought drunken forth, and I shall see  
 Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness  
 I'th' posture of a whore.<sup>27</sup>

At the very moment when we see something occur we are asked to experience it as not actually happening but as being remembered, and as falling short of itself in the process. It is of a piece with this sense that the Roman past is gone beyond recapturing that *Antony and Cleopatra* too is littered with words of conspicuously non-Latin origin: the Scandinavian “windowed” (4.14.72) and “odds” (“The odds is gone,” 4.15.66), both brought to England by the Vikings, rub shoulders with the low German “spleets,” first recorded in English in 1585 and here ironically used by Octavius himself, icon of *romanitas*, when he says “mine own tongue / Spleets what it speaks” (4.7.121–22). Maecenas says of Caesar “When such a spacious mirror’s set before him / He needs must see himself” (5.1.34–35); in effect the play itself is a spacious mirror to the English language. In fact it thematizes Shakespeare’s own practice in the exchange between Lepidus and Antony:

*Lepidus* What manner o’thing is your crocodile?

*Antony* It is shaped, sir, like itself, and it is as broad as it has breadth.  
 It is just so high as it is, and moves with its own organs. It lives  
 by that which nourisheth it, and the elements once out of it, it  
 transmigrates.

*Lepidus* What colour is it of?

*Antony* Of its own colour too. (2.7.41–44)

Caesar’s question “Will this description satisfy him?” (4.7.50) both hits and misses the point. The description *has* to satisfy Lepidus, woefully inadequate though it may be, because Lepidus and we are essentially in the same situation: he is being asked to apprehend a crocodile and we are being asked to apprehend the court of Cleopatra, and in both cases the only available representational material is language, which follows its own logic and is inflected and configured by forces outside the experience of Romans and Rome. Nor is Antony’s studied refusal of simile necessarily simply perverse, for it calls attention to the way in which language operates essentially on its own terms and creates its own reality: words are the tools through which we apprehend and construct the world, and that is why it behoves us to pay such close attention to the Anglo-Saxon flavor of the words through which Shakespeare chooses to construct his Rome.

In other Roman plays, too, the tension between Latin and the vernacular obtains. In *Julius Caesar*, Cassius, discussing Julius Caesar himself, icon of Roman conquest, says, "I had as lief not live as live to be / In awe of such a thing as I myself,"<sup>28</sup> where "lief," "live" and "thing" are Old Frisian, "be" West Germanic, "awe" Old Norse, and "myself" Old English. In *Coriolanus*, Menenius exhorts the plebeians to "Think / Upon the wounds his body bears, which show / Like graves i'th'holy churchyard,"<sup>29</sup> clearly pointing not to Republican Rome, where tombs were built by the sides of roads, but to a post-Roman, Christianized period in which temples have been replaced by churches. Menenius also declares "I would not have been so fidiused" (2.1.122–23), a nonce-word invented by Shakespeare for the occasion and infused by its grammatical function with a slyly salacious flavor, while the Third Servingman says "Why, here's he that was wont to thwack our general" (4.5.184); thwack is an obviously onomatopoeic word not found in English before the sixteenth century, and even if *OED*'s suggestion that it might be equivalent to "thack" is accepted, that is in any case Old English. "This is clean kam" (3.1.302) derives directly from the Welsh *cam*, crooked, and while *OED* thinks that "abram" colored hair (2..3.18) is a variant of auburn, it has an undeniably biblical ring which makes it almost as anachronistic as churchyards.

Moreover, latinity in *Coriolanus* may find itself deliberately associated with insincerity or with values from which the speaker wishes to dissociate himself. Kolentzis suggests that in Shakespeare "Direct references to Latin, as well as comic commentary associated with excessively ornamented Latinate speech, regularly figure" and that "When characters use Latinderived speech in a subtle way, particularly when their words are set alongside native 'Saxon' or 'Germanic' words, the contrast often exposes the ornate Latinisms as inadequate or even untrustworthy."<sup>30</sup> *Coriolanus* can serve as a prime example of this. Coriolanus himself says of the people "since the wisdom of their choice is rather to have my hat than my heart, I will practise the insinuating nod and be off to them most counterfeitly" (2.3.97–99); here a stolidly Anglo-Saxon first half of the sentence gives way to the Latinate "practise," "insinuating" and "counterfeitly" in the second, words which collectively weave a web of deception and pretense. The tribunes, by contrast, confidently call "The Aediles, ho!" (3.1.172) and term Coriolanus "a traitorous innovator" (3.1.174): their use of the Roman authority-term "Aediles" sits badly alongside the patently self-interested nature of their own authority, and "traitorous innovator" is transparently insincere, serving to underline the degree to which latinity is associated with deception.

