



MONTCLAIR STATE
UNIVERSITY

Montclair State University
**Montclair State University Digital
Commons**

Department of English Faculty Scholarship and
Creative Works

Department of English

Summer 2009

**“Boadicea Onstage before 1800, a Theatrical and Colonial
History.” *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 49.3 (Summer
2009): 595-614.**

Wendy Nielsen
nielsenw@mail.montclair.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/english-facpubs>



Part of the [Dramatic Literature, Criticism and Theory Commons](#), and the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

MSU Digital Commons Citation

Nielsen, Wendy, "“Boadicea Onstage before 1800, a Theatrical and Colonial History.” *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 49.3 (Summer 2009): 595-614." (2009). *Department of English Faculty Scholarship and Creative Works*. 13.

<https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/english-facpubs/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at Montclair State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Department of English Faculty Scholarship and Creative Works by an authorized administrator of Montclair State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@montclair.edu.

Boadicea Onstage before 1800, a Theatrical and Colonial History

WENDY C. NIELSEN

Immortalized by Alfred, Lord Tennyson in 1864, Boadicea, the British warrior queen who led an army against the Romans around 61 A. D., was celebrated by Victorians in a variety of media. In several closet dramas, for instance, Boadicea stars as an appropriately Victorian figure, a caring mother defending her brood against foreign invasion.¹ In visual culture, a statue of Boadicea and her Daughters (1856–71) by Thomas Thornycraft graces Westminster Bridge facing Parliament.² Before enjoying such austere Victorian privileges, however, Boadicea proved an enticing though problematic subject for onstage dramas, one that spelled failure in short-lived productions. Yet she inspired several reimaginings of her role as a figure at once resisting empire (the Romans) and embodying British expansionism. This essay will examine the shifting representations of Boadicea—from beleaguered mother to barbaric warrior—in a number of plays staged between 1600 and 1800. It will ask how far we may proceed in assigning nationalistic impulses to Boadicea for each of her British audiences. Various seventeenth- and eighteenth-century observers note that Boadicea is either chastised too much or too little, and at the very least, she represents an unconventional version of femininity to the audiences of the time, which is perhaps the reason critics disagree so radically on her treatment. In other words, Boadicea does not really work as a national icon because she evokes too many contentions for British audiences, who appear to react with typical canniness to this ambivalent figure.

Wendy C. Nielsen is an assistant professor in the English Department at Montclair State University. The author of scholarly articles on Olympe de Gouges, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Charlotte Corday, and Elizabeth Inchbald, she is at work on a book-length study of women warriors in European Romantic drama.

It is nonetheless curious that writers who dramatize the end of Boadicea's life turn out to be so heavily invested in the colonial projects of Greater Britain.

Significantly, the voice of this monument comes from a Romantic poet well-known for the mock-heroic mode, William Cowper; lines from *Boadicea: An Ode* (1782) accompany the aforementioned statue (erected following victory in the Second Anglo-Boer War) and seem to legitimize empire: "Regions Caesar never knew, / Thy posterity shall sway."³ Some recent authors claim that Boadicea allegorizes this kind of expansionist brand of nationalism. According to Vanessa Collingridge, Boadicea becomes popular in the eighteenth century because she embodies national pride.⁴ Boadicea's "'story' could be made to fit as an allegory or celebration of British (that is, largely *English*) nationalism, while the background of Roman imperialism fitted nicely with Britain's own expanding empire in the Americas. Together, the two ancient cultures of Britain and Rome gave strength and depth to a developing pride in modern English culture."⁵ However, performance history complicates the association of this figure with English patriotism. For, in fact, audiences abroad did not seem to reject dramas such as *Boadicea, or Queen of the Celts*, which succeeded in New York in 1849, only months before the Astor Place Riot, when *anti*-British sentiment flared following William Charles Macready's feud with the American actor Edwin Forrest.⁶ Moreover, another anonymous play was published in New York in 1860, presumably for an American audience.⁷ So it is not at all clear, as Marilyn Gaull points out, how Boadicea comes "to represent British nationalism, and a permanent rebuke to the Roman invaders, any invaders, or the declining fortunes of the British empire."⁸

In performance, Boadicea generally fares poorly, a trend that continues in televised productions.⁹ Carolyn D. Williams suggests that "only by quitting the stage could [Boadicea] become a national institution," a claim that has some merit, given the longevity of this figure in poems, closet dramas, and sculpture.¹⁰ Yet, as I hope to show, Boadicea's status as "a national institution" is questionable. Plays about Boadicea sometimes made timely responses to national crises, but on the whole they never achieved lasting success. The manager of Drury Lane, David Garrick, starred in Richard Glover's *Boadicea* play in 1753¹¹ and Charles Isaac Mungo Dibdin brought at least two pantomimes about Boadicea to Sadler's Wells and the Royal Circus in the years around 1800.¹² However, George Colman's July 1778 revival of

John Fletcher's tragedy (ca. 1612) on this subject remains the most enduring adaptation because it resonated with audiences during the so-called invasion scare.¹³ In contrast to tradition, this summer production considered women-at-arms in a semiserious manner. Normally, actresses played women in breeches for comedies and farces. Dorothy Jordan (1761–1816) made her career through such roles: Viola in *Twelfth Night*, Priscilla Tomboy in *The Romp*, Hippolita in *She Wou'd and She Wou'd Not*, and the schoolboy Little Pickle in the farce, *The Spoiled Child*, a part for which she was long remembered.¹⁴ Nonetheless, in an audience's laughter at caricatures or even failure to respond to plays, we can perhaps better understand social and cultural taboos. As Daniel O'Quinn suggests in his recent study of imperialism in late-eighteenth-century London theater, in times of national crisis the theater can be read along the lines of "autoethnographic acts," meaning the ways in which plays co-author fictions about national identity.¹⁵

