



# 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 3

# “A Borrowed Blood for Brute”: From Britain to England

I HAVE ALREADY MENTIONED THE importance of hybridity to ideas of English national identity. In this chapter, I start with *The Misfortunes of Arthur* and then turn to a range of plays including *Aluredus sive Alvedus*, *Fair Em*, *Hengist*, *King of Kent*, and *Edmund Ironside* to explore the concept of what *The Misfortunes of Arthur* calls “a borrowed blood for brute.” Arthur was the most famous Dark Age king of all, and the figuring of Elizabeth herself as Arthur was the culmination of the Tudor myth, bringing to mystical and metaphorical fruition the pattern that had failed in real life when Henry VII’s eldest son Arthur died in adolescence early in the century. Arthur was a figure of immense cultural resonance: Edward IV too had chosen the name for a son, albeit a bastard one, Arthur, Lord Lisle, and Paul Whitfield White observes that the Accession Day tilts were inherently Arthurian in character and that there was an annual “King Arthur’s Show” in London.<sup>1</sup> However, the figure of Arthur was beset by problems because there was neither documentary nor physical evidence of his existence. This is a play that is interested in the phenomenon of bodies returning from the dead—W. R. Streitberger points out that Gorlois needs to ascend in order to enter, as if he were rising from his grave—but is also aware that it has no body of its own to produce.<sup>2</sup> The first named English body is Aidan’s, buried at Lindisfarne in 651, followed by Cuthbert’s and Bede’s, both in Durham Cathedral. Having conveniently “discovered” the body of Arthur for Henry II, the monks of Glastonbury Abbey were deprived of it by Henry VIII, leaving no physical relic of the king except the highly dubious “Round Table” displayed at Westminster. Edward the Confessor’s chair, on which the monarchs of England were crowned and which enclosed the Stone of Scone (mentioned in *Macbeth*), was one of very few physical relics of pre-Conquest rule, whether genuine or fictitious: the statue of Bladud in Bath definitely and the Brutus Stone in Totnes probably date from later in the seventeenth century. This was perhaps why James devoted such special attention to the rebuilding of Arthuret church

near Longtown in Cumbria, which had suffered substantially at the hands of Border Reivers: its name and its traditional association with the king gave it such resonance that it was repaired by public subscription, an event sufficiently noteworthy to be mentioned in sermons delivered both at St. Alban's in 1612 and at Paul's Cross in 1613.<sup>3</sup> Even this, however, revealed a problem at the same time as it gestured toward a solution, because if there was too little physical evidence for Arthur, then when it came to place-names there was far too much: for all Dee's presentation of him as the conqueror of large parts of Europe, could it really be credible that a Dark Age king could have held court in Winchester, fought on the Scottish Border, and founded a dynasty in Wales?

To connect the Tudors (and through them the Stuarts) to Arthur also raised another problem. Arthur is a crucial link in the idea of descent from Brutus and an important authorizing figure for the Tudor claim to the throne, but in most versions of his story, Arthur left no son. There is however, a different account offered by the Inns of Court play *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*, known more commonly and hereafter as *The Misfortunes of Arthur* and written by a variety of authors including Francis Flower, Christopher Yelverton, Francis Bacon, John Lancaster, and others, but usually ascribed principally to Thomas Hughes. *The Misfortunes of Arthur* ostensibly solves the problem of Arthur's childlessness, but actually foregrounds it and its consequences, because in its version of events, Arthur's enemy Mordred is his son as well as his nephew, being the product of Arthur's incest with his sister Anne. (In Geoffrey, Mordred leaves sons, but there is no suggestion here that he does.)<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the play unsettles our belief in the accuracy of its own representation in that it contains a character called Gildas, a significant name because it was also that of a Dark Age monk and chronicler of whom little is known but who was nevertheless hugely influential in shaping later views of the period. As Leslie Alcock observes, Bede's extensive reliance on him meant that "the story told by Gildas has remained the fundamental account of the Anglo-Saxon settlement of England ... almost to the present day." Especially noteworthy is the fact that a significant part of Gildas' work is devoted to "a denunciation of kings and secular authority,"<sup>5</sup> though Arthur is exempted from this because Gildas' *Historia Brittonum* identifies Arthur as a *dux bellorum*. In *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, though, Arthur has become a king, and

Mordred wants to be one after him, even though kingship is presented as a malevolent and sinister force: Mordred declares, "let terrour teach, / What Kings may doe, what Subiects ought to beare" (sig. B4r). In such a context, all the play's Gildas can do is offer advice he knows no one will take—as he admits himself, "I know how hard a thing / It is, for mindes trainde vp in Princely Thrones, / To heare of ought against their humor's course" (sig. E1r)—and disclaim any ability to understand the course of history: "Whereto this tempest tend's, or where this storme / Will breake, who knowes?" (sig. E1r).

In *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, then, everything is questioned, as one might perhaps expect from a play produced by a group of young men bent on setting the world to rights. Arthur dies without issue (and if he did have a surviving child it would have been a bastard born of incest); therefore there can be no *translatio imperii* (and even if there were, kings are of questionable legitimacy and only interested in grabbing land and power for themselves); therefore there can also be no transmission of authentic British identity (and even if there were it would be hopelessly hybridized); and anyway the whole story might be mythical in the first place. Indeed although Hughes' play was staged before the Queen in what Curtis Perry describes as "the uneasy interval between the execution of Mary Stuart and the attack of the Spanish Armada,"<sup>6</sup> Brian Jay Corrigan suggests that what the play is really invested in is imagining what would have happened if Elizabeth *hadn't* executed Mary, Queen of Scots—that it is in effect un-history,<sup>7</sup> and thus presents itself as consciously fictitious.

This sense that what the audience sees is a constructed rather than an actual version of events is underlined by the fact that *The Misfortunes of Arthur* represents a sort of historical melange in something of the same way that *Titus Andronicus* does, and seeks to glance at as many historical moments as it possibly can. (Indeed it shares territory with *Titus*, and also with *Cymbeline*, in its use of the resonant name Lucius, supposedly that of the first Christian king of Britain.) There is precedent for this in Geoffrey, where Arthur fights the Romans, and when

The moment the Romans said good-bye and went away, apparently never to return, the enemies whom I have mentioned reappeared once more from the ships in which they had sailed off to Ireland. They brought with them other companies of Scots and Picts, with Norwegians, Danes and all the rest whom they had under command, and seized the whole of Albany up to the Wall.<sup>8</sup>

*The Misfortunes of Arthur*, though, goes well beyond Geoffrey. “The argument of the Tragedie” opens “At a banquet made by Vther Pendragon for the solemnising of his conquest against the Saxons,” which puts Arthur’s father not in the immediately post-Roman Dark Ages but somewhere more like the time of King Alfred; however, it then shoots us back in time by adding that thirty-two years after this Lucius Tiberius demands that tribute be paid to Rome because of Caesar’s conquest. We are catapulted forward again when Mordred is joined not only by Saxons, Irish, and Picts but also by Normans, and time collapses altogether when Mordred says to the Dux Pictorum:

I will in lieu of your so high deserts,  
 Geue you and yours all Brytish lands that lie  
 Betweene the floud of Humber, and the Scottes.  
 Besides as much in Kent as Horsus and  
 Hengistus had, when Vortigern was King. (sig. C2r)