The same contrast between latinity and sincerity is also evident in *King Lear*, which while obviously not a Roman play does nevertheless have a significant relationship to the genre in that it effectively sandwiches the period of the Roman occupation: officially set in Britain's legendary pre-Roman past, it also glances forward to the centuries which followed the occupation by its use of the word "century" for a body of soldiers (4.4.6). In the old play of *King Leir* the Oswald figure is called Skalliger, but Shakespeare deliberately imports a sprinkling of Anglo-Saxon names, including those of King Edgar, whom Spenser in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* explicitly mentions as a lawgiver, and of Oswald himself.<sup>31</sup> What the play effectively invites us to believe, therefore, is that England before the Romans and England after the Romans were in essentials the same, for character names and vocabulary items that ought logically to postdate the Romans are in fact to be found before them.

The play offers a number of pairings of English and Latinate vocabulary choices. Regan's Latinate "I am alone felicitate / In your dear highness' love" sits strikingly next to Cordelia's stolidly Anglo-Saxon "You have begot me, bred me, lov'd me."<sup>32</sup> Edmund, who lies, promises Gloucester "auricular assurance" of Edgar's guilt (1.2.88–89), which couples latinity with the sinister note struck by the implicit allusion to the distinctively Catholic practice of auricular confession (Kolentzis observes that "the speech of the villainous Edmund is markedly more Latin-inflected than that of his brother");<sup>33</sup> by contrast the Fool, who tells true, offers the resolutely Anglo-Saxon vocabulary of:

Mark it, Nuncle:  
 Have more than thou showest,  
 Speak less than thou knowest,  
 Lend less than thou owest,  
 Ride more than thou goest,  
 Learn more than thou trowest,  
 Set less than thou throwest;  
 Leave thy drink and thy whore,  
 And keep in a-door,  
 And thou shalt have more  
 Than two tens to a score. (1.4.115–25)

When the Fool speaks to Lear of "That lord that counsell'd thee / To give away thy land" (1.4.137–38), there is an even starker contrast between the Latin origin of that flawed counsel and the staunchly English words "lord," "thee," "give" and "land" which sum up the core of the situation.

*Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare's earliest Roman play,<sup>34</sup> also pits Latin against English. *Titus Andronicus* is steeped in the world of classical literature; we hear of *Metamorphoses* and of verses out of Horace and are aware that we are in a world where the image of "Ovid among the Goths" represented polar extremes of civilization and barbarism. Here, though, the contrast between words of Latin origin and words of Anglo-Saxon origin acquires an added dimension. Although older theories of their origin connected them to Scandinavia, the Goths were coming increasingly to be associated with Germany, and therefore to be understood as in opposition and antithesis to Rome: thus in William Rowley's *A Shoo-maker a gentleman* Dioclesian informs his co-emperor, whom he calls his "Brother Caesar," that

the Gothes, and Vandalls have outpast  
The bounds, and o're the Rhine past into Burgandy, our worke  
Must be to reverberate, and drive them to Confined Germany.  
(sigs. B3r–B4v)

Francesca Royster suggests that *Titus* draws attention to this view of the Goths as Germanic, arguing that "Saturninus's reference to Tamora's 'hue,' ... alludes to her Germanic paleness,"<sup>35</sup> and Kurt Johannesson argues that this "new picture of the Goths, like the concept of the Renaissance, was born in Italy: in the end they are parts of the same myth. At its base lies the deep-rooted hatred of foreigners in medieval Italy"; conversely, "In medieval and Renaissance Germany there was deep suspicion of and aversion to everything Italian or Roman, for the pope had often humbled the German emperors." Whatever its origin, the result of this trend was a progressive Germanization of the Goths, as evidenced by the fact that Franciscus Irenicus included them in his 1518 *Germaniae exegesis*.<sup>36</sup> George North traces the etymology of the name Gothland to German—"Thys woord Gotlande in the Germaine tounge doth interpretat a good ground of good land" (sig. A4v)—and Johannesson argues that the Germanization of the Goths was accelerated by the growing influence of "German reformers, who began to see the Gothic overthrow of the Roman Empire as prefiguring the Protestant break-away from the Roman Catholic Church."<sup>37</sup> The fact that the Goths were first converted by Arians could be mapped onto Lutheranism,<sup>38</sup> and as Royster notes, "Many shared Augustine's view that the triumph of the Goths over Rome in AD 410 was just punishment for Roman decadence."<sup>39</sup>

