Honors College

Spring 5-2017

The Legendary King: How the Figure of King Arthur Shaped a National Identity and the Field of Archaeology in Britain

Elizabeth Gaj Proctor
University of Maine

THE LEGENDARY KING: HOW THE FIGURE OF KING ARTHUR SHAPED A

NATIONAL IDENTITY AND THE FIELD OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN BRITAIN

by

Elizabeth G. Proctor

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for a Degree with Honors

(Anthropology)

The Honors College

University of Maine

May 2017

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Sarah Harlan-Haughey, Assistant Professor of English and Honors

Dr. Gregory Zaro, Associate Professor of Anthropology and Climate Change,

Chair, Department of Anthropology

Dr. Mimi Killinger, Associate Professor of Honors, Rezendes Preceptor for the Arts

Dr. Daniel Sandweiss, Director, School of Policy and International Affairs, Professor of Anthropology and Quaternary and Climate Studies, Cooperating Professor of Earth and Climate Sciences and Global Policy

Dr. Joel Anderson, Lecturer in History

Abstract

The legend of King Arthur has spread throughout Western Culture to such an extent that he is a world-wide symbol of courtly chivalry, justice, and rightful kingship. The question of Arthur's existence has captured public fascination and ignited scholarly debate. To understand this fascination, we need to look at the development of Arthurian legend by examining the historical context in which the nation of Great Britain was created through the overpowering of indigenous cultures and a consolidation of medieval kingdoms by outside groups. Drawing from archaeological evidence, historic, and current sources, we can understand King Arthur's role as a symbol of Britain, which has affected the narrative of Tintagel Castle as the birthplace of King Arthur.

Tintagel Castle is a major tourist destination and is currently undergoing excavations. These have been widely publicized, following a tradition of linking archaeological evidence and artifacts to Arthurian legend. This research delves into the rhetoric used to justify support for Arthurian archaeology. The legend of King Arthur is not a static story, yet most people know only one version of it. The proto-nationalist forces that shaped the legend of King Arthur, combined with the commercialization that surrounds the archaeology of Arthurian sites, promote an idealized version of British history, which continues to affect current events and the national identity of British peoples. There needs to be a more nuanced, responsible approach Arthur to reflect archaeological evidence and real history. To conclude this thesis, I will suggest possible alternatives to the current presentation of Tintagel.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The story of King Arthur that we know and love, from musicals, comedies, novels, and Disney films, is the result of a combination of English ethnocentrism and politicized romanticism. King Arthur, with his beautiful but unfaithful wife and his caravan of chivalrous knights, has captured the Western imagination in a way that not many other figures from folklore have. King Arthur has become a symbol of British-ness worldwide, the "once and future king".[1] This, in turn, has affected the practice of archaeology in the British Isles. The mere mention of Arthur can turn archaeological digs into a media frenzy. Government organizations have butted heads with local minority groups over treatment of archaeological sites. The idea of King Arthur is much more complex than our popular conception of him can accurately convey.

To examine the complicated relationship between the archaeology of Arthur and the reality of his story, it may be best to start at the beginning. To be clear the King Arthur we are familiar with did not exist. There was no king presiding over the Round Table at Camelot, relying on his chivalrous knights and the wisdom of Merlin to make sure justice was done. Instead, the first shadowy mentions of Arthur show a warrior, capable of leading thousands of soldiers and killing hundreds of men in a single battle. These side mentions of Arthur's prowess, like the line in the welsh poem of the 9th century *Y Gododdin* which praised a warrior of legendary prowess, "though he was no Arthur"[2], evolved into the Romances containing the characters familiar to today's readers. This change mirrors the social and political changes in Great Britain from the

---

[1] *The Once and Future King* was used as the title of the popular novel by T. H. White, although it originated with Sir Thomas Malory in *Le Morte D'Arthur*.
[2] Ashe, Geoffrey and Norris J. Lacy, *The Arthurian Handbook*. (New York, Routledge, 2009), 21

end of the Roman occupation to the medieval period. Bands of Celtic warriors united under local kings were subjected to multiple invasions, first of Anglo-Saxons then Norman forces. Arthur, local hero-warrior, becomes King Arthur, symbol of justice, chivalry and kingly power through works such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*. Geoffrey of Monmouth was the first extant writer to suggest Tintagel in Cornwall as the birthplace of King Arthur, leading Richard of Cornwall to build his castle there in 1235.[3] This opened the door for others who wanted to associate themselves with the legendary Arthur by way of location, tapping into some of his power as heirs to his kingdom.