The legend of Boadicea might seem to resemble a national autoethnography because ancient chroniclers attribute her revolt to a united rebellion by *Britain*, even though the concept of the nation state did not exist in the first century. Boadicea's tribe—the Iceni—occupied East Anglia, and they later united with the Trinovantes residing near modern London.¹⁶ But according to legend, a *personal* dispute led to animosity toward the Romans, who flogged Boadicea and raped her daughters following a disagreement about who owned her deceased husband's kingdom. It is curious that Boadicea's revolt is even remembered. For it was neither the first nor the last attempt to thwart Roman rule, and the final battle ended rather badly: a small force of 10,000 Romans killed approximately 80,000 Britons, and then Boadicea probably killed herself with poison. Archaeologists find evidence for these skirmishes in central southeast England, but somehow Boadicea has become associated with Wales, as evidenced by a prominent statue in Cardiff City Hall. Associating Boadicea and her daughters with Wales might come from conflating two events that happened in 61 AD: the slaughter of Druid priests and the defeat of Boadicea and her allies, who thereafter become Celts. In plays about Boadicea, audiences enjoyed the spectacular scene in the Druid temple, when she sacrificed a hare to the goddess Andate—an allusion to Andraste, a supposed warrior goddess of the Celts. Incidentally, *Bouda* resembles the word for "victory" in modern Welsh, and her name could be translated as *Victoria*. This paper refers to Boadicea because poets use this spelling,

but the correct spelling and pronunciation is of course Boudica, incorrectly transcribed by Gaius Cornelius Tacitus (ca. 56–117) as Boudicca in *The Annals of Imperial Rome* and further obscured by medieval scribes, who inserted an “a” in place of the “u,” and an “e” instead of the second “c.”¹⁷

The first play about this figure offers yet another spelling and pronunciation: John Fletcher’s *The Tragedie of Bonduca* (ca. 1612).¹⁸ Fletcher draws from ancient chronicles, which paint a starkly graphic portrait of the native army’s atrocities, including the mutilation of women’s bodies: “They spared neither age nor sex: women of great nobilitie and woorthie fame they tooke and hanged up naked, and cutting off their paps, sowed them to their mouthes, that they might seeme as if they sucked and fed on them, and some of their bodies they stretched out in length, and thrust them on sharpe stakes.”¹⁹ Raphaell Holinshed repeats a scene from Cassius Dio’s *Roman History*,²⁰ but its inclusion in the early modern *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1577) is important because Boadicea defies the association of women with domesticity when she leads an army. Indeed, the act of cutting off women’s breasts and sewing them to their mouths contradicts women’s traditional roles as nurturers. In her book *The Legacy of Boadicea: Gender and Nation in Early Modern England*, Jodi Mikalachki argues that, in the case of Boadicea, writers such as Holinshed redefine “the national problem of ancient savagery as an issue of female insubordination . . . to isolate a complementary tradition of native masculine civility.”²¹ Fletcher follows this pattern, too, when he portrays his warrior queen as a careless leader, a bad mother, and an unpleasant bully. The first scene opens with Bonduca boasting loudly that “a weak woman, / A woman beat these *Romanes*.”²² Her daughters, Bonvica and an unnamed sister, lure the Roman soldiers into a trap by promising them food and sex, but in the second act, the Romans start to win; Bonduca rashly orders her troops to charge, and all is lost. In the fourth act, Bonduca forces her daughters to join her in suicide and calls one a “whore” for hesitating.²³

The other “general of the Britains,” Caratach, plays the leading man in Fletcher’s tragedy.²⁴ When George Colman revived this play in July 1778, the *Westminster Magazine* observed: “The hero of [the play] is evidently Caratach, tho’ Bonduca has given it a name.”²⁵ Moreover, Caratach acts out the “native masculine civility” that Mikalachki describes because he takes charge of the family and is not responsible for the troops’ loss on the battlefield. Caratach is not only Bonduca’s cousin but also a father figure (he

takes care of his nephew Hengo), and he extends his stewardship to starving Roman soldiers, whom he rescues from Bonduca's daughters. The final line of the play, spoken by the Roman general Suetonius, even celebrates Caratach's good works: "March on, and through the Camp in every tongue, / The Vertues of great *Caratach* be sung."²⁶

The historical figure on which this character is based, Caratacus, neither fought with Boadicea nor knew her: he ruled over southern English tribes about a decade earlier. Another British queen, Cartimandua, betrayed Caratacus and delivered him to the Romans, and he later gained fame for a speech he delivered before the emperor Claudius in Rome.²⁷ This historical Caratacus *did* have connections to Wales (he took refuge there from the Romans), but he should not be confused with the Welsh leader Caradoc, born a millennium later.²⁸

None of this explains why Bonduca seems like such an unlikely British heroine, or why Fletcher sympathizes with the Romans and portrays the warrior queen as rash rather than reasonable, as a creature of instinct, and as a ruler unnatural. Bonduca does not even appear in the fifth act, although later adaptations change that. Scholars have related the peculiar inversion of loyalties in *Bonduca*—Fletcher's sympathy with the Romans and not the British Bonduca—to Jacobean politics, since it likely premiered during the first decade after the ascension of James I.²⁹ Simon Shepherd finds that Fletcher's play appeals "to the traditional depiction of the monarch, of James, as an imperial figure."³⁰ Julie Crawford argues that Caratach, friend of the Romans, stands for the Catholic sympathizer James and that Bonduca represents "a demonized Elizabeth."³¹ According to all the play's interpretations excepting one, Bonduca represents an uncomfortably familiar Otherness, while the Romans and Caratach represent British audiences.³² Perhaps Fletcher shows understanding for the Romans because they represent another group of colonists: the English struggling to survive in America. As mentioned earlier, the Roman soldiers in the play are starving. According to Claire Jowitt, this scene echoed the problems of the Jamestown, Virginia colony, which also experienced starvation and leaned on the native population to feed them, as related in Captain John Smith's *Proceedings of the English Colony* (1612).³³

To my knowledge, *Bonduca* was not performed again until September or October 1695, when a friend of the actor George Powell improved on it by adding music by Henry Purcell—including the popular song "Britons Strike Home"—and by giving Bon-

duca's daughters more lines.³⁴ Yet another production, Charles Hopkins's *Boadicea, Queen of Britain*, appeared at Lincoln's Inn's Fields in November of 1697 and 1699.³⁵ Although these plays contain significant differences, as we will see, they both reflect late-seventeenth-century audiences' concerns with portraying the history of British rule as masculine and civilized. According to historian Kathleen Wilson, "manliness' was not conceived of as the antithesis of femininity, but *vulgarity* was," and writers often lauded British women's domesticity and decorum as a way to celebrate superior English values in relation to those of the conquered.³⁶ So it is not surprising that in *A History of Britain* (1670) John Milton charges ancient chroniclers with emphasizing Boadicea's activities in order "to embellish and set out thir Historie with the strangeness of our manners, not caring in the meanwhile to brand us with the rankest note of Barbarism, as if in *Britain* Woemen were Men, and Men Woemen."³⁷ According to Milton and others, Boadicea represents uncivilized and female barbarity, not the civilized and masculine qualities embodied by figures such as Caratach.

