



# Dutch Crossing

Journal of Low Countries Studies

ISSN: 0309-6564 (Print) 1759-7854 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ydtc20>

## Gascoigne's The Spoyle of Antwerpe (1576) as an Anglo-Dutch text

Raymond Fagel

To cite this article: Raymond Fagel (2017) Gascoigne's The Spoyle of Antwerpe (1576) as an Anglo-Dutch text, *Dutch Crossing*, 41:2, 101-110, DOI: [10.1080/03096564.2017.1291747](https://doi.org/10.1080/03096564.2017.1291747)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03096564.2017.1291747>



© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 14 Mar 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 391



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Gascoigne's *The Spoyle of Antwerpe* (1576) as an Anglo-Dutch text\*

RAYMOND FAGEL

*History Institute, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands*

*The Spoyle of Antwerpe* (1576) by the English soldier poet George Gascoigne is considered both a major source on the Sack of Antwerp that took place in that same year, and a primordial example of Renaissance autobiographical writing. The finding that Gascoigne copied most of the text of his so-called witness report from a Dutch pamphlet undermines both these assumptions. As an Anglo-Dutch text, the *Spoyle* becomes an exciting example of cultural translation between England and the Low Countries, demonstrating how parts of an anonymous Dutch pamphlet were converted into an autobiographical English text.

KEYWORDS Sack of Antwerp (1576), George Gascoigne, Dutch Revolt, Spanish Army, Early Modern History, Translation History, English Renaissance Literature

## George Gascoigne and his *Spoyle of Antwerpe*

The English soldier and writer George Gascoigne (c. 1535–1577), generally considered a minor Elizabethan author, reached Antwerp on October 22, 1576, to leave the city again on November 12 of that same year. In between, on November 4, the royal army that had been gathered in Antwerp castle had attacked the city and would subsequently sack it for days on end. It was the dramatic outcome of a power struggle between the illegally united States-General of the Habsburg Netherlands and the remains of the royal government and the royal army. This famous eye-witness to the so-called *Spanish Fury* in the city of Antwerp arrived back in London on November 21. It was only four days later that he finished his report on the events, and publication followed within a week from then: 'I have thought good, for the benefit of my countrie, to publish a true report therof'. Gascoigne starts off the main body of his text with a dramatic description stating that 'my hap was to bee present at so piteous a spectacle, as the sacking and

\*The research for this article was undertaken within the research project *Facing the Enemy. The Spanish army commanders during the first decade of the Dutch Revolt (1567-1577)*, financed by the Dutch national research council NWO.

spoyle of Antwerpe, (a lamentable example whiche hath alreedy filled all Europe with dreadfull newes of great calamitie).<sup>1</sup>

The opinions on this anonymously published report are very diverse, then and now. George Whetstone, his companion of both arms and letters, did not even mention it in his 'catalogue of Gascoigne's good deeds and praiseworthy writings', while John W. Cunliffe, the editor of the complete works in 1910, called it 'the most remarkable of his literary works', including it as an appendix to his edition of the complete works.<sup>2</sup> One of his modern biographers calls *The Spoyle* 'one of the most vivid and realistic descriptions of war in the English language'.<sup>3</sup> Without exaggeration we can state that the *Spoyle of Antwerp* is amongst the most important and most cited sources for the events in Antwerp during the Fury and an exemplary model of Early Modern autobiographical writing.<sup>4</sup>

George Gascoigne was born around 1535 and would die in 1577, only shortly after his eventful visit to Antwerp. His fruitless attempts to find a place for himself at the English court had brought him years before to complete bankruptcy, ending up in jail. In 1571, he started a new career as a soldier in an English regiment helping out the rebels in the Low Countries under command of William of Orange. For a few years he travelled in between England and the Low Countries, involved in several important military actions. However, the Dutch rebels had serious doubts about his loyalty and accused him of treason. He would finally end his military years in the Low Countries as a prisoner of war in the royal jail of Haarlem.<sup>5</sup>