The historical Hengist and Horsa here rub shoulders with the mythical Lochrine, who is evoked both by the idea of partitioning Britain and also by the mention of Humber, since that was the name of the Scythian invader whose widow Lochrine married. Arthur too mentions Hengist and Horsa—“no lesse a tumult’s raisde, / Than when Hengistus fell and Horsus fierce / With treacherous truce did ouerrunne the Realme” (p. 28)—and “Hoel King of little Brittainne,” “Aschillus King of Denmarke,” and an unnamed king of Norway also put in an appearance, though in Dekker, Ford and Rowley’s *The Welsh Ambassador* Hywel Dda (the person meant by “Hoel King of little Brittainne”) is a contemporary of Alfred’s grandson Athelstan and thus hundreds of years after Arthur. Conan (who takes his name from a character who was a contemporary of Lochrine) takes us still further forward in time when he says “Let Saxons now, let Normans, Danes, and Scottes. / Enjoye our medowes, fieldes, and pleasant plaines” (p. 39), which evokes 1066, and we should therefore be alert to the irony of his prophecy that

when perhaps our Childrens Children reade,  
 Our woefull warres displaied with skilfull penne:  
 They’ll think thee heere some sounds of future facts (p. 38)

“Facts” can mean deeds as well as pieces of factual information, but the play has made it perfectly clear that facts in the usual sense are not its stock in trade.

Conan's prophecy mentions a "skilfull penne." As noted above, Hughes was not the sole author, and he may well not have been solely responsible for the play's agenda: David Bevington points out that "Francis Bacon, one of the contributing authors of *Misfortunes*, supported the program of Burghley and Walsingham for tough action against the Catholic danger."<sup>9</sup> Moreover, Corrigan suggests that the authors were also the actors,<sup>10</sup> and if so Bacon may well have played one of the elder statesmen and thus been directly associated with the idea of propounding an agenda, though this must remain speculation. One thing which is abundantly clear, though, is that at least one of the authors was someone who had seen, and been impressed by, the work of Christopher Marlowe. Edward Paleit notes that "Hughes's play uses Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* to give the action poetic colouring and an ethical-political structure in which the Senecan motif of the sinning royal house is extended into the worse-than-civil war between Arthur and Mordred, the bastard product of the king's sinful incestuous desire—thus reprising the conflict between *gener* and *socer*, Pompey and Caesar, in the *Bellum Ciuile*";<sup>11</sup> Marlowe partly translated Lucan, though whether he had done so by the time *The Misfortunes of Arthur* was staged is less clear. Above all we see the mark of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, both parts of which were staged in the same year as *The Misfortunes of Arthur*; Gawin's exhortation to his brother to "Remember Arthurs strength, his conquestes late, / His fierie mynde, his high aspiring heart" is only the first of several references to the key Tamburlainian concept of aspiration,<sup>12</sup> as when the Chorus laments "O restlesse race of high aspyring head" (sig. C3r).<sup>13</sup> *Tamburlaine* was a figure of considerable interest for discourses of British and English national identities. On the one hand, he was a Scythian, and as such not only of the same ethnic group as Humber in *Locrine* but also associated with a rather derogatory narrative of Scottishness: John Clapham in *The historie of Great Britannie* is one of many to take the view that "These Picts and Scottish-men (as some writers report) came first out of Scythia."<sup>14</sup> On the other, Richard Harvey calls *Tamburlaine* as a material witness to the credibility of the Brutus story, with specific reference to the question of whether Brutus could really have accomplished the sea-voyage from Italy with sufficient followers to found a nation: "I would Tamerlane were euen now here, to answere your Ocean argument: hee could tell you, that his multitude of rude Scythians and shepheardes could do more Actes then all the fine gay troopes and rankes of Baiazete."<sup>15</sup> *Tamburlaine*, then, could suggest both Englishness and Scottishness, both Self and Other; he is the Scythian whom we might see in the glass, the ultimate figure of hybridity.

Moreover, I have argued elsewhere that Tamburlaine can in many ways be seen as the fulfillment of a prophecy made in the quintessential “British history” play *Gorboduc*<sup>16</sup> and that Marlowe’s play is directly remembered in both *King Lear* and *Lochrine*, both of which tell stories about kings who, like Tamburlaine, have three children from among whom they must choose one or more successors. Finally, one might imagine various responses to the figure of Tamburlaine, but when Marlowe’s two plays about him were first staged, in the year before the Armada, one thing which no one could fail to notice was that he was a military strongman, and the idea of a ruthless and invincible leader could hardly fail to be of interest in a country facing the imminent danger of invasion. In that context, the principal idea conveyed by the figure of Tamburlaine might well have been that no national identity can be secure if it cannot be defended by force.

Another aspect of the Tamburlainian identity which might have caught the attention of the dramatists of *The Misfortunes of Arthur* is its liminality. Tamburlaine himself intends to reach as far as “all the ocean by the British shore” (4.1.249), and *The Misfortunes of Arthur* has an almost obsessive interest in the idea of the shoreline, the place where England both starts and ends. The Argument announces that “Arthur at his landing was resisted on the stronds of Douer, where he put Mordred to flight. The last field was fought at Cornwell” (sig. A1r), neatly plotting the two extremities of the south coast. Later Mordred declares that “E’r Arthur land, the Sea shall blush with blood. / And all the Stronds with smoaking slaughters reéke” (sig. B1r); after the battle, Mordred’s first question is “And hath he wonne? Be Stronds & shoares possess?” (sig. B3r), as if possession of England’s coast was synonymous with possession of England. However, early modern England was acutely aware of the instability of many parts of the country’s shoreline, and the fact that the boundaries of England had moved over time. The antiquarian Reginald Bainbrigg observed of Bowness-on-Solway that “The foundations of the pict’s wall may be sene, upon the west skar at a lowe water, covered with sand, a mile or more within the sea,”<sup>17</sup> clearly showing that the line of the coast had changed, while John Wilson in *The English Martyrology* declared that St. Felix “was ordayned Bishop of an old Citty called Dunmocke (otherwise Dunwich) which at this day is more then halfe consumed by the sea.”<sup>18</sup> Julie Sanders observes that in 1631 the earl of Carlisle secured a ruling that the Wapping mudflats were to be classed as “the King’s Waste,” that is “part of the river and therefore in the pos-

session of the monarch rather than any landowner,"<sup>19</sup> and Ralf Hertel points out that Camden "speculate[s] that once there might have existed a land bridge between Kent and Calais";<sup>20</sup> Stuart Piggott notes that Richard Verstegan, whose Dutch background had given him experience of drowned land, also believed there had been a land-bridge between Britain and the Continent.<sup>21</sup> Sophia Kingshill and Jennifer Westwood point out that the sandbar Scroby Sands, opposite Great Yarmouth, emerged above the surface in 1578 and was claimed by the local inhabitants, who christened it "Yarmouth Island." Sir Edward Clere, lord of the manor, was about to go to law over its ownership when a storm in 1582 washed it away completely.<sup>22</sup> It is also suggestive that John Clapham in *The historie of Great Britannie* should speak of "the Ile of Wight, and ... that part of the firme land (which lieth over against it),"<sup>23</sup> as if the Isle of Wight were *not* firm.