Almost as long as the King Arthur legend has existed, there has been a fascination with the material culture of King Arthur and his court. As early as the eleventh century, the monks at Glastonbury Abbey were claiming their location was the final resting place of King Arthur and Queen Guinevere, a politically motivated claim because they were in desperate need of financial and royal support.[4] Since then, sites related to King Arthur have been among the earliest slated for preservation by the British government, investigated with cutting-edge technology, and on the receiving end of numerous sources of funding to inform their preservation and promote the growing heritage tourism industry in Britain.[5]

The heritage tourism industry surrounding Arthurian sites has its advantages and disadvantages. One advantage is the funding and technology provided by organizations

---

[3] Radford, C. A. Ralegh, *Tintagel Castle,* (London, HM Stationary Office, 1937), 3
[4] Ashe and Lacy, *Handbook, 61*
[5] Examples of this include Leslie Alcock's use of magnetometry at Cadbury Castle between 1966 and 1970, current Tintagel work, funded by English Heritage, and the list of sites with Arthurian sites included in the Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1882.

like English Heritage, a trust which supports hundreds of historically significant

monuments and sites throughout Great Britain. On the other hand, in order to be

financially sustainable as a tourist destination, English Heritage must sometimes pander

to the general knowledge or the expectations of the public, which can cause disputes with

local organizations and historians. In one instance, English Heritage faces a long-

standing grudge from local groups in Cornwall, the location of their largest Arthurian

site, Tintagel Castle. These disputes cast a shadow on English Heritage and their

operations at Tintagel Castle.

Tintagel Castle is an interesting case study for anyone interested in the

relationship between Arthurian legend and archaeology. The direct references to Tintagel

Castle as the birthplace of King Arthur were not prevalent in the literature until the works

of Geoffrey of Monmouth introduced it in the twelfth century[6], but the reverence towards

Tintagel by Arthurian enthusiasts has cemented its place in the legendary canon.

Tintagel, geographically, is in historically Celtic territory, home of people who originally

spoke a Brythonic language and were not Romanized. Cornwall was a part of the ancient

kingdom of Dumonia, which historically clashed with the kingdom of Wessex and later,

Anglo-Saxon England.[7] Arthur's birth at Tintagel would make him a Celtic, Cornish

king, not an Anglo-Saxon or even a Norman one, a distinction felt keenly by Cornwall's

residents. The ruins of Tintagel are those of a twelfth-century castle, built by a Norman

Earl.[8] However, archaeologists have found evidence of earlier occupation at Tintagel,

indicating its importance well before the Romantic writers made it Arthurian.

---

[6] Ashe and Lacy, *Handbook, 37*
[7] Bernard Deacon, *A Concise History of Cornwall,* (Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 2007), 16
[8] Radford, *Tintagel Castle,* 3

In short, this paper sets out to examine the complicated political relationship that drove the creation of King Arthur as a historical figure and romantic character type, and further made him a symbol of an English national identity. Drawing from the early manuscripts as well as the medieval romances, it will attempt to explain the changes to Arthur's personality in the context of the creation of the unified nation of Great Britain. The inclusion of the archaeology of sites historically represented as Arthurian stems from an attempt to understand the motivation behind such excavations and the way they are presented to the public. Examining one site, Tintagel Castle, more closely offers a glimpse into the public fascination with King Arthur and forces a closer look at the presentation of King Arthur to the public. The goal of archaeology is to learn about the past through material culture, but we must also be able to present the past in a way that increases understanding of the reality of human history. To start, we will explore the origins of Arthur in literature. This is, admittedly, a larger body of work than this thesis could hope to cover, but we will focus on works that connect Arthur to real places in England or significantly changed the existing narrative. We will briefly touch upon some proposed theories for the existence of a historical Arthur, as these inform the next section on Arthurian Archaeology. We will be using Tintagel Castle as a case study for the effects of tourism on an active archaeological site. Tintagel Castle is managed by English Heritage, so it will be necessary to understand their role in the heritage tourism industry in Britain. English Heritage has faced criticism of and opposition to their management of Tintagel, so we will be exploring some of the arguments against them. In that same vein, the following chapter will be a critique of the media coverage of Arthurian sites. To conclude, I will explain why it is necessary to learn about the cultural

impact of the treatment of the legend of King Arthur, and offer some solutions for

moving forward in a socially and historically conscious way.