Recently, Linda Bradley Salamon has sung the praise of *The Spoyle*, calling it a 'major source for both Elizabethans' understanding of their Spanish opponent and modern historical writing'. And she continues: 'Gascoigne observes the sack keenly and narrates his observations closely, with telling details and anecdotes'. In his 'well-calibrated, rising rhetoric' she has found 'three registers of prose, distinct in style and tone, that move from neutrality to outrage at the Spanish forces'. 'He can describe, narrate, analyze, assess, and even condemn through shifts in tone and lexicon that subtly and gradually make his meaning plain'.<sup>6</sup>

The first register she has 'unpacked' is the 'military reportage of the culminating battle and the events that led up to it', a 'journalistic layer' as she calls it. As an example, the author presents us with a text full of factual information on the arrival of the troops.<sup>7</sup> A second register is called by her that of 'judgment', 'aiming at calm detachment'. Here we find an example of the German soldiers who let their pikes drop when the Spanish arrived, crying 'Oh lieve Spaniarden, lieve Spaniarden'.<sup>8</sup> The third layer is that of first-personal narration, recalling 'the poet behind the soldier'. He tells the story of a father and a mother who were forced to fetch their young daughter out of a convent in order to satisfy the sexual needs of two Spanish soldiers. There is also the terrible anecdote of a young English merchant who in the end was hanged by the Spanish soldiers. Or, another wonderful phrase from the *Spoyle of Antwerpe*: 'for every *Dom Diego* must walk jetting up & down the streetes with his harlotte by him in her cheine and bracelettes of gold'.<sup>9</sup>

## A Dutch pamphlet as the principal source of the *Spoyle of Antwerpe*

Bradley Salamon has rightly felt that the *Spoyle* consists of several registers, however, she has missed something essential in this Early Modern propagandistic text that can help explain how it was possible for Gascoigne to create such a piece of writing only days after his return to London. The fact is that the poet has undoubtedly made extensive use of a Dutch pamphlet, probably brought with him on the voyage to England. This pamphlet was originally written in Dutch but soon afterwards translated into French. Gascoigne may have used the French edition, but after his years as a soldier in the Low Countries, it is far from impossible that Gascoigne had mastered the Dutch language. The *Warachtige beschrijvinghe van het innemen van Antwerpen* (The true description of the capture of Antwerp) had been written 'door een die daer selfs teghenwoordich gheweest is' (by one who had been present himself).<sup>10</sup> This title is almost completely copied by Gascoigne: *The Spoyle of Antwerp, faithfully reported by a true Englishman, who was present at the same*. The main difference lies in the naming of an Englishman instead of an anonymous author. The French translation does not refer to the author being present at the scene, which makes it very plausible Gascoigne did indeed make use of the Dutch language text.

All the examples quoted in the paragraph above on the three registers can be traced back as literal translations from the Dutch original, including the anecdotes that seem to convey some sort of personal experience. In all, Gascoigne re-uses some 90% of the text of the Dutch pamphlet. Only the first and the last paragraphs of the pamphlet are missing, containing for example the names of the streets that had suffered most from the sack, information probably not considered very useful for an English audience. Gascoigne's voice is only truly dominant in the first and the last pages and within a central part of the text. It can be stated that circa 50% of the *Spoyle of Antwerpe* is not much more than a slightly reworked translation of the pamphlet. Sometimes the author just intervenes with a few words, adding for example 'about ten of the clock before noon', or 'about eleven of the clock', in order to give more authenticity and precision to the text. His central statement that he was 'enforced to become an eyed witnes of their entry' is completely surrounded by paragraphs that are directly taken from the Dutch pamphlet.

Though Gascoigne's text clearly loses importance as a reflection of personal experience during the Early Modern period as a result of its mixed character, it gains worth as an exciting example of cultural transfer between England and the Low Countries, and more particularly, of cultural translation. Peter Burke speaks in this context about a double process of 'first reaching out to appropriate something alien and then domesticating it'.<sup>11</sup> What does the English poet take over from the Dutch, and more importantly, how does he use this information to forge his own story and turn it into the personal narrative of an Englishman? We shall first analyze how Gascoigne engages with the Dutch text, and then continue by focusing on the parts that are not taken from the Dutch and that might be original experiences and/or ideas of the English soldier poet. Since, of course, the use of more written sources by Gascoigne cannot be excluded.