The tide and the changes it brought provided potent and popular images of both death and liminality. There was a recurrent idea that birth and death were linked to the turning of the tide: Sophia Kingshill and Jennifer Westwood note that "Sixteenth-century parish registers of Heslidon (now Hesleden) sometimes noted the state of tide at the time of death, so we learn that on 11 May 1595, at six in the morning, 'being ful water', Henrie Mitford of Hoolam died, and that on 17 May of the same year, at noon, 'being lowe water',<sup>24</sup> Mrs Barbarie Metford died," which they compare with Mistress Quickly's observation in *Henry V*, II. 3, "'a parted even just between twelve and one, even at the turning o' th'tide"; one could also note *The Duchess of Malfi*, where Bosola tells the Duchess "'Tis now full tide,'tween night and day: / End your groan, and come away."<sup>25</sup> The low water mark was the appointed place of execution (and sometimes of burial) for certain sorts of criminals: Holinshed mentions pirates being condemned to be hanged at low water mark,<sup>26</sup> and Stow calls Wapping "the usuall place of Execution for the hanging of Pyrates and sea Rouers, at the lowe water marke, and there to remaine, till three Tydes had ouerflowed them."<sup>27</sup>

The shore, then, spoke of uncertainty and instability, yet *Misfortunes of Arthur* puts great symbolic weight on those shifting sands. That the shore means more than just itself is clearly suggested when Gawin says of Mordred:

like as the craggy rocke,  
Resists the streames, and flings the waltering waues  
Aloofe, so he reiects and scornes my words. (sig. C2r)

The boundaries of land and self are figured as coterminous here: *pace* Donne, Mordred is an island entire unto himself. Mordred's own words suggest this even more strongly:

What though I be a ruine to the Realme,  
 And fall my selfe therewith? No better end.  
 His last mishaps doe make a man secure.  
 Such was King Priams ende, who, when he dyed,  
 Closde and wrapt vp his Kingdome in his death.  
 A solemne pompe, and fit for Mordreds minde,  
 To be a graue and tombe to all his Realme. (sig. C3r)

Troy might have fallen when Priam did, but Mordred will go one step further: England will disappear not only *with* him but *into* him, as its unstable shores collapse in on themselves.

Almost equally disturbing is the fact that the exactly opposite principle applies in the case of Arthur. The Nuntius declares that "Arthur hath woonne: but we haue lost the field. / The field? Nay all the Realme, and Brytaines bounds" (sig. E2v). There is, it seems, a radical *discontinuity* between Arthur's body and his land whereby it is possible for the triumph of one to entail the absolute forfeiture of the other. Moreover, Arthur dies praying:

let my death and parture rest obscure.  
 No graue I neéde (O Fates) nor buriall rights,  
 Nor stately hearce, nor tombe with haughty toppe:  
 But let my Carkasse lurke: yea, let my death  
 Be ay vnknown, so that in euery Coast  
 I still be feard, and lookt for euery houre. (sig. F4r)

There was in fact a reasonably established tradition that, even if the body was now lost, Arthur had been buried at Glastonbury—Dee says so, as do Drayton,<sup>28</sup> Harvey,<sup>29</sup> and John Clapham in *The historie of Great Britannie*<sup>30</sup>—but the play obviously wishes to riddle that. Ostensibly, it does so to suggest that Arthur may return, but to the extent that Arthur embodies British national identity, it also leaves us uncertain what has happened to that, and it evokes instability in another way too, by once again equating England with its unstable coasts. On England's shifting shoreline, the turning of the tide takes away souls and bodies vanish from sight, and it is that shoreline that *The Misfortunes of Arthur* imaginatively inhabits, and to which it consigns the iconic but untraceable body of Arthur.

In doing this, the play also inevitably recalls the loss of many other bodies at the time of the Dissolution of the Monasteries. Geoffrey is always careful to note where everyone is buried: Turnus at Tours (p. 71); Brutus in London (p. 75); Lear beneath the River Soar (p. 86); Belinus on the top of Billingsgate (p. 100); Gurguit Barbruc in Caerleon (p. 101); Archgallo in Leicester (p. 104); Lud near Ludgate (p. 106); Nennius by the north gate of London (p. 110), though Merlin does prophesy that in the future the kings buried in London will be disinterred (p. 176); Cassivelaunus in York (pp. 118–19), as too is Severus (p. 127); Vortimer in a bronze pyramid in the port where the Saxons habitually land (p. 163); Aurelius Ambrosius, Uther, and Constantine at Stonehenge (pp. 202, 211, 262); Helena at the top of Mont St. Michel (p. 241); Bedevere in Bayeux and Kay near Chinon (p. 257); Cadwallo in a bronze statue (p. 280). We are also told of the early martyrs that “Even now their tombs and the places where they suffered would kindle an immense glow of divine charity in the minds of all who saw them, had they not been forgotten by their fellow-countrymen” (pp. 130–31), and it is one of many black marks against Mordred that in contrast to Arthur, who “buried his dead,” he “made no arrangements whatsoever for the burial of his dead” (p. 259). At the Dissolution, though, the bones of the important Oxford saint St. Frideswide were not only disinterred but mingled with those of Catherine, wife of Peter Martyr, and the same fate befell many other bodies.<sup>31</sup> In *The Duchess of Malfi*, Antonio says:

I do love these ancient ruins:  
 We never tread upon them but we set  
 Our foot upon some reverend history.  
 And questionless, here in this open court,  
 Which now lies naked to the injuries  
 Of stormy weather, some men lie interr'd  
 Lov'd the church so well, and gave so largely to't,  
 They thought it should have canopy'd their bones  
 Till doomsday; but all things have their end:  
 Churches and cities, which have diseases like to men,  
 Must have like death that we have. (5.3.9–18)

Among the rest, many royal bodies were lost, and with them the link to the past which they represented. Richard III's was one, and it too bore on the question of English and British national identities: Philip Schwyzer, noting that Sir George Buck's translation of the epitaph on the tomb that Henry VII erected for Richard III (which disappeared

at the dissolution of the Greyfriars monastery in 1538) says that he “possess’d the British throne” and has him speak of how “My English left me in the luckless Field,” invites us to be aware of “a curious and powerful vision of history, one prominent in the late fifteenth century and still available in the late sixteenth—a vision of Richard III as the last king of the English, an ethnic chieftain leading his ‘gentlemen of England’ on a doomed charge against the tribe fated to be both their antecedents and successors, the Britons,” in the shape of the Welsh “son of prophecy,” Henry Tudor.<sup>32</sup> Schwyzer observes that Richard owned (and inscribed his name in) copies of Guido delle Colonne’s *Historia destructionis Troiae* and Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia regum Britanniae*, both of which suggest an interest in the British History,<sup>33</sup> and Richard is certainly connected to Britishness in the 1619 Douai play *Fatum Vortigerni*, where Martin Wiggins observes a marked similarity between V.xix and the scene in which Richard is visited by ghosts before Bosworth.<sup>34</sup> One can also see signs of a rather striking “Welshification” of Richard in R. A.’s *The Valiant Welshman*, where Codigune, who is eventually crowned King of Wales, says “Ile fall my selfe, or plucke this Welshman down” (sig. C1r); this closely echoes Richard of Gloucester in *Henry VI, Part 3*, and there is indeed a character called Gloster who says “Onely Kings wils are Lawes for other men” (sig. E1r), a philosophy of tyranny which would be perfectly at home in the mouth of his Shakespearean counterpart.