CHAPTER 1

How A General Became A King

The Origins and Development of Arthurian Literature

The legend of King Arthur has permeated Western culture to such an extent that the names of Arthur, Guinevere, Merlin and Lancelot are familiar to most people, even those outside of the specialized field of medieval literature. The story of King Arthur proves time and time again to put the "popular" in popular culture, resulting in animated films, musicals, low-budget comedies, numerous books, and many works of visual art. Some of these works are still recognizable to a modern audience, while some have been exiled to the libraries of specialists. There are countless references to the legend of King Arthur in works whose subject matter is far removed from medieval England. But all of these iterations of Arthur seem to stem from the same general storyline- that popularized by Geoffrey of Monmouth in *Historia regum Britanniae*. In these modern, popularized versions of the Arthurian tale, Arthur is at the head of a noble team of knights, the Round Table, with Merlin the wizard at his side and the tragic Queen Guinevere in his bed. These characters endure from Medieval versions of the legend, but there is a revolving door of secondary characters, like the Lady of the Lake and Sir Balin, who appear in

varying degrees of popularity in different versions of the legend in medieval times, but have fallen by the wayside in today's popular culture.   However, Geoffrey of Monmouth was far from the first to write about a legendary figure named Arthur in England, and he was certainly not the last to alter the legend to fit his needs. While it would be impossible for this thesis to cover all of the major works concerning Arthur from the earliest mentions to the modern day, we will be covering some of the most influential and recognizable works until the end of the nineteenth century.

To learn about the origins of Arthurian legend, we turn to *The Arthurian Handbook,* an extensive guide to the various iterations of Arthur's existence. Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe offer a succinct, easy to follow guide, helpful to those beginning their foray into the world of Arthurian literature.   Geoffrey Ashe is, of course, a name worth mentioning for his prolific role in Arthurian scholarship, as well as his role as a co-founder of the Camelot Research Committee, which played an important role in attempting to connect real archaeological discoveries to the legend of King Arthur.

For Lacy and Ashe, the first indication of the presence of Arthur in British folklore comes from *Historia Brittonum,* compiled in Latin by Nennius around the beginning of the ninth century. Nennius mentions Arthur in a single chapter referring to the conflict between the Saxons and the Britons. The passage speaks to Arthur's prowess as a military leader, saying "Arthur fought against them in those days with the kings of the Britons, but he himself was a leader of battles", and recounting the battle of Badon, "in which nine hundred and sixty men fell in one day from one charge by Arthur, and no

one overthrew them except himself alone".[9] For Lacy and Ashe, this vague passage

raises the question of what the early Arthur's role was—a high king or primarily a

military commander.[10] The role of Arthur as a warrior is repeated often in the early

references to his deeds. The *Annales Cambriae* also mentions the battle of Badon and the

end of Arthur. At Year 93, an entry which approximately corresponds with the year 539

CE, it is written that the remarkable events were, "The strife of Camlann, in which Arthur

and Medraut fell. And there was plague in Britain and in Ireland".[11] Here we can begin

to see references to what would eventually become the beloved tale of Arthur. Medraut

is an early version of Mordred, and his role is an example of one that has shifted

drastically through various iterations of the legend- first a potential ally in the *Annalles

Cambriae,* to a usurper of the throne in *Historia regnum Britanniae,* an illegitimate,

traitorous nephew in the Vulgate, and finally, the love child of an incestuous night

between Arthur and his half-sister Morgause in Malory.[12] Other characters who begin to

appear, as prototypes of later, still-recognizable characters, include

Gauvain/Walewein/Gwalchmai (Sir Gawain)[13], Cai/Cei/Keie (Sir Kay)[14], and

Guenevere/Guenever/Ginover/Gwendoloena/Gaynor/Waynor/Gwenhwyfar

(Guinevere)[15], among other members of Arthur's entourage.