## Transforming a pamphlet into an eye-witness report

As Gascoigne states in his short introduction, he had heard in Antwerp only one name of a Spanish nobleman involved in the sack, calling him Dom Emanuel. As he had not found this name in the Dutch pamphlet, he introduced an extra sentence on Dom Emanuel in between paragraphs he translated from the Dutch. When giving his version of the famous anecdote on the Spanish mutineers who did not want to eat and drink before the attack until they could do so in Antwerp, he neatly introduced a ‘as I have hearde credibly reported’.<sup>12</sup>

In the central part of his text, Gascoigne really seems to be writing about his own experiences as he narrates how he took his sword and cloak and went to see for himself what was happening in the streets. He then describes how he met people on the streets and he asked a man standing armed in front of his door what it all meant: ‘who answered me in these words, Helas mounseieur, il ny a poynt de ordre & voila la ruine de ceste ville’. He then continues his walk meeting a young Walloon trumpeter who also cries out a phrase in French he quotes.<sup>13</sup>

However, the whole paragraph is completely based on the Dutch original in which the Walloon trumpeter is introduced, indeed crying out the same ‘Où est-ce que vous enfuyez Canaille? Faisons teste pour l’honneur de la Patrie’. And the pamphlet then continued with ‘Et quelqu’un luy respondit: Helas monsieur, il n’y a point d’ordre, & voila la ruine de ceste ville’. Gascoigne turns himself into the person who had asked this question, but separating it from the anecdote of the Walloon trumpeter. This part of his walk through the streets is therefore a complete fiction, created by Gascoigne to put himself in the scene as somebody actually present in the streets. At this point, one starts wondering whether he really had left the English House of the merchants at all, as he claims to have done. Another poignant example of transformation:

At least all the world wyll beare mee witnes, than ten (yea twenty dayes) after, whosoever were but poynted at, and named to bee a Wallon, was immediatly massacred without furder audience or tryall. For mine owne part, it is wel known that I did often escape very narrowly, because I was taken for a Wallone.<sup>14</sup>

This paragraph is wonderfully and skillfully transformed into a personal memory, maybe overdoing it slightly by the use of elements like ‘all the world wyll beare mee witnes’ and ‘it is wel known that’, and introducing maybe a little too much terror and dramatism with his ‘immediatly massacred’ and ‘I did often escape very narrowly’. The poet in Gascoigne could not restrain himself. In reality, he had started fantasizing after reading a much more generally set phrase in the pamphlet explaining the difficult situation of the Walloons:

Daer en boven wel twintich daghen nae de furie al wat sy voor Walen conden vinden, moest-ent met den doodt becoopen alsoo dat vele andere uut suspicie van dier natie te wesen noch mede vermoort werden sonder eenich advys oft audientie.<sup>15</sup>

We find a comparable ingenious rhetorical strategy when he presents himself talking to Spanish soldiers as an active courageous actor:

I have talked with sundry of them, and demaunded why they would command that the Townehouse should be burned? And their aunswer was, because it was the place of assembly where all eveyll counselles were contrived. As though it were just that the stockes & stones should suffer for the offence of men. But such is their obstynate pride and arrogancie, that if they might have their wyll, they woulde raze & destroy the Townes, untill no one stone were left uppon another.<sup>16</sup>

This seemingly reflection of a conversation between Gascoigne and some Spanish soldiers and the successive negative judgment, again is taken from the Dutch pamphlet:

Ende daer beneven hebben sy moetwillich verbrant dat statelicke stadthuys met alle die monumenten ende olde loeffelicke recorden ende gedachtenissen seggende dat daer de vergaderinghe hadde gheweest van alle boose raedt en verraderische aenslagen'.<sup>17</sup>

In essence, he takes the element of 'moedwillig', deliberate, as an incentive to put the words in the mouths of some Spanish soldiers as questioned by himself.