Other iconic English bodies had also disappeared in ways which are remembered in early modern English plays. William Rowley’s *A Shoemaker a gentleman*, published in 1638 but apparently written some twenty years previously,<sup>35</sup> is like *The Misfortunes of Arthur* a play which brings in as much history as possible—the characters include “Alured, King of Brittain,” i.e. Alfred, his nameless queen and, with wild disregard for fact, their two sons Eldred and Offa, St. Winifred, the kings of the Goths and Vandals, Bassianus, and the emperors Maximinus and Dioclesian—and which may also glance at *The Misfortunes of Arthur* when the shoemaker calls his wife “dame Guiniver” (sig. H1r). It too shrouds the burial of its king in mystery when Alured dies in the first scene and the queen says:

Here will I stay, untill my eyes like briny Pyoners  
With their continuall Cadence, have digg’d up  
A woefull Sepulcher, for these sweet Corps. (sig. B2r)

The queen, it seems, will bury him in the ground where he lies, and though this is obviously fanciful, we hear nothing of any more practical arrange-

ments. (In fact John Leland noted that Alfred and Edward the Elder were both buried at Hyde and that the abbey no longer existed.)<sup>36</sup> In *Ancient funerall monuments*, John Weever records other losses of royal bodies: of King Stephen's burial in Faversham Abbey in 1154, for instance, he says, "His body rested here in quietnesse vntill the dissolution, when for the gaine of the lead wherein it was encoffined, it was taken vp and throwne into the next water. So vncertaine is man, yea greatest Princes, of any rest in this world, euen after buriall," while another abbey:

hath beene honoured with the sepulture of foure Queenes, foure Dutchesses, foure Countesses, one Duke, two Earles, eight Barons, and some thirty fīue Knights; whose names are set downe by Stow in his Suruay of this honourable Citie; and in all, from the first foundation vnto the dissolution, sixe hundred sixtie and three persons of Qualitie were here interred. In the Quire were nine Tombes of Alabaster and Marble, inuironed with barres or strikes of iron: one Tombe in the body of the Church coped also with iron, and seauenscore graue-stones of Marble in diuers places; all which were pulled downe, taken away, and sold for fiftie pounds or thereabouts, by Sir Martin Bowes Maior of London, An. 1545. The rest of the Monuments are now wholly defaced, not any one remaining at this day, saue such which are of later times.

Even when tombs survived, they might be deceptive; Weever notes that at Hadley

Here in this Church, as the Inhabitants say, Gurmond, or Gurthrun, a Danish King lieth interred: and this their assertion is confirmed by the most of our ancient Historians; yet the Tombe which they shew for his funerall Monument beares not that face of Antiquitie, as to be of seuen hundred yeares and more continuance.

In such a context, it came as no surprise that when Glastonbury was dissolved, Arthur's body was apparently lost.<sup>37</sup> Indeed burial in the play is seen as inherently uncertain, which creates a sense of hovering between life and death neatly captured when Gueneuora soliloquizes:

Not death, nor life alone can giue a full  
 Reuenge: ioyne both in one. Die: and yet liue.  
 Where paine may not be oft, let it be long.  
 Seēke out some lingring death, whereby, thy corse  
 May neither touch the dead, nor ioy the quicke. (sig. A4r)

Gueneuora's vision of her future has her neither dead nor alive, but poised liminally and apparently indefinitely between the two states in a way which undermines the whole concept of burial.

Perhaps, though, the loss and disappearance of Arthur might not be a wholly bad thing. The Chorus declares that

In Rome the gaping gulfe would not decrease,  
 Till Curtius corse had closde her yawning awes.  
 In Theb's the Rotte and Murreine would not cease,  
 Till Laius broode had paide for breach of lawes:  
 In Brytain warres and discord will not stent:  
 Till Vther's line and offspring quite be spent. (sig. B2r)

This is a richly suggestive passage. The idea that the peace and prosperity of Britain depend not on the reappearance of Arthur but on the total extinction of his bloodline would obviously have been startling enough, but as Perry notes, "The phrase 'gaping gulfe' would likely also have reminded the play's audience of John Stubbs' ill-fated 1579 tract *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf Where into England is Likely to be Swallowed by another French Marriage*,"<sup>38</sup> that mooted between Queen Elizabeth and the Roman Catholic Duke of Alençon. Two kinds of foreignness are raised here, Roman as in Roman Catholic and Frenchness, and perhaps then we should be alert to a possible pun when Arthur calls Mordred's dead body

A fearefull vision of my former guilte:  
 A dreadfull horror of a future doome:  
 A present gaule of minde. (sig. F3r)

Although the sense is clearly "gall," it is hard not to hear an aural pun on "Gaul" which could muddy the waters of identity yet further, as in *King Lear* where Mumford puns on "Gawles" and "as bitter as Gall," and to see the play as potentially incriminating not only Mary Queen of Scots but also Elizabeth, through her desire for a French husband.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, Rome figures again in the Nuntius' greeting to England:

Haile natiue soyle, these nine yeares space vnseéne:  
 To theé hath long renommed Rome at last  
 Held vp her hands, bereaft of former pompe. (sig. B2v)

Underlying this passage is the paradox that Rome may be Catholic and hence alien but is also a point of origin, as when a character is named "Dux Pictorum," reminding the reader both of the continuing importance of

Latin in the sixteenth century and of the fact that the play is set in an age in which the Romans were a recent memory. We should therefore hear an ominous note in the Chorus' apparently innocuous remark that "rare the roome, which time doth not controwle" (sig. C3r): here too we should hear a pun, for "Room" was the standard contemporary pronunciation of Rome, and the aural echo reminds us that the original Rome fell and that anything equivalent to a successor state to Rome might also be expected to do likewise.

In *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, we do indeed see Britain fall apart, for in order to prosecute his claim to it, Mordred has to dismember it. First he promises to give Gilla

all Brytish lands that lie  
 Betweene the flood of Humber, and the Scottes.  
 Besides as much in Kent as Horsus and  
 Hengistus had, when Vortigern was King. (sig. C2r)

Next he promises the crown of Scotland to the Dux Pictorum (sig. C2r). It is thus against a backdrop of fragmentation, rearrangement and uncertain identities that the play conducts its analysis of the conflicted and contested nature of the Englishness which will eventually replace moribund Britishness. The Argument of the second Act declares that "In the fourth Scene the King of Ireland & other forrein Pri[nces] assure Mordred of their assistan[c]e against Arthur" (sig. B2r), so that when Mordred does eventually rebel he does so, according to Arthur, "With sluggish Saxons crewe, and Irish kernes, / And Scottish aide, and false redshanked Picts" (sig. D2v). Arthur's force is if anything even more international: the Nuntius declares that

On Mordreds side were sixtie thousande men,  
 Some borowed powres, some Brytans bred at home.  
 The Saxons, Irish, Normans, Pictes, and Scottes  
 Were first in place, the Brytanes followed last.  
 On Arthurs side there were as manie more.  
 Islandians, Gothes, Noruegians, Albanes, Danes,  
 Were forraine aides, which Arthur brought from Fraunce. (sig. E3r)