 The legend of Arthur, the powerful warrior, took a different tack with the work of

Geoffrey of Monmouth. Through *Historia Regnum Britanniae,* the *History of the Kings*

---

[9] Ashe and Lacy, *Handbook,* 13

[10] Ibid., 13

[11] Ibid., 16

[12] Lupack, Alan, *The oxford guide to Arthurian literature and legend*, (New York; Oxford [England], Oxford University Press, 2005), 461-462

[13] Ibid., 445

[14] Ibid., 453

[15] Ibid., 449

of Britain, Geoffrey has influenced the Arthurian legend since the mid-twelfth century

CE. Geoffrey is the first to introduce Merlin as a wizard and advisor to Uther Pendragon

and his son, King Arthur.[16] He is also the first to name Arthur's mother, the beautiful

Ygerna (Igraine), wife of the Duke of Cornwall, and to situate Arthur's conception (and

likely birth) at Tintagel Castle.[17] Geoffrey names Arthur's sword Caliburn, locates his

court at Caerleon-upon-Usk, and designates Mordred as Arthur's traitorous nephew.[18]

One explanation for the popularity of Geoffrey's version of the Arthurian tale is

that it is in keeping with medieval traditions of authorship and therefore was a reliable

source for other medieval authors. Geoffrey claimed to have translated *Historia Regnum*

Britanniae from a much earlier British source, although such a source was never found

and can never be proven to have existed.[19] As pointed out in *The Arthurian Handbook,*

"medieval storytellers seldom strove to be original...Medieval minds valued authority and

tradition; medieval authors often claimed to be drawing on previous authors…even when

they were not".[20] Additionally, earlier, traditionally Celtic versions of Arthur, if they

existed, would have existed as oral tradition. Early Welsh mentions of Arthur, which

Lacy and Ashe call "proto-Arthurian literature,"could have been calling on the Briton's

druidic traditions of oral mythology transmitted through poetry in the form of Welsh

bards.[21] The transmission of culture through oral traditions inevitably results in a fluidity

of certain details. Individual storytellers have their own worldviews and agendas, which

results in plot changes and omissions of those details deemed unimportant. Perhaps

---

[16] Ashe and Lacy, *Handbook,* 37
[17] Ibid., 37
[18] Idib., 38
[19] Ibid., 40
[20] Ibid., 2
[21] Ibid., 19-20

Geoffrey of Monmouth's fully realized tale filled in some of the blanks in the story of Arthur's origin that were lost as the tale was retold from generation to generation.

Geoffrey's work also provides a glimpse into the early impact of nationalism on Arthur. In Geoffrey's work, Arthur is an enemy of the Scottish people, and during the reign of the Plantagenets, the nobility claimed him as a fully English king.[22] This left Scottish writers split on how to approach Arthurian Legend. In John of Fordun's 1385 work, *Chronica Gentis Scotorum,* he writes that while he does not find Arthur to be an objectionable character, the throne should have gone to Gawain or Mordred, the two Scots in Arthur's court.[23] Later Scottish writers were even more critical of Arthur, perhaps reflecting moments of contemporary Scottish opposition to English rule. This fight against the Anglicization of Arthur is an ongoing issue, especially in Cornwall.

The work of Chrétien de Troyes in the twelfth century, in the shape of five romances and two epic poems, heavily influences perceptions of Arthur today.[24] The changes Chretien de Troyes made to the legend allowed him to "present the King as a secondary character… [in] the position of patriarch".[25] The knights in the work of Chretien de Troyes are expected to adhere to a certain set of standards and codes, "to serve God, King, justice and morality, their ladies, and the cause of all who are in need. They are expected to develop their military skills, perfect their moral state, and exhibit appropriate social behavior".[26] But since no one wants to read about people who are perfect all the time, Chretien de Troyes creates drama and action through the conflicting

---

[22] Ibid., 60
[23] Ibid., 60
[24] Ibid., 68
[25] Ibid., 69
[26] Ibid., 69

messages of practice of Arthurian chivalry, human desire, and spiritual perfection.[27] This

quest for spiritual perfection informed one of Chretien de Troyes most enduring

additions- the Holy Grail. While references to the Holy Grail in Arthurian materials

today are referencing the chalice of the Last Supper (a clarification made by Robert de

Boron at the end of the twelfth century), Chretien de Troyes' Holy Grail was a platter

which held a single mass wafer.[28]

From this time forward, Arthurian tales appear in German, Dutch, Spanish,

Portuguese, Scandinavian, and Italian literature as well as English and French. He has

already become somewhat of a worldwide phenomenon by the time of Thomas Malory's

famous *Le Morte D'Arthur,* published in 1485 by William Caxton.[29] In the words of