The revival of *Bonduca; or, the British Heroine* conforms to Milton's view of history and gender when it shifts the focus of the play to the romance of one of Bonduca's daughters, Claudia, with the Roman soldier Venutius (whose name probably derives from the betrayed husband of Cartimandua).³⁸ The actress portraying Claudia, Jane Rogers (d. 1718), had more lines than the ostensible protagonist, identified in the *Dramatis Personae* as Mrs. Knight, maybe the sixty-four-year-old actress and singer Mary Knight.³⁹ Because the relationship between Claudia and her lover Venutius forms the center of the action, *Bonduca; or the British Heroine* shares more in common with comedy than tragedy. By transforming the legend of Boadicea into a romance, Powell's friend not only rehabilitates the wayward daughters of the original, but also alters the gender politics of the play. Fletcher's Bonduca enters the stage with loud boasts, but in this later version, she appears apologetic for bragging that a woman beat the Romans and concedes "'tis a Woman's Frailty" to boast.⁴⁰ So this Bonduca is held to a feminine standard of conduct, and her daughter Claudia even leaves the fighting and bragging to her lover Venutius, as the following lines from the first act illustrate:

CLAUDIA: Like a true *Britain*, like *Bonduca's* Daughter,
I'll dress my Hero, bring his Shining Armour;
Admire my Soldier, while with Pride I view

The graceful Horrors graven on his Shield,
 And Terror fitting on his haughty Crest;
 Then praise, embrace, and urge him to the War.⁴¹

Unlike her mother, Claudia does not fight in the war, but rather cheers on its soldiers as a woman should according to the norms of the day. When Powell's friend transforms *Bonduca* into a tragicomedy about her daughters, he de-emphasizes women's roles in early politics. This version has an impact for future generations because it remains standard at Drury Lane until 1778, when Colman adapts it further.⁴² However, a different drama about Boadicea played at the rival theater. Owing to disputes about salary and casting, the actors Thomas Betterton (1635–1710), Elizabeth Barry (1658–1713), and Anne Bracegirdle (1663?–1748) seceded from the United Company and started a new theater in the old Tennis Courts at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1695.⁴³ These were the most famous actors of their era, and they all starred in Charles Hopkins's *Boadicea, Queen of Britain* in November of 1697.⁴⁴

Like Fletcher, Hopkins makes the dramatic action turn on a heterosexual romance. He emphasizes the romance between one of Boadicea's daughters, called Camilla and portrayed by Bracegirdle, and her Roman lover Cassibelan, who together dominate the action. Hopkins's *Boadicea*, performed by Barry, exhibits even less strength than her predecessors on the London stage, for, in fact, she grants leadership of the British army to Betterton's Cassibelan in the first act: "Prince, in your Valour I repose my Trust, / Strong are our Armies as our Cause is just."⁴⁵ This marks a major shift from Fletcher's play, which acknowledges women's roles on the battlefield; instead, Hopkins concentrates on societal expectations about women as passive and domestic. Another contrast to Fletcher's play is Hopkins's treatment of imperialism, since the latter dramatist sharply critiques the Romans' occupation of Britain. For example, in the first act, Boadicea confronts their general verbally and demands, "First, let your numerous Forces be dismiss; / Your Garrisons from strong-Wall'd Towns withdraw, / No *British* Subject shall be kept in awe / . . . And *Rome* shall be our Ally, not our Lord."⁴⁶ In addition, the Romans actually act like villains (or rather a villain, Decius) because Hopkins incorporates the abduction and rape of Boadicea's daughter into the action of the play.

This critical tone makes sense considering Hopkins's Irish connections. As the son of the Bishop of Derry, Hopkins (1671?–1700) grew up in the garrison town of Londonderry, and, during the

years of the English Revolution (1688–89), Hopkins returned home to Ireland after graduating from Cambridge, meaning he would have witnessed one of its bloodiest scenes: the Siege of Derry.⁴⁷ Some of the references to armed conflict in *Boadicea, Queen of Britain* could well represent places like soldier-occupied Ireland. Boadicea's call for Rome to ally with the British, might betray Hopkins's wish to see the English ally peacefully with the Irish, and the deaths onstage make similar comments on the nature of war as an adjunct to dominion. Camilla's suicide upstages her mother's demise because the former's death scene lasts longer, and because Camilla's is a civilian death and a consequence of rape, it has special meaning. Whereas Boadicea dies as a consequence of fighting, Cassibelan and Paulinus mourn the death of Camilla as a civilian tragedy of war. The final lines of the play, spoken by the Roman general, underscore this intimate understanding of the *human* cost of expansionism and intervention:

PAULINUS: *Rome triumph'd still o'er Britain in distress:
Britain, when prosp'rous, show'd her Mercy less.
So high the Cruelty of both was driv'n,
That both are punish'd by Offended Heav'n.
Hence let successful Warriours learn to show
A tender Pity to the prostrate Foe.
Let those, on whom their Fortunes never frown,
Relieve the Wretches that are trampil'd down:
They who stand fast, still succour them who fall,
Since Humane Chance is what attends us all.*⁴⁸

Gauging audience reaction to such insightful words about war remains difficult because *independent* theater reviewing becomes commonplace only after 1800. Yet by most accounts, audiences received the play well.⁴⁹ Bridget Orr surmised that Boadicea “enabled playwrights to re-present an apparent national defeat as a triumph of civilization and order, as the establishment of a Roman-British polity, ancestor of a revived ‘Great Britain’ with her own expansionist agenda, embraced civilization and masculine rule.”⁵⁰ While Orr's assessment holds true for the final two plays under discussion here, Hopkins's play departs from this general trend. By portraying the rape of Boadicea's daughters and focusing on the destruction and pain wrought by war, this Anglo-Irish playwright seems to find fault with conquest in general. The play was only revived once more, on 7 November 1699, suggesting that audiences were not entirely receptive to its message.