Goths were also increasingly conceived of as physically similar to the Germans. In this, as in so much else, early modern historians drew on the authority of Tacitus, who had claimed that

the peoples of Germany have never contaminated themselves by intermarriage with foreigners but remain of pure blood, distinct and unlike any other nation. One result of this is that their physical characteristics, in so far as one can generalize about such a large population, are always the same: fierce-looking blue eyes, reddish hair, and big frames—which, however, can exert their strength only by means of violent effort. They are less able to endure toil or fatiguing tasks and cannot bear thirst or heat, though their climate has inured them to cold spells and the poverty of their soil to hunger.<sup>40</sup>

History has not been kind to this passage in that its assertion of racial purity was inevitably seized on by the Nazis, but what would have caught the eye of Renaissance readers would have been the reference to the Germans' "big frames," for this spoke to a well-established racial stereotype of big, "fat-foggy Germans (who men say / Are nothing but flesh and belly)."<sup>41</sup> The idea that the Goths were bigger than the Romans is also to be found in *Titus Andronicus*, when Titus says to his brother:

Marcus, we are but shrubs, no cedars we,  
No big-boned men framed of the Cyclops' size. (4.3.46–47)

By implication, the Goths with whom he is obviously contrasting himself *were* big-boned, so Titus is proposing a significant difference between them and the Romans. What we see during the course of *Titus Andronicus*, however, is a remarkable process of exchange whereby Romans and Goths each draw their own vocabulary out of the other, making a mockery of Marcus' warning to his brother "Thou art a Roman, be not barbarous" (1.1.383).<sup>42</sup> As soon as they come into contact with Goths, the Romans start to sound like Goths. Titus himself declares "Here Goths have given me leave to sheathe my sword";<sup>43</sup> "give," "leave," "sheathe," and "sword" are all Germanic in origin. Shortly afterwards, Lucius demands

Give us the proudest prisoner of the Goths,  
That we may hew his limbs and on a pile,  
*Ad manes fratrum* sacrifice his flesh. (1.1.99–102)

"Hew" is Germanic and "limb" Old Norse; the actual Latin of "*Ad manes fratrum*" and the Latinate "sacrifice" thus sound suspiciously like a rather belated attempt to pull back from barbarism, and their effect is in any case immediately negated by the Germanic "flesh." Similarly Saturninus remarks when confronted with the Goth queen Tamora,

A goodly lady, trust me, of the hue  
That I would choose were I to choose anew (1.1.265–66)

"Goodly" is Old Frisian, "trust" Old Norse, "hue" West Germanic, "anew" a distinctively Old English prefix on an originally Latin-derived word. Saturninus may just have been elected emperor of Rome, but he sounds for all the world like a Goth.

The Goths, conversely, sound like Romans. Tamora exclaims "O cruel, irreligious piety" (1.1.133) and Chiron adds "Was never Scythia half so barbarous!" (1.1.134); "piety" is little changed from the Latin *pietas*, and "barbarous" was the onomatopoeic word coined by the Greeks for describing those who did not speak Greek. Indeed the first act ends with a Goth actually speaking Latin as Demetrius exits saying "*Per Stygia, per manes vehor*" (1.1.634), and later Aaron speaks of Enceladus, Typhon and Alcides (4.2.95–8). Titus himself tries to reassert *romanitas*:

Here none but soldiers and Rome's servitors  
Repose in fame; none basely slain in brawls. (1.1.357–58)

'Soldiers,' 'servitors,' 'repose,' and 'fame' are all words of Latin origin, and hence are appropriately applied to those allowed to lie in this Roman monument; 'slain' is of Germanic origin, 'none' Old English, 'basely' Anglo-Norman, and 'brawls' Middle English, and hence they are equally appropriately excluded. However, moments later Titus has to ask "And shall? What villain was it spake that word?" (1.1.364); "shall" is one of the two auxiliaries by which modern English forms the future tense ("will" being the other), and the use of auxiliaries is foreign to an inflected language such as Latin. We are pulled even more inescapably into modernity when the Roman Marcus, speaking of the archetypal Roman icon Lucrece, refers to "the woeful fere / And father of that chaste dishonoured dame" (4.1.89–90), "fere" being a Northumbrian word first recorded in 975, and again when Tamora vows "I'll find a day to massacre them all" (1.1.455), for the word "massacre" entered English only after the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572, an association underlined by the even more obviously French "we'll give your grace *bonjour*" (1.1.498). Rome is made to appear transient, and its influence impermanent, as a play about ancient Rome proves to have one eye firmly fixed on the urgently contemporary.