When the pamphlet tells us about 'want sy niet en spaerden oudt noch ionck, vrient noch vyant, Italiaen noch Portegis',<sup>18</sup> Gascoigne thought it more expressive to improve the last comparison just a little bit into 'they spared neither friende nor foe: Portingal nor Turke', leaving the rest of the sentences intact.<sup>19</sup> As stated already before, what was supposed to be a sad remembrance of a poor English merchant, has nothing to do with a personal experience, as could have been easily the case, since it is again an almost literal translation of the Dutch pamphlet.

In a dramatic description of the dead bodies lying all over the place, Gascoigne copied the part of the people drowned and of poor Germans lying dead in their armor, some with their heads and shoulders burnt off, but then he enriches the text with some learned comparisons and more expressive images that may come from his own observations or from his own imagination: 'where a man might behold as many sundry shapes and formes of mans motion at time of death: as ever Mighel Angelo dyd portray in his tables of Doomes day'. Gascoigne was at that time fully into the theme, as he had just published a moral treatise called the *Droomme of Doomes day* in that very same year. And a second addition to the text:

So that you might looke down into the bulk & brest and there take an anatomy of the secrets of nature. Some standing uppon their waste, being burnte of by the thighes; & some no more but the very toppe of the brain taken of with fyre, whiles the rest of the body dyd abide unspeakable torments.<sup>20</sup>

And then he continues again with phrases taken from the pamphlet that complete the created picture. The above mentioned examples make it totally impossible to question the chronological order of the creation of the two texts, as it would have been utterly foolish and completely incomprehensible for anybody to convert Gascoigne's smooth text into that of the anonymous pamphlet. This possibility will therefore not be considered any further in this article.

## An Englishman in Antwerp during the Spanish Fury

In his preliminary ‘to the reader’ Gascoigne attempted to limit the negative effects his text might have in England, explaining that only plain soldiers had finally entered the building of the English merchants during the sack and nobody of the Spanish elite. He hoped that the friendship between Elizabeth I and Philip II would remain ‘firme and unviolate’. He had forgotten to mention this within the text as it was written in haste. Gascoigne clearly seems to have been afraid of creating enemies at court. Though he has been called a protégé of the Earl of Leicester, his pacifying remark on the relations between Philip II and Elizabeth I does not seem to coincide with Leicester’s more aggressive policy.<sup>21</sup>

According to the rhetoric of the time, he sets off stating his initial intention to be completely impartial and to ‘set downe a plaine truthe, for the satisfyng of sutche as have hetherto beene caried aboute with doubtful reportes’. However, he almost directly reveals his impartiality: ‘it is then to bee understoode that the sackyng & spoyle of Antwerpe hath been (by all lylelyhoode) longe pretended by the Spanyerds’, a statement surrounded by terminology that perfectly fits the tradition of the Black Legend. He also uses the preceding so-called Spanish Fury of Maastricht to explain the behavior of the citizens of Antwerp. It is not likely that this first part of the text was written without the help of some other, unknown external sources, seen the degree of detail on the events at Walem and Maastricht.

In the central part of the text we come across another large paragraph that cannot be traced back to the pamphlet, and that is recounted in a very personal manner. It starts at the English House where he was lodged. As said, he claims to have left the house when the fighting had already begun. However, the first encounters with people on the streets are creations of Gascoigne’s imagination, invented with the help of the pamphlet, as we have seen earlier. He then continues with his visit to the stock exchange, the *Bourse*. For the moment we must give him the benefit of the doubt about the description he gives of people running him over whilst fleeing the fighting. He was thinking: ‘What in Gods name doe I heare which have no interest in this action?’<sup>22</sup>

He then manages to regain the English House, but ‘without vaunte be it spoken, passed through five hundred shotte, before I could recover the English house’. He said to his fellow-countrymen that the Spanish had entered the city and he expressed his hope that they had gone back again to the castle by then. We might have doubts about the number of five hundred shots, but the rest of the story seems quite plausible. He had gone to the *Bourse*, had been overrun by people fleeing and had returned home with shots fired everywhere around him and then hoping the Spanish would return to the castle and all would be over. He went to the governor of the English House and

privily perswaded him to drawe in the company and to shut up the gates: The which he consented unto, and desyred me because I was somewhat better acquaynted with such matters then the Marchauntes, to take charge of the key: I tooke it willingly, but before I coulede well shut and barre the gates, the Spanyardes were nowe come forwards into the same streat.