For the Nuntius, the day of battle is the day "whenceforth men might inquire / What Brytaine was" (sig. E3r), and the ethnic diversity of these troops ensures that it will be by no means clear what the answer might be. The uncertainty is compounded by the fact that England's neighbor and

enemy Ireland is anachronistically made to possess a perfectly secure and established identity in the play when “the Argument and manner of the second dumbe shewe” declares that “there came a man bareheaded, with blacke long shagged haire downe to his shoulders, apparaild with an Irish Iacket and shirt, hauing an Irish dagger by his side and a dart in his hand” (sig. B2v). Though Clapham declares in *The historie of Great Britannie* that in the time of Agricola “The Nature and Fashions of the Irish, did not then much differ from the British,”<sup>40</sup> *The Misfortunes of Arthur* prefers to draw on an established visual lexicon of Irishness which is assumed to be transhistorically stable, in a way that Englishness and Britishness are not. Arthur is gone without trace or heirs, and if whatever ethnic group he must be taken to be ruling over survives at all, it does so only in specific and isolated locations:

Let Saxons now, let Normans, Danes, and Scottes.  
 Enioye our medowes, fieldes, and pleasant plaines:  
 Come, let vs flye to Mountaines, Cliffes and Rockes,  
 A Nation hurt, and ne’r in case to heale. (sig. E4v)

“Mountaines, Cliffes and Rockes” is by no means a bad description of what we would now call the Celtic fringe, and the fact that we still recognize its truth confirms our sense that the play is presenting the marginalization of the indigenous inhabitants as a done deal. Even more damaging to any sense of a securely established national identity is the Nuntius’ casual declaration that after the battle “There lay the hope and braunch of Brute supprest” (sig. E4r). The play may attempt to row back from this in Gorlois’ belated reference to Elizabeth as “That pieresse braunch of Brute: that sweete remaine / Of Priam’s state” (sig. E4v), but the Nuntius’ words are unequivocal and the damage has been done.<sup>41</sup> The heirs of Rome and Troy have gone, and have left no addresses.

In their place, in Gildas’ words:

Hencefoorth the Kernes may safely tread their bogges:  
 The Scots may now their inrodes olde renewe,  
 The Saxon well may vow their former claimes,  
 And Danes without their danger driue vs out. (sig. E4v)

The previously demonized Danes, Saxons and Normans must now count as the English, as is clearly seen when the Chorus laments:

Would Gods these warres had drawne no other blood,  
 Then such as sproong from breasts of forreine foes:

So that the fountaine, fedde with chaungelesse course,  
 Had found no neerer vents for dearer iuyce.  
 Or if the Fates so thirst for Brytish blood,  
 And long so deeply for our last decaie:  
 O that the rest were sparde and safe reseru'd,  
 Both Saxons, Danes, and Normans most of all.  
 Heereof when ciuill warres haue worne vs out,  
 Must Brytaine stand, a borrowed blood for Brute. (sig. E4v)

That hugely evocative phrase "a borrowed blood for Brute" forces a recognition of what even diehard defenders of Brutus covertly conceded when they acknowledged that the line of Lochrine had died out and had to be replenished by that of Camber: we are no pureblood Trojans, descendants of Aeneas and through him of the goddess Venus, but mongrels, a fundamentally hybridized nation which has survived only through the genetic and cultural contribution of foreigners. Having initially invited us to root for Britons against foreigners, *The Misfortunes of Arthur* shows us that the distinction is in fact facile and unsustainable; we should rather wish that "the rest were sparde and safe reseru'd, / Both Saxons, Danes, and Normans most of all," because it is they who will need to provide that borrowed blood of which the stock of Brutus so urgently needs a transfusion.

The effects of that borrowing of blood are explored in a variety of plays, and many of them make specific and symbolic use of the Brutus story to present hybridity and miscegenation as essential to national survival. Ideas of recurrence and resurfacing are also important as history is seen to repeat and reproduce itself in ways which suggest an essential continuity. In *Bonduca*, Tracey Miller-Tomlinson suggests, the name Hengo, which Fletcher seems to have invented for the nephew of the Icenian queen Bonduca, invites us to connect him with the Anglo-Saxon Hengist and to see the Roman conquest not as the death-knell of British identity but as a stage in its development:<sup>42</sup> Hengo, who is apparently the last male heir of the Iceni and by implication of Brutus, may die, but he will in some sense be symbolically resurrected in Hengist. In one of the less reputable bastard offspring of *King Lear*, the anonymous 1606 play *No-body and Some-body* (though Anthony Archdeacon suggests Heywood as a possible author),<sup>43</sup> the entire plot is structured around recurrence in that the play's official business is, its subtitle announces, to tell the story of "Elydure, who was fortunately three seurall times crowned King of England," his reign being interspersed first with that of his elder brother and secondly with the brief and dis-

astrous attempt of his two younger brothers to rule together (though the play in fact spends its energies less on this ostensible story than on the heavily labored wordplay to be had from the existence of two characters called Nobody and Somebody and the resultant opportunities for gags about “Nobody did this”).<sup>44</sup> Even in *Gorboduc*, in which Eubulus bleakly announces “Lo, here the end of Brutus’ royal line,” he perhaps qualifies that slightly when he says five lines later “The heir, to whom the sceptre longs, unknown,” which may imply that the bloodline can no longer be securely identified rather than that it has become extinct.<sup>45</sup> In *A Shoo-maker, a Gentleman* “Crispianus” (actually Eldred in disguise) prophesies that the son of his brother Offa will “through this land plant a whole race of Kings” (sig. K2v). Identities are hopelessly riddled in this play in which no one character can be sensibly or plausibly connected to another: not only is it impossible to identify an Eldred and an Offa who might be sons of a king called Alured (presumably Alfred), let alone the putative children of one of those sons, but Eldred and Offa have also become fused with their disguises to such an extent that Crispin and Crispianus, their respective aliases, come to be treated as though they were real and independent characters: thus we are told that “it is well knowne to you Cordwiners that every yeare you doe celebrate the Feast of Crispine, & Crispianus” (sigs. A3r–v), even though Crispin and Crispianus are not real people at all but fictitious personae assumed by Eldred and Offa. The situation becomes even less clear when at the end of the play Maximinus says of Eldred and Offa “then let these twains, / Being English borne, be Brittain Kings againe” and appoints one to rule in the north and one in the south (sig. L1v), at which point Crispin and Crispianus presumably cease to have even a notional existence. Even if no individual can be securely identified, though, the overwhelming sense is that Britishness itself goes on, thanks at least in part to a marriage between a British prince and a Roman princess.