Critiques about the cost of war surface in another *Boadicea* play written by Richard Glover (1712–85), a second-generation Hamburg merchant and sometime MP for Weymouth.⁵¹ For the production of *Boadicea* at Drury Lane in the winter of 1753, the famous actor and manager Garrick (1717–79) portrayed the role of Boadicea’s brother-in-law, Dumnorix.⁵² Like his predecessors Caratach and Cassibelan—the male leads in previous *Boadicea* plays—Dumnorix must justify why he chooses not to fight:

DUMNORIX: Not with unbridled passion, I confess,
 I wield the sword and mount the warlike car.
 With careful eyes I view’d our suffring isle,
 And meditated calmly to avenge her.
 Unmov’d by rage, my soul maintains her purpose
 Through one unalter’d course; and oft before
 As I have guided thy unruly spirit,
 Against its wildness will I now protect thee,
 And from a base, inhuman action save thee.⁵³

By remaining the voice of reason, the figure of Dumnorix protects the homeland against the “base, inhuman action” of war between Boadicea and the Romans. The contrast between Boadicea and her obedient, passive, and domesticated sister, Venusia, completes this pattern of dichotomies that appear in other retellings of the legend.⁵⁴

Oppositions also defined Glover’s political life. In addition to working in the House of Commons, Glover—who also wrote another tragedy, *Medea* (premier Drury Lane 24 March 1767)⁵⁵—opposed Robert Walpole’s foreign policy through literature, such as a poem, *London, or the Progress of Commerce* (1739), and an epic poem, *Leonidas* (1737), about the Spartan king’s resistance to the Persian army.⁵⁶ Glover became a spokesperson for traders who lost profit owing to piracy, and he petitioned against competition from the colonies for trade and workers.⁵⁷ In her analysis of newspapers, pamphlets, and broadsheets in *Sense of the People: Politics, Culture, and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785*, Wilson characterizes the rising merchant class to which Glover belongs.⁵⁸ According to her, they advocated trade over high finance, championed imperialism, and argued for maintaining the balance of power in Europe through expansionism. Significantly, this constituency admired “opposition hero[es]” such as Admiral Vernon, who conquered Spanish fortifications at Porto Bello but left the town intact for British traders.⁵⁹ In fact, Glover penned a

well-known poem in honor of Admiral Vernon, "Admiral Hosier's Ghost" (1740).⁶⁰ In the play, Dumnorix resembles this kind of opposition hero who fights with restraint, especially when he laments: "Have we with fell ambition, like the Romans, / Unpeopled realms, and made the world a desert?"⁶¹

Not much of this subtext would have made sense to London audiences at the time, because a wave of bellicose patriotism was sweeping the country in anticipation of the Seven Years' War. Glover's tragedy received some positive reviews, perhaps owing to his friends in politics, theater, and the press⁶² (according to Matthew S. Buckley, three more-or-less-identical groups of people⁶³). The playwright Arthur Murphy (1727–1805) predicted correctly "that this Tragedy will prove an elegant Closet-companion to every reader of taste."⁶⁴ Its inclusion in *Bell's British Theatre* established Glover as an *author*, which was significant because playbills almost never included the name of the dramatist.⁶⁵ Consequently, most eighteenth-century readers and writers probably knew Glover's play better than Fletcher's owing to this multivolume series, which printed *Boadicea: A Tragedy* alongside two portraits of prominent actors in the roles of Boadicea and Dumnorix.⁶⁶ After reading it, Robert Southey wrote that Glover's only fault was that he treated the Romans "too respectfully," implying some sympathy with Boadicea.⁶⁷ A wide range of critics, including Garrick, complained that Boadicea was "neither an object of *Terror* or *Compassion*: but of *Detestation*."⁶⁸

Such negative reaction marked a shift in how audiences understood Boadicea, paving the way for a redemption of sorts in Colman's (1732–94) adaptation of Fletcher's *Bonduca* for the rest of the brief summer season (twelve nights) at his newly acquired playhouse, the Haymarket, in July 1778.⁶⁹ *The Monthly Review* commended the production for the "considerably softened" features of *Bonduca* and her "two savage daughters," whom Colman made appear less aggressive by staging one instead of two abductions of the Roman soldiers, and by accentuating the romantic subplot between the soldier Junius and one of *Bonduca*'s daughters.⁷⁰ However, as in Fletcher's original, *Bonduca*'s daughters act treacherously and dishonor the British cause, while the figure of Caratach attempts to domesticate them by commanding: "Learn to spin, / And curse your knotted hemp!"⁷¹ For his role as Caratach, the actor West Dudley Digges (1720?–86) garnered more praise from reviewers than the actresses portraying *Bonduca* and her daughters; Sarah Siddons's biographer James Boaden called him "the very absolute Caratach of Fletcher . . . quite equal to Kemble's

Coriolanus, in bold original conception and corresponding felicity of execution.”⁷² Thus Colman’s *Bonduca* functions as a vehicle for elder leading men, and it could be titled *Caratach*. Colman produced *Bonduca* during subsequent summer seasons, but its debut in 1778 was important because he tailored the play and its publicity for an audience worried about the impact of women on war.