One shot almost hit him on his nose and made a hole in the gate of the English House. Nonetheless, the Spaniards did not attempt to enter the house through the gate and continued their chase elsewhere. Gascoigne's action here presents him as a real leader in the defense of the house of the English merchants, using his experience as a soldier in the Dutch Revolt. This part of the *Spoyle of Antwerp* may until further notice be considered as a description of the real-life experience of Gascoigne.

In the last few pages of *The Spoyle* we return to the English House and again he turns out to be the hero of the day. When the Spanish soldiers threaten the governor he intervenes:

I wyll not boast of any helpe afforded by me in that distresse: but I thanke the Lorde God, who made mee an instrument to appease their devillish furies. And I thinke that the governour and the company wyll confesse that I used mine uttermost skylly and ayde for the safegarde of theyr lyves, as well as mine own.<sup>23</sup>

Was Gascoigne also the real hero in reality? Other sources seem to indicate that it was the English catholic émigré George Norton who through his calm intervention succeeded in avoiding the spilling of any blood by the Spanish soldiers.<sup>24</sup> However, in a letter from the merchants adventurers written from Antwerp on November 10 to the Privy Council, we can read: 'the discourse of these tragedies we omitt, and referre the same to be reported to Your Lordes by this bringer Mr. George Gaston, whose humanitie in this tyme of trouble we for our partes have experimented'. As Gascoigne had been serving as a soldier for several years, his brave conduct, certainly in the company of merchants, does not need to be doubted.<sup>25</sup>

The exact truthfulness of Gascoigne's account should be studied with the help of more sources from the side of the merchant adventurers, but we can clearly see that here the *Spoyle of Antwerpe* demonstrates a classical aspect of early modern memoir writing: it serves as defense of somebody's personal actions. However, in the case of a text published anonymously, this function must not have been that prominent. Nonetheless, it might be the reflection of a possible manuscript memoir written for the governors of the merchant adventurers in London, or even 'to delyver the same unto her Majestie and counsell in such sort as I beheld it there'.<sup>26</sup> Gascoigne always looks for an entry into the royal court, and of course he had been accused of treason during the war. Recently, Philip West even stated that 'Gascoigne had a vested interest in seeming to tell the truth'.<sup>27</sup>

Almost at the end of his text, Gascoigne evaluates the events in Antwerp. The Spanish and their faction were only with five thousand men, and 'the trenches made againste them of suche height as seemed invincible'. Within the city there were fifteen or sixteen thousand able and well-armed men, and nevertheless it was won in three hours. For one part this 'miraculous victory' was the result of the capacities of the Spanish troops, 'Caesar him selfe had never any suche souldiours'. However, they should have had much more order after the victory. 'Their daily trade in spoiling hath made them the cunningest ransackers of houses, and the best able to bring a spoyle unto a quicke market, of any souldiours, or mastertheeves that ever I heard of'.<sup>28</sup> But the main cause of the events lied in the 'iniquitie' of the inhabitants, causing 'Gods just wrath'. 'For

surely the inhabitants lacked but good guides and leaders: for having none other order appointed, but to stande everye man armed in readynes before his doore'. And while they so died as easy victims of the royal troops, the Walloon and German soldiers that were supposed to defend the inhabitants fled like animals.

## Gascoigne's fame

George Gascoigne was an eye-witness of the Spanish Fury, and the *Spoyle of Antwerp* can surely be taken as an eye-witness account of the events. However, it was not written by one witness, but at least by two, and maybe even by more as we may assume that Gascoigne has made use of multiple sources, especially for the period leading up to the Fury that he did not find in the Dutch pamphlet. It does not make the information contained within the text any less valid, but we have to evaluate it as an example of cultural transfer between England and the Low Countries.