Other plays too showcase the potential advantages of hybridity. Tracey Miller-Tomlinson, noting that in Fletcher’s *Bonduca* (ca. 1613) “Phallic allusions involving Roman swords and Briton scabbards abound in the play,” argues that “the hybrid identities that result from the breakdown of binaries in *Bonduca* can ... be read as salutary, not only giving rise to the very idea of the nation in the play but also necessary to its vision of national unity and preservation.”<sup>46</sup> The anonymous author of *The Valiant Welshman* (ca. 1615) goes even further when he has the Brigantian Venusius express to the Welsh Caradoc his regret

that thus long I haue spent  
 My honour and my time, in ayding Rome,  
 And thus far haue digrest from Natures lawes,  
 To ayde a forrayne Nation 'gainst mine owne. (sig. H2v)

Historically, there were of course differences between the Silures and Ordovices, the tribes over whom Caradoc rules, and the Brigantes, but here the author chooses to lose sight of those and to privilege instead a monolithic distinction between them and us which enfolds all Britons within an umbrella classification. A similar confidence in the potential for success of an essentially hybrid identity can be seen in Anthony Brewer's *The Love-sick King*, where the city walls of Newcastle, here imagined to have been built during the Danelaw rather than in 1265, the year in which they were actually begun, become emblematic of an indomitable Englishness which has survived historical vicissitudes and which leads Canute's sister Egina to say "If all the English perish, then must I, for I (now know) in England here was bred, although descended of the Danish blood, King my Father, thirty years governed the one half of this famous Kingdom, where I, that time was born an English Princess" (sigs. B2r–B3v). Egina might be of Danish origin, but she identifies as English.

In Henry Burnell's 1641 *Landgartha*, too, the idea of recurrence attaches itself to the Danes: Phoebus says that for "Troy's Brutaines":

a certaine people, and call'd Danes  
 (Cymbrians by some) will prove their worst of banes.  
 But shall be beaten backe; not without paine.  
 At length (in processe of much time) shall raigne  
 In this faire Ile, a Prince (one way descended  
 Of Troian race: I'th'other side extended  
 Vp by the Royall blood of Danes).<sup>47</sup>

The idea of recurrence is present too, and again in association with Danes, in William Drury's 1619 play *Aluredus, sive Alvredus*. This was originally written in Latin and first acted at Douai in 1621, where, as its most recent editor notes, its appeal "lay in the fact that Alfred's situation could be pressed into service to stand for the predicament of Drury's contemporary Catholics, likewise dislodged from their proper places by an invasion of what they regarded as barbaric outsiders"; it was subsequently translated into English by Richard Knightley in 1659 because, to quote its most recent editor again:

Knightley realized that, without a word being changed, Drury's play had the capacity to acquire an entirely different meaning for a different audience in much altered historical circumstances. Alfred now stood for the exiled Charles II, the loyal followers who share his exile and work for his restoration for faithful royalists, the Danes for "barbaric" Puritans.<sup>48</sup>

Knightley's English version, which is the one I shall be quoting from, is thus in itself an example of recurrence of a sort, testifying to the flexibility and versatility of a single historical figure. In it, the distinction between the two nations falls apart when Humfrey says to someone whom he takes for a Dane "Is't not to insensible brutes I send / My complaints" (1.13.532–33); this activates the Brutus/brute pun but connects it to Danes rather than Britons, although the supposed Dane is in fact Humfrey's fellow-Saxon Athelrede in disguise. Both Alfred and Gothurnus (Guthrum) embody the idea of coming back, Gothurnus saying "England, I rise from thy ashes / As a Phoenix from his reviving flame" (1.4.165–66) and being presented by Alfred himself as figuring the future when Alfred appoints him king of the Anglians and tells him

Nor shall you want  
A kingdome, for where great Britaine confronts  
The rising sun, you shall rule its people. (5.16.2850–52)

The rising sun was regularly employed to figure the notion of succession to the crown, and clearly points at the idea of futurity. Futurity is also implicit when a messenger says that some of the Danes "have lost both their lives and all their artillery" (3.13.1507), clearly imagining them in terms more appropriate to seventeenth-century troops than to ninth-century ones, and again when Cuthbert says Alfred now possesses "great Britaine's monarchy" (Epilogue, 2861), since the term Great Britain would not come into circulation until the reign of James VI and I.

The idea that today's Dane is tomorrow's Englishman is also suggested when Humfrey, Athelrede and Alfred all at various points disguise themselves as Danes and when Strumbo mistakes Alfred the Great and St. Cuthbert for "two Danish suckers of my English aile" (2.6.846). The English and the Danes are effectively interchangeable, and Strumbo's mistake is by no means ridiculous because the Danes and the English do use the same language: St. Cuthbert refers to England as "A prey to Mars" (Prologue, 11) and Gothurnus also mentions Mars (1.4.134), so that saint and heathen are improbably bonded by classical mythology. Recurrence

is in fact inherent in the structure of *Aluredus, sive Alvredus*, for Drury's play collapses English history in the same way as *Titus Andronicus* does Roman. Strumbo, who shares a name with a character in *Locrine*, says of St. Cuthbert "this man by his discovery hath already disembodied me, and the other will presently make me nobody" (2.6.873–75); this looks like an allusion to *No-body and Some-body*. Strumbo also cannot draw his sword from the scabbard (5.10), which looks like an allusion to King Arthur; he says "I am born in a cuntry where trees make war upon men" (2.7.946–47), which looks like an allusion to *Macbeth*; and finally he wishes "O that I were a hare!" (2.6.883), which looks like an allusion to *Bonduca*, since the sacrifice in III.i was almost certainly of a hare, the animal traditionally offered to to the British goddess Andraste; *Bonduca* is also suggested when Alfred fears that the Danes will rape his daughters (4.11.1649–53), since that is what the Romans do to Bonduca's daughters. Dana F. Sutton's introduction comments that "the theme of Alfred's moral reform lacks plausibility and does not sit well with the other elements of the play"; that is arguably because he is sharing a persona with Lear at the time, in that Neothus' accusation is in effect that he should have taken better care of poverty and want (4.11.1671–81), and Lear is echoed again later when Bragadocia says he is "a king, ev'ry inch of me" and Pimpo observes aside "A cockscombe would fit his head excellently well" (3.5.1567–68). Finally Rollo suggests that Gothurnus might marry Edelvitha (4.17.2094–95), evoking the story of Emma, wife of Canute, whose story was told in *Emma Angliae regina ac Mater Hardicanuti Regis*, also performed at Douai. Altogether, then, *Aluredus, sive Alvredus* presents the story it tells as one in which past and present are collapsed into each other, and in which England is always already, and simultaneously, both what it was and what it will be.

Hardicanute, one of those gestured at in *Aluredus, sive Alvredus*, is a central figure in another play which explored the anglicization of the Danes. In the anonymous *Edmund Ironside*, the English are initially securely separate from the Danish. Facing mutilation by the Danes, First Pledge exhorts Second Pledge, "so let us perish like to gentlemen / like to ourselves and like to Englishmen" (2.3.663–64), and then appeals to heaven to "Pour thy vengeance on this bloody Dane" (2.3.709). The English are also equally securely associated with Troy. Edmund tells his followers, "Go in, brave lords, your sight doth me more joy / Than *Agamemnon* when he conquered Troy" (1.1.381–82); Canute, conversely, exhorts his, "Go to yon city which we mean to sack / new Troy, the state of

Edmund Ironside" (3.2.863–64). However, Stitch figures the Englishness of the Pledges as prosthetic and thus removable—"How they'll look when their noses be off! Everyone will take them for Frenchmen" (2.3.688–89). Once their noses have indeed been cut off, the second of them assures Canute that "We go but to thy cost, proud Danish Canute / throughout this isle thy tyranny to bruit" (2.3.726–27); "bruit" obviously means "noise" as in the sense of "to noise abroad," but also offers a verbal pun on "Brut." The followers of Canute, though, also have access to this language: Southampton, father of Canute's queen Egina, declares unexpectedly "I do remember hardy *Hannibal* / did use these words at won *Tarentum*'s loss ..." (4.4.1553–54), as if he could personally remember Roman history in the way that characters in *The Valiant Welshman* seem able to do. Even more provocatively, Canute himself delivers a little lecture on how

The ground I stand on, Edmund, is mine own  
 fallen to me not successively indeed  
 but by forfeiture as copyhold  
 rent-run and wanting reparations  
 falls to the lord. (5.2.1789–93)

For Daniel it would have been better for Edmund Ironside "to haue died at the battaile of Essendon with England" because his very identity was fatally undermined by it and "Knut became Edmond, and Edmond, Knute";<sup>49</sup> here, we see that happen as Canute claims to be the true owner of Edmund's England.