The historical context in 1778 probably determined the modest success of this production more than Colman’s work on the adaptation. At the peak of the war in America, France assisted the rebel colonies and challenged Britain’s control of the Channel, and as a result, an invasion scare preoccupied nearly everyone.⁷³ Lord North’s government responded to this threat by establishing military encampments on the southern coast, and Colman capitalized on this atmosphere, writing in his review of *Bonduca* for the *London Chronicle*: “The Subject chosen for it was the Analogy between the Invasion of Britain by the Romans, in the Days of the bold Queen of the Iceni, and the Invasion which the timid Women of this Day dread from our Neighbours the French.”⁷⁴

Colman’s reference to “the timid Women of this Day” discounted the many women—according to some, too many—who visited soldiers’ camps along the coast. Of course, Richard Brinsley Sheridan’s *The Camp* (premier Drury Lane, 15 October 1778, fifty-seven nights) satirized the visits of young women to the army camps, and the prologue by Richard Tickell even referred to *Bonduca*, which had premiered a few months earlier.⁷⁵ The same month that *Bonduca* appeared at the Haymarket, the *Westminster Magazine* published “A Sketch of the Humours of a Camp, in a Letter from an Officer at Cox-heath,” which remarked, among other things, that female visitors ate too many of the soldiers’ provisions.⁷⁶ Behind such critiques lies the oft-mentioned fear that the presence of women alongside troops—not only fashionable upper-class women, but also spouses, camp followers, nurses, cooks, prostitutes, and potential spies—impedes British military prowess. In his prologue to *Bonduca*, Garrick emphasized a united front:

To *modern* Britons let the old appear
 this might to rouse ’em for this anxious year:
 to raise that spirit, which of yore when rais’d,
 Made even *Romans* tremble while they prais’d.⁷⁷

In contrast to seventeenth-century adaptations of *Bonduca*, the producers of this rendition promote audience identification with the ancient warrior queen and not with the Romans in order to draw audiences to the playhouse. However, *Bonduca* shares some affinity with the much-maligned female visitors to the military encampments in southeast England: *Bonduca* also suggests that the presence of women endangers the success of a British response to foreign invaders. Although women such as *Bonduca* and her daughters (or the visitors at Coxheath Camp) want to contribute to the war effort, Colman's *Bonduca* reminds audiences that the British troops really need men like Caratach to defend the country.

In any case, 1778 was the last time a play about Boadicea went over particularly well with audiences. In May 1808, for example, Covent Garden produced *Bonduca* for the actor George Frederick Cooke's benefit, the one day a year when performers collected the profits of the house. Although managers spent nearly 1,000 pounds on costumes and scenery, audiences did not attend in sufficient numbers to cover production costs.⁷⁸

The history of Boadicea onstage before 1800 suggests some other reasons her story fails to capture audiences' imaginations. In plays based on Fletcher's *Bonduca*, elements of domestic drama and military spectacles are combined, but as the ostensible heroine, *Bonduca* falls flat in both arenas. She neglects to protect her people and then orders the death of her own children before taking her own life. Ultimately, audiences face too many contradictions in the figure of *Bonduca*, who emerges as neither heroine nor villainess. Military spectacles present violence in patriotic and positive terms, and especially in the provinces, the eighteenth-century British playhouse often featured and catered to live soldiers. However, dramas about Boadicea omit any scenes in which she battles the Romans, and her suicide remains the only act of female-inflicted violence that audiences see. When Fletcher and his successors consign Boadicea's only act of violence to suicide, they deny her an active role on the battlefield and in the dramatic action.

On the other hand, plays about Boadicea and her daughters often draw attention to the inhumane aspects of armed conflict: starvation, abduction, the dislocation of families, rape, murder, and destruction. In the figures of Caratach and Dumnorix, Fletcher, his successors, and Glover suggest that British men are civilizing forces in conquest. Such fictions resemble other points in eighteenth-century history when British global expansion (iden-

tified with leaders such as Admiral Vernon) becomes “mystified as an ultimately benevolent as well as patriotic act.”⁷⁹ Powell’s friend, Hopkins, Glover, and Colman also contrast the barbarity of Bonduca/Boadicea with her daughters, who, as objects of romance, model feminine civility (and by extension, the superiority of British manners). Hopkins offers the most sobering account of war because his *Boadicea* includes the rape of Boadicea’s daughter as part of the direct action. Hopkins of course grew up in an area that only became part of Greater Britain after the Act of Union—Ireland. The conflicts between Boadicea and Caratach (or Cassibelan or Dumnorix) depict Britons as a band of needlessly quarrelling siblings, perhaps analogous to the tensions building between England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

These coincidences signal a shared interest in dramatizing the concerns of the stakeholders in the emerging empire. Fletcher’s *Bonduca* connects the defeat of Boadicea to the rise of Caratach and characterizes the Romans’ defeat of the British as a mistake in leadership. When Colman revives the play in 1778, women are visiting, and according to some observers, disturbing local military encampments. Glover’s *Boadicea* makes explicit that her excess of feeling, her femininity, contribute to one of Britain’s most spectacular defeats. So according to Glover and Fletcher, if only Dumnorix or Caratach—the former a fictional character, and the latter someone who never met the ancient warrior queen—had been the general in charge, then this famous defeat would never have happened because either man would have at least acted *civilly*. These dramas recast the major players of early British history as masculine, typifying myths about Amazons and other warrior women who are revealed to be savage and brutal.⁸⁰ Warrior women such as Boadicea remind audiences about the supposed need for men to take charge of political affairs and foreign populations. Boadicea probably appeals to reading audiences more than theatergoers, and she owes whatever longevity she has in the British imagination to her presence in the reading room. However, these plays do not present Boadicea as an iconic nationalist figure, and in fact, do quite the opposite. Onstage before 1800, dramatists appear unable to paint her sympathetically, because to do so seems to condone her stunning defeat, or at least the savage mistakes of undomesticated and uncivil women.

NOTES

¹Nineteenth-century closet dramas include Sir Coutts Lindsay, *Boadicea: A Tragedy* (London: W. Clowes, 1857); A. F. Hopkinson, *Boadicea* (London: A. F. Hopkinson, 1888); and Mrs. Aylmer Gowing [Emilia Gowing Blake], *Boadicea: A Play in Four Acts* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1899).

²Sir (William) Hamo Thornycraft took fifteen years to construct the statue, according to Marina Warner in *Monuments and Maidens: The Allegory of the Female Form* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1985), pp. 50–1.

³William Cowper, *Boadicea: An Ode*, in *The Poems of William Cowper*, ed. John D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 1:431–2, 432. On Cowper's connection to the mock-heroic mode, see Richard Terry, "Meaner Themes': Mock-Heroic and Providentialism in Cowper's Poetry," *SEL* 34, 3 (Summer 1994): 617–34.