We should also be cautious when writing about the self and about eye-witnessing accounts. Because of the supposed autobiographical character of the text, it has gained the preference of a great many authors. We wish to hear the personal and individual voice of the past and prefer this to the anonymous voices that are so omnipresent in the Early Modern world. Especially when a text can be connected to such a famous author as Gascoigne, an example for writers such as Spenser, Sidney and Shakespeare, and a moralist, satirist, dramatist, sonneteer, courtly poet and deviser of courtly entertainments.<sup>29</sup>

Peter Arnade makes ample use of Gascoigne in his book on the narratives of the Dutch Revolt.<sup>30</sup> All the quotes he distills from the *Spoyle of Antwerp* are however not of the making of the English poet, but come out of the pencil of the anonymous author of the pamphlet, proving that some of the most important quotes used in the historical debate have a different origin. The parts of the *Spoyle* that do belong to him are either general remarks, in part personal opinions, but often related to the general discourse of the Black Legend, or the less interesting stories on his own experience in and around the English house in Antwerp.

The *Spoyle* is also regarded as the principal source of the famous anti-Spanish play *A Larum for London*.<sup>31</sup> Gascoigne has even been named as one of the authors and already in 1872 both works were printed together. I do not doubt the fact that the anonymous author of the play, first published in 1602, may have made use of *The Spoyle*. It is however difficult to consider Gascoigne as the main source of the play, as this British tradition seems to indicate. Hispanist Ann Mackenzie had no doubts when writing about *A Larum for London* in 1982, and recently Adam McKeown still followed the same line of argument.<sup>32</sup> However, this last author also mentions an anonymous pamphlet that has also been named as an important source of the play, *An historical discourse or rather a tragicall historie of the citie of Antwerpe*, dated 1586. The date of publication suggests a direct relation with the fall of Antwerp in 1585, that may have returned the story of the Spanish Fury to the fore. The idea of the *Discourse* as an important source for the play can already be found in the early nineteenth century.<sup>33</sup> The argument against its importance as used by McKeown does not seem to hold when

we compare the play with both texts. Spanish commander Sancho Dávila and a captain of the German forces called Cornelius Vaneind both have important roles in the play, as the villain and the traitor of the story respectively. Both protagonists are present in the *Discourse* but are completely absent in Gascoigne's text. Of course, it is possible that the author of *A Larum for London* took his historical information from still other texts, but the *Discourse* is undoubtedly as convincing as a source.

This example again shows the star power of an Early Modern text with a famous name attached to it, and with all the characteristics of a personal life-story. And of course, it offers a more exciting read, better written, and easier accessible than the anonymous Dutch pamphlet. As an Anglo-Dutch text, the *Spoyle* becomes a telling example of cultural translation between England and the Low Countries demonstrating how parts of an anonymous Dutch pamphlet could be converted into an autobiographical English text.

## Summary

*The Spoyle of Antwerpe* (1576) by the English soldier poet George Gascoigne is considered both a major source on the Sack of Antwerp that took place in that same year, and a primordial example of Renaissance autobiographical writing. The finding that Gascoigne copied most of the text of his so-called witness report from a Dutch pamphlet undermines both these assumptions. As an Anglo-Dutch text, the *Spoyle* becomes an exciting example of cultural translation between England and the Low Countries, demonstrating how parts of an anonymous Dutch pamphlet were converted into an autobiographical English text.

## Notes

1 George Gascoigne, *The Complete works of George Gascoigne*, ed. by J. W. Cunliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), II, p. 590.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 586–599.

3 Ronald C. Johnson, *George Gascoigne* (New York: Twayne's Publishers, 1972), preface.

4 Hugh Dunthorne, *Britain and the Dutch Revolt 1560–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 10. Another example is the special treatment of *The Spoyle* in Marjorie Rubright, *Doppelgänger dilemmas. Anglo-Dutch relations in Early Modern English literature and culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), pp. 235–239.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 15–17; G. W. Pigman III, 'Gascoigne, George (1534/5?–1577)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2010). I have not been able to consult Gillian Austen's modern biography of George Gascoigne, published in 2008.