*Titus Andronicus*'s systematic blurring of the boundaries between Romans and Goths bore directly on the question of a considerable interest to the Renaissance, which was what had happened to the Goths. For

a big, successful people they had performed a strangely effective disappearing act; contemporary readers of Shakespeare's play could hardly have failed to notice that there was no longer a people who called themselves Goths. The Renaissance had several answers to the conundrum of what had become of them. For George North, they scattered

aboute the yeare of Christe. 380. at what tyme the Gothes, that long before were gone oute of Swecia and Gothia, made great spoyle, and wonderfully troubled the Romaynes both in Italye, Spayne, and Fraunce. The Gothes which continually remained in theyr countye, did vnite and knyt them selues to the Swecians, bothe in lawes and maners, and euer synce haue bene subiectes to the Kynges of Swecia.<sup>44</sup>

For North, then, some Goths went to Sweden. However, he goes on to describe how

The Gothes & the Swecians tyme out of mynde, & eyen from the beginning of their beyng: haue vnited & knyt themselues in leage & amitye, both vnder one law and one King. And also they haue appointed the confines & boundes of both Countries to be as one kyngdome. Yet haue they often tymes deuided them selues the one from the other, and eche nacion haue had their seueral king.<sup>45</sup>

Although basically Swedish, then, North's Goths are so only on a sort of part-time basis, and he also acknowledges that other descendants of the Goths are now to be found in very different climes, suggesting a terrifying degree of mobility and malleability inherent in their racial identity: "They possessed Italy no smal time, they occupyed Fraunce, and they grounded them selues so in Spayne, that theyr chiefe Nobilitie doth discende from them, as the Romaine histories doth mencion."<sup>46</sup> William Slatyer in his *The history of Great Britanie* concurs that "Spaniard and Italian both, / Are said descended of the Goth,"<sup>47</sup> while Thomas Stocker in *A tragicall historie of the troubles and ciuile warres of the lowe Countries* elaborates how

the christians which came of Gothes, for the auoyding of the intoltable oppressions, and horrible furie of these nations [the Moors], retyred and withrewe them selues into the Mountaynes of Arragon, who at that tyme were called the Cantabrians, and Asturians, and chose one named Pelagius to be their king. This Pelagius forsaking the name of a Gothe, beganne to make very great warres against the Mores.<sup>48</sup>

Pelagius in effect becomes an ex-Goth, and the people he leads are Christians, offering a stark reversal of traditional polarities by which Goths,

once synonymous with savagery and barbarism, are now literally on the side of the angels.

Even closer to home, there was a strongly held view that, in some sense at least, the Goths were in fact *us*. In *Fuimus Troes*, Camillus explicitly associates the Goths with the British when he informs Caesar that Brennus led the Gauls to sack Rome (2.7.35–46). Tacitus had suggested that the Britons were always already a mixed bag and that the best guide to their ancestry came from maps rather than mythology:

Who the first inhabitants of Britain were, whether natives or immigrants, is open to question: one must remember we are dealing with barbarians. But their physical characteristics vary, and the variation is suggestive. The reddish hair and large limbs of the Caledonians proclaim a German origin; the swarthy faces of the Silures, the tendency of their hair to curl, and the fact that Spain lies opposite, all lead one to believe that Spaniards crossed in ancient times and occupied that part of the country. The peoples nearest to the Gauls likewise resemble them.<sup>49</sup>

John Clapham in *The historie of Great Britannie* follows Tacitus in favoring the idea that the original Britons came from the Continent, though he thinks of them specifically as French: he speaks of “the Inhabitants of this Ile, as being originally discended from the Gauls,” though he thinks that the Britons soon diverged from the Gauls in that they were taller, less polite, and displayed a distinctly un-French reluctance to eat poultry: “It was held among them, as a thing vnlawfull, to eate of a hare, a hen, or a goose.”<sup>50</sup>

The idea that the Goths had become the English was supported by claims that Goths physically resembled the original inhabitants of Britain since early Britons, too, were big-boned. In Geoffrey, the Saxons who descend on Vortigern are described as “men of huge stature,”<sup>51</sup> and Aubrey Burl notes that “In a print of 1575, two robbers spaded into a round barrow near Stonehenge, a piratical haul of a skull and crossbones alongside them but nothing of mercenary value. The sketch ‘sheweth wher great bones’ of men are found.”<sup>52</sup> Stuart Piggott also notes that in 1578 Sir Thomas Elyot declared that a giant had been found buried at Stonehenge and that “when Brutus and his companion Corineus arrived, the latter killed a ‘detestable monster, called Goëmagog, in stature twelve cubits’ at Plymouth, where a turf-cut figure or figures of the giant was being cleaned by 1486 and survived until at least 1602,”<sup>53</sup> and Rowland Wymer points out that