Geoffrey Ashe and Norris J. Lacy, Malory "[marked] the culmination of medieval

Arthuriana, [and] exerted an immeasurable influence on the Arthurian tradition,

especially English and American, of the modern world."[30] The major changes Malory

made include reordering episodes, reemphasizing certain scenes, and elimination of some

events.[31] Lacy and Ashe see these changes as a result of Malory's contemporary cultural

climate, writing "It may be more to the point to admit that neither narrative techniques

nor literary tastes in fifteenth century England were what they had been in thirteenth

century France."[32]

After Malory, we skip forward about four hundred years to the work of Alfred,

Lord Tennyson in the 1800s. In 1850, Tennyson was appointed Poet Laureate by Queen

---

[27] Idid., 69
[28] Ibid., 73
[29] Ibid., 128
[30] Ibid., 121
[31] Ibid., 128
[32] Ibid., 131

Victoria, and in 1859 he published *The Idylls of the King*, a composite work made up of twelve poems concerning events in the life of King Arthur.[33] According to Lacy and Ashe, "his poetry was in large part responsible for the great flowering of Arthurian poetry during the Victorian period."[34] Tennyson is a master of the melancholy, and his poem "The Passing of King Arthur" at the end of *The Idylls* is haunting to say the least. Tennyson describes the scene after the final battle between Arthur and Mordred, writing,

> Last, as by some one deathbed after wail
>
> Of suffering, silence follows, or through death
>
> Or deathlike swoon, thus over all that shore,
>
> Save for some whisper of the seething seas,
>
> A dead hush fell; but when the dolorous day
>
> Grew drearier toward twilight falling, came
>
> A bitter wind, clear from the North, and blew
>
> The mist aside, and with that wind the tide
>
> Rose, and the pale King glanced across the field
>
> Of battle: but no man was moving there;
>
> Nor any cry of Christian heard thereon,
>
> Nor yet of heathen; only the wan wave

---

[33] https://www.britannica.com/biography/Alfred-Lord-Tennyson
[34] Ashe and Lacy, *Handbook,* 158

Brake in among dead faces, to and fro

Swaying the helpless hands, and up and down

Tumbling the hollow helmets of the fallen,

And shivered brands that once had fought with Rome,

And rolling far along the gloomy shores

The voice of days of old and days to be.[35]

The somberness found in Tennyson's *Idylls* resulted from his desire to use the legend of King Arthur to make a statement about the morality of the Victorian age, instead of faithfully repeating medieval themes.[36] The themes apparent in Tennyson's work, and in this passage, in particular, are connected to the overall treatment of the legend of King Arthur. There is a distinct dichotomy between in-groups and out-groups, between us and them, Christians and heathens, Britons and Romans, the living and the dead. This is a distinction felt today in Cornwall, where the division for many people lies between the Cornish and the English. He also mirrors the theme of the "once and future king" when he mentions "days old and days to be." He draws heavily from Malory for his source material, something for which some readers, both Victorian and modern, have criticized him.[37] Lacy and Ashe write that "the accusations of his critics are tantamount to a proscription against the use of his sources as inspiration dictates."[38] The legend of King Arthur has been built in layers, with each author drawing from previous source material

---

[35] Alfred Tennyson, "The Passing of Arthur", *The Idylls of the King,*
https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems-and-poets/poems/detail/45325#poem
[36] Ashe and Lacy, *Handbook*, 159
[37] Ibid., 162
[38] Ibid., 162

along the way. Tennyson is just following tradition when it comes to building an original work based on an existing literary tradition.

The appearance of Arthur in literature did not stop with Tennyson, but our discussion of the origins and subsequent changes to the legend will. By the twentieth century, the major plot points of Arthurian legend were well established. This is not to say that no iconic works concerning Arthur have emerged during the past century or so. One has to look no further than T. H. White's *Once and Future King,* or on a less serious note, the 1975 film *Monty Python and the Holy Grail* to see this is not the case. With the various technological advances of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, writing one's own version of the legend of King Arthur has become easier than ever. But these prolific works seem to have one thing in common: they draw from already established characters and storylines. It is now hard to imagine a world in which the name King Arthur is not immediately recognizable in the West, and for some scholars, this abundances of sources implies a historical existence. The next chapter will cover several of these proposed theories, to get a sense of how strongly some people support a historic Arthur.