6 Linda Bradley Salamon, 'Gascoigne's globe: *The Spoyle of Antwerpe* and the Black Legend of Spain', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 14.1, special Issue 18 (2008), 1–38 (pp. 2, 38).

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 23–25.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 27–29.

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 34–36.

10 Leiden University Library, Thyspf: 258. The French translation: *Brieve et veritable histoire de la prise d'Anvers, et du cruel meurtre, embrasement de feu, et autres actes inhumains des Espagnols: le 4. iour de Novembre, 1576, traduite de Flamend en François*, Knuttel pamphlet collection Royal Library The Hague, 258.

11 Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia, eds., *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 10.

12 Gascoigne, p. 593.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 594.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 597.

15 'During as long as twenty days after the fury, all Walloons they could find were killed, and even many others whom they thought were of that nation, without any deliberation'.

16 Gascoigne, p. 597.

17 'They also have deliberately burned the impressive town-hall with all the monuments and the old and

- noble records and memories, saying that it was there that all the bad ideas and treacherous attacks had been planned’.
- 18 ‘Because they did not spare old nor young, friend nor foe, Italian nor Portuguese’.
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 596. For the use of the Turks in another of Gascoigne’s works: Johnson, p. 90.
- 20 Gascoigne, p. 596.
- 21 *Ibid.*, p. 590; Dunthorne, p. 25–26.
- 22 *Ibid.*, p. 595.
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 598.
- 24 Oskar de Smedt, *De Engelse natie te Antwerpen in de zestiende eeuw, 1496–1582* (Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1950–1954), I, p. 410.
- 25 J. Kervyn de Lettenhove, ed., *Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l’Angleterre sous le règne de Philippe II* (Brussels: Académie Royale, 1890), IX, no. 3230. There may be a case of mistaken identity between George Norton and George Gaston (Gascoigne).
- 26 Gascoigne, p. 599.
- 27 Philip West, ‘Early Modern war writing and the British Civil Wars’, in K. McLoughlin, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016; consulted online 1 June 2016), pp. 98–111; Y. N. Harari, *Renaissance Military Memoirs. War, History, and Identity, 1450–1600* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), pp. 98–100.
- 28 Gascoigne, p. 599.
- 29 Gillian Austen, ‘Self-portraits and self-presentation in the work of George Gascoigne’, *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 14.1, Special issue 18 (2008), 1–34.
- 30 P. Arnade, *Beggars, Iconoclasts, and Civic Patriots. The Political Culture of the Dutch Revolt* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), pp. 249–252.
- 31 A. L. Mackenzie, ‘A study in dramatic contrasts. The siege of Antwerp in A Larum for London and El saco de Amberes’, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 59 (1982), 283–299 (pp. 286–287).
- 32 Mackenzie, p. 286–287; Adam N. McKeown, *English Mercuries. Soldier Poets in the Age of Shakespeare* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2009), pp. 83–101.
- 33 McKeown, p. 175; William S. Lancaster, ed., *A Larum for London: A critical edition of the performative text* (Dissertation Texas A&M University-Commerce, 2011); Raymond Fagel, ‘La Furia Española en el teatro. ¿Un trágico accidente de la guerra o una agresión premeditada?’, in Yolanda Rodríguez Pérez and Antonio Sánchez Jiménez, ed., *La Leyenda Negra en el crisol de la comedia. El teatro del Siglo de Oro frente a los estereotipos antibispánicos* (Madrid and Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana-Vervuert, 2016), pp. 51–66.

## Notes on contributor

Raymond Fagel is lecturer in Early Modern History at the History Institute of Leiden University.

Correspondence to: Raymond Fagel, History Institute, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands, Postbox 9515, 2300 RA. Email: [r.p.fagel@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:r.p.fagel@hum.leidenuniv.nl)