well after that “The giant images of Corineus and Gogmagog ... were carried in pageants ... Corineus was costumed as a Roman and the Albion giant Gogmagog as an ancient Briton.”<sup>54</sup> The Britons were thus aligned with an ethnic group consisting of Scandinavians (Colbrand, whom Guy of Warwick fought, was a giant, and in Kyd’s *Solyman and Perseda* Erastus speaks of “the bigbound Dane”),<sup>55</sup> Goths, and “big bonde Germans.”<sup>56</sup> In *Fuimus Troes*, Brennus speaks of “big-boned Britons” (1.1.19) and Caesar describes male Britons as “tall and big, / With blue-stained skins and long black dangling hair” (2.4.10–12).

The idea of a kinship between English and Germans was promulgated with particular vigor by the Anglo-Dutch Catholic polemicist Richard Verstegan in *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605), who even went so far as to propose that there had once been a land-bridge between Britain and the Continent.<sup>57</sup> Samuel Klinger notes that:

Verstegen is aware that [Tacitus] does not mention the Saxons, but in order to establish his own preference for tracing English origins back to Saxon origins and to make use at the same time of Tacitus’ general description of the Germans, he glibly affirms that the reason why Tacitus did not call the Saxons by name is that he knew them by the name of Cambrians.<sup>58</sup>

The Saxons were rendered respectable by the fact that they were seen as having introduced parliaments: Rebecca Brackmann notes that William Lambarde told a jury that the laws of England came from the Germans, “from whom both we and the Norman conquerors are descended,”<sup>59</sup> and Sir Edward Coke declared in 1597 that “At the first we were all one House and sat together, by a precedent which I have of a Parliament holden before the Conquest by *Edward* the Son of *Etheldred*. For there were Parliaments before the Conquest.” Oliver Arnold refers to this as “The Commons’ creation myth, enshrined in a sacred book,”<sup>60</sup> while Matthew Parker used the supposed purity of the Anglo-Saxon church as support for Protestantism.<sup>61</sup> While they might not have been descended from the goddess Venus, as Brutus supposedly was, the unimpeachably historical Saxons, vouched for by the unquestionably historical Tacitus and enjoying a generally good press, might well seem ancestors worth having.

For many early modern writers, what went for the Saxons also went for the Goths. Jonathan Bate declares that “To the Elizabethans, Jutes, Getes, Goths and Germans were not only interchangeable, they were also their own ancestors. Lambarde tells of how they established themselves in

Kent, a county which, as Shakespeare reminds us, was especially associated with freedom and valour"; for Bate, "The Goths who accompany Lucius ... are there to secure the Protestant succession."<sup>62</sup> As Samuel Klinger notes, there was a widespread tendency to equate the Goths with the Jutes who had settled Kent and "The term 'Gothic' came into extensive use in the seventeenth century as an epithet employed by the Parliamentary leaders to defend the prerogatives of Parliament against the pretensions of the King to absolute right to govern England," not least because of the idea that the Goths had a *dux bellorum*, a leader appointed specifically and solely for times of war, rather than a hereditary monarch; although most of the examples Klinger gives are considerably later than *Titus*, he does note Samuel Daniel's defense of Goths and also the existence of "an anthology or primer of Gothic ideas composed by the leading members of the society. Although not gathered and printed until 1658, the papers were prepared several decades before for oral presentation at the meetings of the society (Francis Tate, one of the authors, died in 1616)."<sup>63</sup> It is also notable that in *Cymbeline* Belarius, Polydore and Cadwal are noble savages not unlike the Goths in *Titus*.

It is therefore no coincidence that *Titus Andronicus* should display a number of overlaps with the two plays in which Shakespeare was later to tackle the subject of the British History, *King Lear* and *Cymbeline*. Innogen and Lavinia have in common the extent to which their lives are configured by those of their brothers; both have dynastic significance (in Geoffrey, Silvius, father of Brutus, marries a niece of Lavinia);<sup>64</sup> and both are prospective victims of rape by relatives, though Cloten's attempt on Innogen is unsuccessful. Both plays, too, have a character called Lucius, which according to Geoffrey of Monmouth was the name of the first Christian king of Britain. Equally Chiron's "Was never Scythia half so barbarous!" (1.1.134) anticipates Lear's mention of "The barbarous Scythian, / Or he that makes his generation messes / To gorge his appetite" (1.1.115–17), and Chiron's very name, which was that of a centaur, finds an echo in Lear's "Down from the waist they are Centaurs, / Though women all above" (4.6.123–24). When his grandson Lucius kills a fly, Titus asks:

How if that fly had a father and a mother?  
 How would he hang his slender gilded wings  
 And buzz lamenting doings in the air. (3.2.61–63)

Lear adopts a similarly anthropomorphic attitude when he says "die for adultery! No: / The wren goes to't, and the small gilded fly / Does lecher

in my sight" (4.6.111–13). Lear even seems to glance at the supposed Germanness of the Goths when the Gentleman remarks of Gloucester "They say Edgar, his banish'd son, is with the Earl of Kent in Germany" (4.7.90–91). *Titus* also appears to be in dialog with another play about the origins of Britain, *Lochrine*: Lochrine apostrophizes Humber "thou thy selfe at Albanactus tombe / Shalt offred be in satisfaction" as Alarbus is offered in sacrifice at the tomb of the Andronici, and Aaron's assurance that Bassianus is not degenerate echoes *Lochrine's* "Thrasimachus is not so degenerate" (sig. I2r). For Shakespeare, then, *Titus Andronicus*, *King Lear*, and *Cymbeline* are in some sense all essentially part of the same story. That story is about the origins of Britain and how they continued to impact on early modern English identities, and he chooses to tell it in a mixture of Latin words and Anglo-Saxon ones because he sees Englishness itself as a mixture of Latin and Anglo-Saxon influences.

Finally, I want to touch briefly on *Hamlet*, which while obviously not a Roman play nevertheless gestures pointedly at the genre, with its tale of Pyrrhus, Horatio's "I am more an antique Roman than a Dane" (5.2.346), and characters bearing Roman names such as Claudius and Marcellus rubbing shoulders with the ostentatiously Scandinavian Hamlet and Osric. Here, too, words of Latin origin are obsessively coupled with words forged in the linguistic maelstrom of pre-Conquest England. "So hallow'd and so gracious is that time" (1.1.169) couples the English "hallow'd" with the Latinate "gracious"; "With an auspicious and a dropping eye" (I.ii.11) pairs "drop," of Germanic origin, with "auspicious," of Latinate; "Make mad the guilty and appal the free" (2.2.558) has Old English "mad" coupled with Latinate "appal." "That have a father kill'd, a mother stain'd, / Excitements of my reason and my blood" (4.4.57–58) offers the effect twice over, for not only is "reason" of Latin origin and "blood" of Old Frisian, but also though "stained" is of Old French origin, *OED* notes that only in English can it ever carry the connotation of metaphorical rather than literal taint and disfigurement. Finally one might also note Hamlet's conviction that when it comes to his father "I shall not look upon his like again" (1.2.188). The word "like" is originally derived from the Germanic word for "corpse," which still survives in the English term "lych-gate" (the gate through which the corpse was carried into the churchyard) and in a very literal sense his father's "like" is therefore exactly what Hamlet is going to see again, and very soon too. In *Hamlet*, any attempt at adherence to the ideals of *romantitas* can only ever be mediated through a language decisively shaped and characterized by distinctively post-Roman histories and experiences.

In all these plays, then, the story may be of the past, but the language is relentlessly and pointedly of the present, and works insistently to remind us that, though Britain was shaped and marked by the fact of Roman occupation and the myth of descent from Aeneas, that forms only part of its story, for once the Romans retreated many other waves of invasion followed, each of which left their linguistic mark. The story of both England and English is one of hybridization, and it is in the Roman and Roman-related plays more than any others that Shakespeare makes us aware of that by drawing attention to the fact that the very language in which the story of national identity is told has been shaped and configured by hybridity.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Ben Jonson, *The Alchemist*, ed. Peter Bement (London: Routledge, 1990), 2.1.85.

<sup>3</sup> Alysia Kolentzis, "Shakespeare's Linguistic Creativity: A Reappraisal," *Literature Compass* 11.4 (2014), pp. 258–66, p. 262.

<sup>4</sup> Rebecca Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2012), p. 57.

<sup>5</sup> Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 59 and 29. See too Cathy Shrank, "Rhetorical constructions of a national community: The role of the King's English in mid-Tudor writing," in *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place, Rhetoric*, ed. Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 180–98, p. 185.

<sup>6</sup> Carla Mazzio, "Staging the Vernacular: Language and Nation in Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 38.2 (1998), pp. 207–32, pp. 207–8.