⁴Vanessa Collingridge, *Boudica: The Life of Britain's Legendary Warrior Queen* (London: Ebury Press, 2005), pp. 306–16.

⁵Collingridge, p. 306.

⁶*Boadicea, or, the Queen of the Celts*, performed 9–27 January 1849 at the Bowery Theater in New York City NY. Edwin Forrest originally affronted the British actor William Charles Macready in Edinburgh, but their feud culminated at the Astor Place Theater in New York City on 10 May 1849, when crowds rioted, and at least seventeen people were killed by soldiers called in to quell the rioters. *The Cambridge History of American Theatre* (ed. Don B. Wilmeth and Christopher Bigsby, 3 vols. [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998], 1:151, 17, 87) attributes this event to anti-British sentiment, and suggests that the Macready-Forrest feud underscores debates about nationalism and elitism in the nineteenth-century theater.

⁷New York Public Library attributes *Boadicia* [sic] (New York: Ferris and Pratt, 1860) to Richard Glover. However, the drama, in the George Becks collection is not Glover's. In an unsigned review of *Boadicia*, managed by Thomas S. Hambilin, Bowery Theater, New York, the authorship of that production also appears unknown, but the reviewer mentions delight over a "comical oyster dealer" and his family, figures present in neither Glover's tragedy nor the text at New York Public Library (Unsigned review of *Boadicia*, *New York Herald*, 9 January 1849). Other reviews include an unsigned review of *Boadicea*, managed by Thomas S. Hambilin, Bowery Theater, New York, *Spirit of the Times, a Chronicle of the Turf, Agriculture, Field Sports, Literature and the Stage*, 13 January 1849, p. 564, Things Theatrical section, and an unsigned review of *Boadicea; Or, The Queen of the Celts*, managed by Thomas S. Hambilin, Bowery Theater, New York, *The Albion: British, Colonial, and Foreign Weekly Gazette*, 13 January 1849, p. 20, Drama section.

⁸Marilyn Gaull, "Romans and Romanticism," *WC* 36, 1 (Winter 2005): 15–21, 19.

⁹See the historically inaccurate *Boudicca: Warrior Queen*, DVD, directed by Bill Anderson (2003; Boston: WGBH Boston, 2004).

¹⁰Carolyn D. Williams, "'This Frantic Woman': Boadicea and English Neo-Classical Embarrassment," in *The Uses and Abuses of Antiquity*, ed. Michael Biddiss and Maria Wyke (Bern and New York: Peter Lang, 1999), pp. 19–36, 32.

¹¹ *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 5 vols., ed. William Van Lennep (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1962), 4:394–5.

¹² Charles Isaac Mungo Dibdin wrote the libretto for *Boadicea; or, the British Amazon*, performed 14 April 1800 (Easter Monday) at Sadler's Wells, London, and produced another piece, *Bonduca; or, The British Queen* 4 August 1823 at Royal Amphitheatre, Westminster Bridge (Charles Dibdin Jr., *Professional and Literary Memoirs of Charles Dibdin the Younger*, ed. George Speaight [London: Society for Theatre Research, 1956], p. 43).

¹³ George Colman, *The Tragedy of Bonduca*, by John Fletcher, in *The Plays of George Colman the Elder*, ed. Kalman A. Burnim, 6 vols. (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1983), 4:1–46.

¹⁴ "Dorothy Jordan," in *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660–1800*, 16 vols., ed. Philip H. Highfill, Burnim, and Edward Langhans (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1982), 8:245–64, 250, 251.

¹⁵ Daniel O'Quinn, *Staging Governance: Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1770–1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2005), p. 12.

¹⁶ The following discussion of the historical figure Boadicea derives from Miranda Aldhouse-Green, *Boudica Britannia: Rebel, War-Leader, and Queen* (London: Pearson Longman, 2006), pp. 1–35, 183–208, and Richard Hingley and Christina Unwin, *Boudica: Iron Age Warrior Queen* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 111–46.

¹⁷ The story of Boadicea and her daughters appears in Cornelius Tacitus, *Annals*, trans. A. J. Woodman (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2004), pp. 289–93.

¹⁸ Fletcher, *The Tragedie of Bonduca*, in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, ed. Fredson Bowers and Cyrus Hoy, 4 vols. (London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1979), 4:149–260. The exact dating for Fletcher's *Bonduca* remains uncertain. The modern editor of this text, Hoy, notes the preparation of the manuscript between 1625 and 1635, before its addition to the 1647 folio. However, Alfred Harbage's *Annals of English Drama, 975–1700*, revised by S. Schoenbaum (London: Methuen, 1964), p. 100, cites 1611–14, which is consistent with the findings of recent critics such as Claire Jowitt (1609–16) and Julie Crawford (1610–14). See Hoy, "Textual Introduction," in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, 4:151–4; Jowitt, "Colonialism, Politics, and Romanization in John Fletcher's *Bonduca*," *SEL* 43, 2 (Spring 2003): 475–94, 478; and Crawford, "Fletcher's *The Tragedie of Bonduca* and the Anxieties of the Masculine Government of James I," in *SEL* 39, 2 (1999): 357–81.

¹⁹ Raphael Holinshed, William Harrison, and others, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols. (London: J. Johnson, 1807), 1:499–500.

²⁰ Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Dio's Roman History*, trans. Earnest Cary, 9 vols. (Cambridge MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1982), 8:95.

²¹ Jodi Mikalachki, *The Legacy of Boadicea: Gender and Nation in Early Modern England* (New York and London: Routledge, 1998), p. 13.

²² Fletcher, I.i.16–7.

²³ Fletcher, IV.iv.97.

²⁴ Fletcher, dram. pers. (p. 156).

²⁵ Unsigned review of *Bonduca, A Tragedy*, by Fletcher, Colman's Theatre, London, *Westminster Magazine*, August 1778, p. 434.

²⁶ Fletcher, V.iii.203.

²⁷ Malcolm Todd, "Caratacus (fl. AD 40–51)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 50 vols. (Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 10:11–2. Depictions of Caratacus in historical chronicles and illustrations equal the number of representations of Boadicea, as documented by Sam Smiles in *The Image of Antiquity: Ancient Britain and the Romantic Imagination* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 45, 137, and include William Mason's piece, *Caratacus: a Dramatic Poem* (London: J. Knapton, 1759), altered by Thomas Augustine Arne into a closet drama in 1777.