Most notably, though, the idea of recurrence attaches to the Normans, since the Norman Conquest, the most remarkable foreign invasion in English history, might find itself on occasion presented as the return of the Danes (indeed one of the Danes in *Aluredus* is called Rollo, which was the name of William the Conqueror's father), or, even more surprisingly, as the return of the Saxons and even of the Trojans. In John Clapham's *The historie of Great Britannie* Edward the Confessor, Harold Godwinson, and William the Conqueror are all listed under the rubric "The succession of the Princes of Denmarke in the Kingdome of England,"<sup>50</sup> and in *A briefe discoure of royall monarchie*, Charles Merbury develops a contrast between Vortigern, "who for to mainteine his Tyrannie called in the Saxons, and they to stablish their new power: oppressed the Brittons: dryuing them into a corner of the llande, brenning, and spoiling their countrey" and "William the Conquerour (a Prince of more Iustice)" who allegedly had the foresight to recognize that

today's Norman is tomorrow's Englishman and "forbad (at his first arri-uall here) his souldiers to hurte, or spoile any Englishman: saying that it should be a great sinne, and follie for him to spoile that people: which ere many dayes after were like to be his subiectes" (sig. B1v). Curtis Perry quotes Holinshed and Verstegan as going still further by declaring that Danes and Normans were essentially the same, and Sir John Hayward in *The Lives of the III Normans, Kings of England* (1613) as arguing that the Norman invasion "worketh no essentiall change. The State still remained the same, the solid bodie of the State remained still *English*: the coming in of many *Normans*, was but as Rivers falling into the Ocean; which change not the Ocean, but are confounded with the waters thereof."<sup>51</sup> In *Edmund Ironside*, whose subtitle is "A true Chronicle History called *War hath made all friends*," Alfred and his brother the future Edward the Confessor are sent for safety to Normandy (4.2.1436–39), from where Edward will of course return to reign.

The idea that the Normans are not really as foreign as all that is found most clearly in *A pleasant comodie, of faire Em the Millers daughter of Manchester with the loue of William the Conqueror*, sometimes listed as by Robert Wilson but not really to be securely attached to any author. Andrew Hadfield argues that in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* Spenser presents William the Conqueror's imposition of Common Law on the English as "a harsh act performed for their own good,"<sup>52</sup> and *Fair Em* would certainly seem to support this. The play opens with Sir Thomas Goddard, now reduced to working as a miller, lamenting that the Norman invasion has "made a number such as we subiect / Their gentle neckes vnto their stubborne yoke" because the newcomers "seek to roote all Britaines Gentry / From bearing countenance against their tyrannie."<sup>53</sup> However, by the end of the play William not only gladly reinstates him, but has himself inexplicably metamorphosed from a Norman into a Saxon as Demarch refers to him as "the Saxon Duke" (sig. D4r) and Zweno calls him "William Duke of Saxon"; William even introduces himself as "William of Saxonie" (sig. E3v), and in becoming a disguised ruler William is also echoing stories about Richard I and Robin Hood. He even appropriates the story of Brutus when he caps Mariana's comparison of herself to Penelope (sig. C4r) by saying "Nor may I make my loue the seege of Troye / That am a straunger in this Countrie" (sig. C4v). To all intents and purposes, he seems in fact as much the heir of Brutus as Arthur or Lochrine.

In the anonymous *Northerne poems congratulating the Kings majesties entrance to the crowne*, we hear that

This name may well presage th'old Britans good,  
 That Denmarke should in times past Cimbria hight,  
 One letter change, set a where i once stooede,  
 And Wales this name will clayme of ancient right,  
 Nay both those names do on that Countrey light.  
 Our Noble Queene in Cimbria land was borne,  
 That she to Cambria might bring forth a sonne.<sup>54</sup>

Carolyn Sale, noting that Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* is identified as “Cimmerian,” declares:

“Cimmerian” is not simply a synonym for “Moor” ... For Homer, the Cimmerians inhabited a land of darkness at the far edge of the world, possibly Britain ... Plutarch equates them with the Cimbres, and Harrison writes that the Cymbres or Cymbri inhabited the British isles at the time of the Roman invasion, with the Welsh being “the right Cymbri.”<sup>55</sup>

The poem seems to be making the same set of assumptions; headily eliding the Danes with the Welsh by means of the Scots, it effectively suggests that everyone has really been British all along, even when they have temporarily appeared to be something else. Paul Hill, noting that “The last English king, Harold Godwinson, was half-Danish” and that “the last man to fall around the English standard at Hastings probably spoke Danish as well as he spoke English,” observes that by the ninth century “The Danish armies had succeeded in eliminating all but one of the early English dynasties,” the exception being Wessex; “William of Malmesbury dryly noted that Northumbria had already grown into one nation with the Danes.”<sup>56</sup> Collectively, these plays tell the story of that integration and of how the exhausted stock of Brutus was revived by new blood from overseas.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Paul Whitfield White, "The Admiral's Lost Arthurian Plays," in *Lost Plays in Shakespeare's England*, ed. David McInnis and Matthew Steggle (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014), pp. 148–62, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Streitberger, *The Masters of the Revels and Elizabeth I's Court Theatre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 183.

<sup>3</sup> John Boys, *An exposition of the last psalme delivered in a sermon perached at Pauls Crosse the fifth of Nouember, 1613* (London: Felix Kyngston for William Apsley, 1613), sig. B4r; William Westerman, *Jacobs well: or, a sermon preached before the Kings most excellent Majestie at Saint Albans, in his summer progresse 1612* (London: John Beale for Matthew Lawe, 1613), p. 69.

<sup>4</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, trans. Lewis Thorpe (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), p. 262.

<sup>5</sup> Leslie Alcock, *Arthur's Britain: History and Archaeology AD 367–634* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), pp. 22 and 24.

<sup>6</sup> Curtis Perry, "British Empire on the Eve of the Armada: Revisiting *The Misfortunes of Arthur*," *Studies in Philology* 108.4 (2011), 508–37, p. 509.

<sup>7</sup> Brian Jay Corrigan, ed., *The Misfortunes of Arthur: A Critical, Old-Spelling Edition* (New York: Garland, 1992), p. 48.

<sup>8</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, pp. 251 and 147.

<sup>9</sup> David Bevington, *Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 155.