<sup>7</sup> Lucy Munro, "'Nemp your sexes!': Anachronistic Aesthetics in *Hengist, King of Kent* and the Jacobean 'Anglo-Saxon' Play," *Modern Philology* 111.4 (2014), pp. 734–61, p. 748.

<sup>8</sup> See Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 64 and 69.

<sup>9</sup> William Rowley, *A Shoo-maker a gentleman* (London: J. Okes for John Cowper, 1638), sig. F3v.

<sup>10</sup> Julia Briggs, "Middleton's Forgotten Tragedy *Hengist, King of Kent*," *The Review of English Studies* 41.164 (November 1990), 479–95, p. 489.

<sup>11</sup> Jasper Fisher, *Fuimus Troes*, ed. Chris Butler, <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/iemls/renplays/fuimustroes.htm>

<sup>12</sup> A. K. McIlwraith, ed., *Five Elizabethan Tragedies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938), I.1.28.

<sup>13</sup> “Reave,” 2.1.3, 2.1.51, 3.1.26; “bereft,” 2.1.172, 3.1.Chorus 12, 4.2.112, 5.1.2, 5.2.207; “reft,” 2.2.15, 4.2.268, 5.1.134, 5.2.124; “bereaved,” 4.1.4; “bereave,” 5.2.212; “bereaves,” 5.2.247.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Hughes, *Certaine deu[is]es and shewes presented to her Maiestie by the gentlemen of Grayes-Inne at her Highnesse court in Greenewich, the twenty eighth day of Februarie in the thirtieth yeare of her Maiesties most happy raigne* (London: Robert Robinson, 1587), sigs. A2r and C1r.

<sup>15</sup> See Curtis Perry, “British Empire on the Eve of the Armada: Revisiting *The Misfortunes of Arthur*,” *Studies in Philology* 108.4 (2011), 508–37, and Brian Jay Corrigan, ed., *The Misfortunes of Arthur: A Critical, Old-Spelling Edition* (New York: Garland, 1992), p. 48.

<sup>16</sup> W. S., *The lamentable tragedie of Locrine* (London: Thomas Creede, 1595), sig. Elv A; “bereft” also occurs in the play, at sig. K2r.

<sup>17</sup> See for instance Andrew King, “Dead Butchers and Fiend-like Queens: Literary and Political History in *The Misfortunes of Arthur* and *Macbeth*,” in *The Scots and Medieval Arthurian Legend*, ed. Rhiannon Purdie and Nicola Royan (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 121–34 and Barbara Heliodora Carneiro De Mendonça, “The Influence of *Gorboduc* on *King Lear*,” *Shakespeare Survey* 13 (1966), pp. 41–48. *Locrine* sounds sufficiently Shakespearean to have been occasionally attributed to him.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 3.

<sup>19</sup> Charles Merbury, *A briefe discourse of royall monarchie, as of the best common weale wherin the subiect may beholde the sacred maiestie of the princes most royall estate* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1581), sig. E1v.

<sup>20</sup> William Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, ed. G. R. Hibbard (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 4.1.29–30.

<sup>21</sup> William Shakespeare, *King Henry V*, ed. T. W. Craik (London: Routledge, 1995), 3.4.5–10.

<sup>22</sup> Scott Newstok, “Loving and Cherishing ‘True English’: Shakespeare’s Twinomials,” in *Interlinguicity, Internationality and Shakespeare*, ed. Michael Saenger (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2014), pp. 75–85, p. 75.

<sup>23</sup> William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (London: Methuen, 1982), 2.2.501–2.

<sup>24</sup> William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. J. M. Nosworthy [1955] (London: Cengage Learning, 2007), 1.1.28–31. All further quotations from the play will be taken from this edition and reference will be given in the text.

<sup>25</sup> Samantha Frenée-Hutchins, “The Cultural and Ideological Significance and Representations of Boudica during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I”

(unpublished PhD thesis, Exeter University and Université d'Orléans, 2009), p. 176.

<sup>26</sup> John Weever, *Ancient funerall monuments within the vnitied monarchie of Great Britaine* (London: Thomas Harper for Laurence Sadler, 1631), p. 608.

<sup>27</sup> William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. Emrys Jones (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), 5.2.218–21. All further quotations from the play will be taken from this edition and reference will be given in the text.

<sup>28</sup> William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. Norman Sanders (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 1.2.94–95. All further quotations from the play will be taken from this edition and reference will be given in the text.

<sup>29</sup> William Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, ed. G. R. Hibbard (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 3.3.49–51. All further quotations from the play will be taken from this edition and reference will be given in the text.

<sup>30</sup> Kolentzis, "Shakespeare's Linguistic Creativity," p. 263.