²⁸ The coupling of Boadicea with Caratacus probably began in Hector Boece's *The Chronicles of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1540) and continued with chroniclers who copied him, such as George Buchanan's *Rerum Scotticarum Historia* (Edinburgh, 1582), details explored by John E. Curran in *Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism, and the Historical Imagination in England, 1530–1660* (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 2002), pp. 184–5.

²⁹ Jowitt discusses the dating of the first performance of *Bonduca*, p. 478.

³⁰ Simon Shepherd, *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981), p. 149.

³¹ Crawford, p. 365.

³² Paul D. Green prompted later critics (such as the aforementioned Williams, Crawford, Mikalachki, and Jowitt) to reassess Fletcher's depiction of the Romans as analogous to the Britons in his essay, "Theme and Structure in Fletcher's *Bonduca*," *SEL* 22, 2 (Spring 1982): 305–16. In contrast, Ronald J. Boling maintains that Fletcher mocks Caratach and that the "play is pro-British, not pro-Roman" in "Fletcher's Satire of Caratach in *Bonduca*," *CompD*, 33, 3 (Fall 1999): 390–406, 392. However, one of the bases for Boling's comparisons—the Welsh leader Caradoc in R. A. Gent's *The Valiant Welshman* (1615)—is, in fact, an entirely different figure born centuries after Caratacus.

³³ Jowitt, pp. 480–4.

³⁴ *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 1:452–3. On 12 January 1669, the *London Chronicle* listed plays, including *Bonduca*, "formerly acted at Blackfriars and now allowed . . . to the King's Company" (*The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 5 vols., ed. Van Lennep [Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1965], 1:151); however, no record of a performance that year exists to my knowledge. Fletcher and George Powell, *Bonduca; or, the British Heroine* (London: Richard Bentley, 1696), pp. 1–53.

³⁵ The performance in November 1697 (the same month, incidentally, in which the Powell version of Fletcher's *Bonduca* is once again performed) is listed in *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 5 vols., ed. Van Lennep [Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1962], 1:487. Ben Ross Schneider Jr. cites a revival of Hopkins's play, *Boadicea*, on 7 November 1699, a date that coincides with the premier of Charles Hopkins's play, *Friendship Improved; or, the Female Warriour* (*Index to the London Stage, 1660–1800*, [Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1979], p. 427).

³⁶ Kathleen Wilson, *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire, and Gender in the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), p. 25.

³⁷ On this passage from John Milton's *History of Britain*, in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. French Fogle, 8 vols. (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1971), 5:79–80, see also Mikalachki, "The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism," in *SQ* 46, 3 (Autumn 1995): 301–22, 311.

³⁸ See Fletcher and Powell.

³⁹ "Mary Knight (b. 1631)," in *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660–1800*, 9:60–2; Fletcher and Powell, p. [vi]. No other actress by that name can be found in this resource or the *ODNB* to suggest someone else for the role of *Bonduca*.

⁴⁰ Fletcher and Powell, p. 3. Several bibliographies attribute the adaptation of Fletcher's play to the actor playing Caratach, George Powell (1668?–1714), but in a note to readers in the published edition, Powell ascribes the work to a friend.

⁴¹ Fletcher and Powell, p. 6. Only act numbers, not scene breaks, appear in this version of the play.

⁴² *Bonduca; or, the British Heroine* was revived several times at Drury Lane: 4 January 1704; 12 and 18 February, 6 June, and 19 December 1706; 5, 9, 12, and 23 August 1715; 26 June and 10 July 1716; 25 July; 13, 18 June and 15 July 1729; 9 June 1731. It also played at the Haymarket in 1723. Schneider lists another performance on 22 August 1718 in his *Index to the London Stage, 1660–1800*, p. 309. According to *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 5 vols., ed. Emmet L. Avery (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1960), 2:502.

⁴³ Several biographical entries mention this secession: "Elizabeth Barry," *Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660–1800*, 16 vols., eds. Highfill, Burnim, and Langhans (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1973), 1:319; "Thomas Betterton," 2:85; and "Anne Bracegirdle," 2:273.

⁴⁴ Hopkins, *Boadicea, Queen of Britain* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1697), dram. pers.

⁴⁵ Hopkins, p. 4.

⁴⁶ Hopkins, p. 5.

⁴⁷ Jonathan Pritchard, "Hopkins, Charles (1671?–1700)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 28:45.

⁴⁸ Hopkins, p. 56.

⁴⁹ In the dedication to his next play, *Friendship Improved; or, the Female Warriour* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1700), A2, Hopkins writes to Edward Coke that "*Boadicea* pleas'd them, and I received a very great additional satisfaction, when I understood how particularly it pleased You." Two other contemporary sources corroborate this assessment without much detail in *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 5 vols., ed. Van Lennep [Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1962], 1:487. In a letter, John Dryden mentioned "a play in verse called *Boadicea*, which you fair Ladyes likd" and assessed Hopkins as "a poet who writes good verses without knowing how, or why; I mean he

writes naturally well, without art or learning or good sense" (Dryden to Mrs. Steward, 7 November 1699, in *The Letters of John Dryden*, ed. Charles E. Ward [New York: AMS Press, 1965], p. 124).

⁵⁰ Bridget Orr, *The Empire on the English Stage, 1660–1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), p. 266.

⁵¹ Paul Baines, "Glover, Richard (1712–1785)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 22:495–7.

⁵² Richard Glover, *Boadicea: A Tragedy*, in *Bell's British Theatre Consisting of the Most Esteemed English Plays*, 2d edn., 32 vols. (London: John Bell, 1791), 2:dram. pers.

⁵³ Glover, 2:18.

⁵⁴ On the occasion of reprinting Cowper's "Boadicea," Ann Kemmish juxtaposes Venutius and his faithful wife Gelina to a treacherous Boadicea figure in a novella located in the Pforzheimer Collection in the New York Public Library, *Heroic Females, or, an Authentic History of the Surprising Achievements and Intrepid Conduct of Boadicea, Queen of Icenii, and her two Daughters* (London: Ann Kemmish, 1810).