<sup>10</sup> Corrigan, ed., *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, p. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Edward Paleit, *War, Liberty, and Caesar: Responses to Lucan's Bellum Ciuile, ca. 1580–1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 137.

<sup>12</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), sig. C1r.

<sup>13</sup> George M. Logan points out that there is also a very considerable debt to Lucan's *Pharsalia*, a text which Marlowe partially translated ("Hughes's Use of Lucan in the *Misfortunes of Arthur*," *The Review of English Studies* 20 [February, 1969], 22–32).

<sup>14</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), p. 142.

<sup>15</sup> Richard Harvey, *Philadelphus, or a defence of Brutes* (London: John Wolfe, 1593), sig. B1r.

<sup>16</sup> See Lisa Hopkins, *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561–1633* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 24–28.

<sup>17</sup> Alan Michael Whitworth, *Hadrian's Wall: Some Aspects of its Post-Roman Influence on the Landscape* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2000), p. 46.

<sup>18</sup> John Wilson, *The English Martyrology ...* (St. Omer: English College Press, 1608), p. 64.

<sup>19</sup> Julie Sanders, *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620–1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 23–24.

<sup>20</sup> Ralf Hertel, *Staging England in the Elizabethan History Play: Performing National Identity* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), p. 37. He cites *Britannia*, trans. and enlarged by Richard Gough (1606: Hildesheim: Olms, 1974), I: li.

<sup>21</sup> Stuart Piggott, *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989), pp. 57–58.

<sup>22</sup> Sophia Kingshill and Jennifer Westwood, *The Fabled Coast: Legends and Traditions from around the Shores of Britain and Ireland* (London: Random House, 2012), p. 140.

<sup>23</sup> Clapham, *The historie of Great Britannie*, p. 187.

<sup>24</sup> Kingshill and Westwood, *The Fabled Coast*, p. 163.

<sup>25</sup> John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*, ed. John Russell Brown [1964] (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976), IV.ii.194–95.

<sup>26</sup> Raphael Holinshed, *The Third volume of Chronicles* (London: Henry Denham, 1586), p. 811.

<sup>27</sup> John Stow, *A suruay of London Contayning the originall, antiquity, increase, moderne estate, and description of that Citie, written in the yeare 1598* (London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1598), p. 347.

<sup>28</sup> Drayton, *Poly-Olbion*, p. 93.

<sup>29</sup> Harvey, *Philadelphus*, sig. N2v.

<sup>30</sup> Clapham, *The historie of Great Britannie*, p. 200.

<sup>31</sup> Carole Levin, “*The Heart and Stomach of a King*”: *Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), pp. 20–21.

<sup>32</sup> Philip Schwyzer, “A Scum of Britons?: *Richard III* and the Celtic Reconquest,” in *Celtic Shakespeare: The Bard and the Borderers*, ed. Willy Maley and Rory Loughnane (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 25–34, pp. 27 and 34.

<sup>33</sup> Philip Schwyzer, *Shakespeare and the Remains of Richard III* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 107.

<sup>34</sup> Thomas Compton Carleton S.J., *Fatum Vortigerni*, ed. Dana F. Sutton, 2007, <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/vort/intro.html>

<sup>35</sup> The printer’s preface refers to it as having been written “some twenty yeares agoe” (William Rowley, *A Shoo-maker a gentleman* [London: J. Okes for John Cowper, 1638], sig. A4r).

<sup>36</sup> John Chandler, *John Leland’s Itinerary: Travels in Tudor England* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1993), p. 201.

<sup>37</sup> John Weever, *Ancient funerall monuments within the vnitied monarchie of Great Britaine* (London: Thomas Harper for Laurence Sadler, 1631), pp. 278, 388 and 748–49.

<sup>38</sup> Perry, "British Empire on the Eve of the Armada," p. 516, n. 25.

<sup>39</sup> *The true Chronicle Historie of King Leir and his three daughters* (London: Simon Stafford for John Wright, 1605), sig. I1v.

<sup>40</sup> Clapham, *The historie of Great Britannie*, p. 76.

<sup>41</sup> On the contradiction implicit in hailing Elizabeth as a "braunch of Brute" see also Perry, "British Empire on the Eve of the Armada," p. 511.

<sup>42</sup> Tracey Miller-Tomlinson, "Hybrid Gender, Hybrid Nation: Race, Sexuality, and the Making of National Identity in Fletcher's *Bonduca*," *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 46 (2007), pp. 51–66, p. 52. See also Jodi Mikalachi, "The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46.3 (1995), pp. 301–22, p. 314.

<sup>43</sup> Anthony Archdeacon, "The publication of *No-body and Some-body*: Humanism, history and economics in the early Jacobean public theatre," *Early Modern Literary Studies*, <https://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/16-1/archnobo.htm>

<sup>44</sup> Anonymous, *No-body and Some-body. With the true Chronicle Historie of Elydure, who was fortunately three seuerall times crowned King of England* (London: John Trundle, 1606).

<sup>45</sup> Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, *Gorboduc*, in *Five Elizabethan Tragedies*, ed. A. K. McIlwraith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938), 5.1.180 and 5.1.185.

<sup>46</sup> Miller-Tomlinson, "Hybrid Gender, Hybrid Nation," pp. 54–55.

<sup>47</sup> Henry Burnell, *Landgartha* (Dublin, 1641), sigs. F2r–v.

<sup>48</sup> William Drury, *Aluredus, sive Alvredus* (1619), trans. Robert Knightley (as *Alfrede, or Right Reinthron'd*, 1659), ed. Dana F. Sutton for the Philological Museum, 2014, <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/aluredus/>, Introduction.

<sup>49</sup> Samuel Daniel, *The first part of the historie of England* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612), p. 52.

<sup>50</sup> Clapham, *The historie of Great Britannie*, p. 292.

<sup>51</sup> Curtis Perry, "'For They Are Englishmen': National Identities and the Early Modern Drama of Medieval Conquest," in *Shakespeare and the Middle Ages*, ed. Curtis Perry and John Watkins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 172–95, pp. 183 and 180.

<sup>52</sup> Andrew Hadfield, "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory," *The Modern Language Review* 89.1 (1994), pp. 1–18, p. 12.

<sup>53</sup> Robert Wilson (?), *A pleasant comedie, of faire Em the Millers daughter of Manchester with the loue of William the Conqueror* (London: T. N. for J. W., 1591), sigs. A3r and A3v.

<sup>54</sup> Anonymous, *Northerne poems congratulating the Kings majesties entrance to the crowne* (London: J. Windet for E. Weaver, 1604), sig. B3v. As Stuart Piggott notes, the term Cimbria was a particularly flexible one because it signaled descent from Noah's grandson Gomer without being tied to any specific locality: "Gomer could be equated with the historical Cimbri of Jutland, in Italy with Umbria (Gumbria) and more especially with the Welsh, Cymraeg" (*Ancient Britons and*

*the Antiquarian Imagination* [London: Thames and Hudson, 1989], p. 59).

<sup>55</sup> Carolyn Sale, "Black Aeneas: Race, English Literary History, and the 'Barbarous' Poetics of *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.1 (2011), pp. 25–52, pp. 28–29.

<sup>56</sup> Paul Hill, *The Age of Athelstan: Britain's Forgotten History* [2004] (Stroud: The History Press, 2008), pp. 15, 39 and 81.