<sup>31</sup> Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 183.

<sup>32</sup> William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, ed. Kenneth Muir (London: Methuen, 1972), 1.1.74–75 and 1.1.95.

<sup>33</sup> Kolentzis, "Shakespeare's Linguistic Creativity," p. 263.

<sup>34</sup> I am aware of the arguments for attributing the first act of *Titus Andronicus*, from which the majority of my examples are drawn, to Peele, but my interest is in the language of Roman plays rather than in who actually wrote them. I use "Shakespeare" for convenience.

<sup>35</sup> Francesca T. Royster, "White-limed walls: Whiteness and Gothic extremism in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51.4 (2000), pp. 432–55, p. 433.

<sup>36</sup> Kurt Johannesson, *The Renaissance of the Goths in Sixteenth-Century Sweden: Johannes and Olaus Magnus as Politicians and Historians*, trans. James Larson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), pp. 85 and 87.

<sup>37</sup> Ronald Broude, "Roman and Goth in *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Studies* 6 (1970), pp. 27–34, p. 30.

<sup>38</sup> Johannesson, *The Renaissance of the Goths*, p. 101.

<sup>39</sup> Royster, "White-limed walls," pp. 436–37.

<sup>40</sup> Tacitus, *The Agricola and the Germania*, trans. H. Mattingly (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1948), p. 104.

<sup>41</sup> Henry Burnell, *Landgartha* (Dublin, 1641), sig. IIv.

<sup>42</sup> On the use of the word "barbarous" in the play and the attendant linguistic tensions, see Barbara Antonucci, "Romans versus Barbarians: Speaking the Language of Empire in *Titus Andronicus*," in *Identity, Otherness and Empire in Shakespeare's Rome*, ed. Maria Del Sapio Garbero (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 119–30, p. 122.

<sup>43</sup> William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate [1995] (London: Arden, 2003), 1.1.88. All further quotations from the play will be taken from this edition and reference will be given in the text.

<sup>44</sup> George North, *The description of Swedland, Gotland, and Finland ... chieflie out of Sebastian Mounster* (London: John Awdely, 1561), sig. B3v.

<sup>45</sup> North, *The description of Swedland, Gotland, and Finland*, sig. A4v.

<sup>46</sup> North, *The description of Swedland, Gotland, and Finland*, sig. A5r.

<sup>47</sup> William Slatyer, *The history of Great Britanie* (London: W. Stansby for Richard Meighen, 1621), p. 10.

<sup>48</sup> Thomas Stocker, *A tragicall historie of the troubles and ciuile warres of the lowe Countries ... Translated out of French* (London: John Kingston and Thomas Dawson for Tobie Smith, 1583), p. 41.

<sup>49</sup> Tacitus, *The Agricola and the Germania*, pp. 61–62.

<sup>50</sup> John Clapham, *The historie of Great Britannie declaring the successe of times and affaires in that iland, from the Romans first entrance, vntill the raigne of Egbert, the West-Saxon prince; who reduced the severall principalities of the Saxons and English, into a monarchie, and changed the name of Britanie into England* (London: Valentine Simmes, 1606), pp. 1 and 5.

<sup>51</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, trans. Lewis Thorpe (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), p. 156.

<sup>52</sup> Aubrey Burl, *Stonehenge* (London: Constable and Robinson, 2006), p. 57.

<sup>53</sup> Stuart Piggott, *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989), pp. 49–50.

<sup>54</sup> Rowland Wymer, “*The Tempest and the Origins of Britain*,” *Critical Survey* 11.1 (1999), pp. 3–14, p. 7.

<sup>55</sup> Thomas Kyd, *The tragedye of Solyman and Perseda Wherein is laide open, lowes constancy, fortunes inconstancy, and deaths triumphs* (London: Edward Allde for Edward White, 1592), sig. A3v.

<sup>56</sup> Philip Massinger, *Believe As You List*, ed. C. J. Sisson (Oxford: The Malone Society, 1928), p. 6.

<sup>57</sup> Piggott, *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination*, p. 57.

<sup>58</sup> Samuel Kliger, *The Goths in England: A Study in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 116.

<sup>59</sup> Brackmann, *The Elizabethan Invention of Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 205.

<sup>60</sup> Oliver Arnold, *The Third Citizen: Shakespeare's Theater and the Early Modern House of Commons* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), p. 56.

<sup>61</sup> Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism*, p. 107.

<sup>62</sup> Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, pp. 19 and 21.

<sup>63</sup> Kliger, *The Goths in England*, pp. 24–25, 1, 90, 120.

<sup>64</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, p. 54.