⁵⁵ The London Stage, 1660–1800, 4:1230.

⁵⁶ Glover, *Leonidas: A Poem* (London: R. Dodsley, 1737) and *London: or the Progress of Commerce. A Poem* (London: T. Cooper, 1739).

⁵⁷ Glover, *A Short Account of the Late Applicant of Parliament, Made by the Merchants of London upon the Neglect of Their Trade, with the Substance of the Evidence thereupon as Sum'd up by Mr. Glover* (London: T. Cooper, 1742) and *The Substance of the Evidence Delivered to a Committee of the Honourable House of Commons by the Merchants and Traders of London, concerned in the Trade to Germany and Holland, and of the Dealers in Foreign Linens, as Summed up by Mr. Glover* (London: J. Wilkie, 1774).

⁵⁸ Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995).

⁵⁹ Wilson, *The Sense of the People*, pp. 50, 140–5.

⁶⁰ Richard Hardin, "Edward Vernon," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 56:359–63. "Admiral Hosier's Ghost" is reprinted in John Masefield, *A Sailor's Garland* (New York: Macmillan, 1928), pp. 130–3.

⁶¹ Glover, 2:39.

⁶² One or more of the commentaries on Glover's play could be written by himself, such as the anonymous *Short History of Boadicea, the British Queen* (London: W. Reeve, 1754); ECCO ESTC T110483, or the one from his friend Henry Pemberton, *Some Few Reflections on the Tragedy of Boadicia [sic]* (London: R. and J. Dodsley and M. Cooper, 1753); ECCO ESTC T091522. See also Christlob Mylius, *A Letter to Mr. Richard Glover on Occasion of his Tragedy of Boadicia [sic]* (London: A. Linde, 1754); ECCO ESTC T088497, and William Rider, *A Comment on Boadicia [sic]* (London: J. Fuller, 1754); ECCO ESTC T000115.

⁶³ Richard Brinsley Sheridan (playwright, MP, theater manager) embodies the government-controlled stage and press for Matthew Buckley (*Tragedy Walks the Streets: The French Revolution in the Making of Modern Drama* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2006], p. 81).

⁶⁴ *Gray's Inn Journal* (8 December 1753), qtd. in *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 4:395.

⁶⁵ Glover, p. Aij.

⁶⁶ The portraits include Mrs. Powell as Boadicea (a part the actress never performed) and Mrs. Pritchard as Boadicea and David Garrick as Dumnorix. A previous edition was published between 1776 and 1781 in twenty volumes, with *Boadicea* again in volume 2.

⁶⁷ Robert Southey to Horace Walpole Bedford, 24 January 1794, in *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, ed. Charles Cuthbert Southey, 6 vols. (St. Clair Shores MI: Scholarly Press, 1969), 1:45.

⁶⁸ Paul Hiffennan's words (*The Tuner* [1754], in *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 4:401) echo Garrick's, who complains that "Boadicea is detestable from her cruelty and ingratitude" (*Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick*, ed. Stephen Jones, 2 vols. [1808; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969], 1:208).

⁶⁹ Burnim, introduction to *Bonduca: A Tragedy*, in *The Plays of George Colman the Elder*, 4:n. p.

⁷⁰ The unsigned review of *Bonduca: A Tragedy*, Theatre-Royal, Haymarket, London in *The Monthly Review or Literary Journal*, July 1778, p. 157, Monthly Catalogue Dramatic section, was less critical of the revisions Colman made than in an unsigned review in *Town and Country Magazine; Or, Universal Repository of Knowledge, Instruction, and Entertainment*, August 1778, p. 398, Theatre section: "At present it appears of the amphibious race of tragi-comic monsters. Hence it is that scenes being incoherently blended, in a great measure lose their effect, and are almost forgotten before the catastrophe takes place."

⁷¹ Colman, 4:25.

⁷² James Boaden, *Memoirs of Mrs. Siddons, Interspersed with Anecdotes of Authors and Actors* (London: Gibbins and Company, 1893), pp. 97–8.

⁷³ For further information on the response of theater to the invasion scare, see Robert W. Jones, "Sheridan and the Theatre of Patriotism: Staging Dissent during the War for America," *ECLife* 26, 1 (Winter 2002): 24–45.

⁷⁴ "An Account of the Revived Play called BONDUCA," unsigned review of *Bonduca: A Tragedy*, Theatre-Royal, Haymarket, London, *The London Chronicle*, 30 July 1778, pp. 105–6. The paper lists the distribution of dragoons for the Salisbury Camp, Bury St. Edmund's Camp, and Winchester Camp on the same page.

⁷⁵ What can our Arms oppose,

When Female Warriours join our martial'd Beaus.

Fierce from the Toilet, the plum'd Bands appear;

Miss struts a Major, Ma'am a Brigadier;

A spruce *Bonduca* simpers in the Rear.

Richard Tickell, Prologue to *The Camp*, in *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, ed. Cecil Price, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 2:723. *The Camp* was also performed in Bristol (Price, p. 716), but other fictional responses are noteworthy: *A Trip to Coxheath* at Sadler's Wells in July 1779 (Price, p. 707), *Cox-Heath Camp: a Novel, in a Series of Letters* by an anonymous "Lady" (Dublin: Price, 1779), and a satirical print, *A Trip to Cocks Heath* by John Hamilton Mortimer and James Gillray (London: William Humphrey, 28 October 1778).

⁷⁶ *Westminster Magazine* (July 1778), p. 347.

⁷⁷ *The London Chronicle*, 4–6 August 1778, p. 128.

⁷⁸ An unsigned review of *Bonduca* in *The Monthly Mirror*, 3 May 1808, p. 401, Memoranda Dramatica section, attributed the lack of success to the play itself: “The revived piece, however, has but little attraction in acting, and when found heavy at a *benefit*, should not have been repeated.” For another unsigned review, see *The European Magazine*, May 1808, p. 382.

⁷⁹ Wilson, *The Sense of the People*, p. 194.

⁸⁰ According to Laura Brown in *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Minneapolis and London: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1993), p. 167, “as a figure for the other, the image of the Amazon includes and thus conjoins both women and natives,” as well as the alter egos of male European colonizers.