CHAPTER 2

No Smoke Without Fire

The Case for a 'Historical' Arthur

Those who believe that King Arthur, or a figure like him, did exist fall into two

camps. There are those who are staunch supporters of a historical Arthur, a real British

King from the fifth or sixth century, and those who hold that Arthur is a composite figure

with characteristics drawn from multiple important figures from post-Roman Britain. It is

easy to see the appeal of both of these opinions. On the one hand, a historical Arthur

provides a point of pride for the British people, because he has become a representation

of a chivalrous, ideal king. On the other, it is perhaps more realistic to consider multiple

points of origin which then combined into this larger than life figure.

Kings of the past had strong reasons to support a historical Arthur. Stories

revolving around Arthur have consistently enjoyed success, and due to their vague

connections to any real history, Arthur is the king who can do no wrong. Unlike the real

kings, such as Henry VIII, who drew on his name and image at various points in Britain's

history, Arthur did not have to face the scrutiny of his contemporaries, or any real,

physical threat to his position of power. Geoffrey of Monmouth promoted the idea of

Arthur as a historical figure, and Lacy and Ashe explain his motivation by saying that not only was Geoffrey intending to glorify the Celtic past of the Britons, but "[perhaps] he also wanted to flatter the Norman conquerors by giving their island realm a splendid pedigree and making out that their territories in France had been under the same crown before"[39]

In the sixteenth century, John Leland, a sixteenth century chaplain to King Henry VIII and the King's self-proclaimed antiquarian, toured the country, exploring church libraries and examining visible antiquities in England and Wales. Perhaps inspired by the larger than life king in whose name he worked, Leland wrote in his *Itinerary* that Cadbury was the contemporary name for Camelot, a fact seized upon four hundred years later by Leslie Alcock in his archaeological quest for Camelot. Of Cadbury, he wrote "At the very south ende of the chirch of South-Cadbyri Cath bellum standith Camallate, sumtyme a famose toun or castelle, apon a very torre or hille, wunderfully enstrengtheid of nature", also saying "The people can telle nothing ther but that they have hard say that Arture much resortid to Camalat".[40] He also wrote *Codrus sive Laus et Defensio Gallofridi Arturii contra Polydorum Vergilium* and *Assertio inclytissimi Arturii regis Britannia*, in response to Italian humanist Polydore Vergil's criticisms of the idea of King Arthur in *Anglica Historia*. Leland's unflagging support for a historical Arthur can be seen as a reflection of the monarch for whom he worked. King Henry VIII was a monarch much concerned with his own virility, his appearance, and the consolidation of

---

[39] Ibid., 39

[40] John Leland, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543,* (London, George Bell and Sons, 1907)

power, and the connections he could make between himself and Arthur would appeal to all of these.

It is not only kings of the past who have supported a historic Arthur, but some academics as well. Arthurian scholar Geoffrey Ashe has proposed several theories about the origins of the Arthurian legend, even writing that "The Arthurian Legend, however wide ranging in its vagaries, is rooted in Arthurian Fact."[41] Ashe supports the theory of Roman revival that led to the arrival of Arthur in British history. He points out that Artorius is a Roman name, easily changed to Arthur over time and that the dragon emblem was associated with both Roman emperors and Celtic leaders at this time, just as Uther's status is denoted by his name, Pendragon.[42] In support of a historical Arthur, Ashe writes that Arthur is based on of a real person and not an iteration of ancient Celtic Gods, because if that were the case, Gildas would have soundly denounced the Britons for apostasy.[43] Ashe makes a lot of claims about the biography of the historical Arthur that he backs up with pieces of literature cherry-picked from the Arthurian tradition, but with little material evidence. He spins a nice tale, writing that Arthur was a "rustic noble" of "dimly-Romanised stock," whose "youth was spent raiding and feuding" and who eventually "became Ambrosius' successor, and in a crude way, statesmen."[44] This makes for a good story, one that is not out of line with the mythology all around, but Geoffrey Ashe supports it as fact. He says, "No one needs to assume that the later growth of mythology casts any doubt on [this storyline]" and even compares the myths

---

[41] Geoffrey Ashe, *The quest for Arthur's Britain,* (Chicago, Academy Chicago Publishers, 1994), 27
[42] Ashe, *Quest,* 38
[43] Ibid., 39
[44] Ibid., 50

surrounding Arthur to the stories surrounding American folk heroes like Davy Crockett.[45]

However, with this assertion Ashe ignores the fact that Davy Crockett existed much

closer to our own time and that there is in fact material evidence of the life of the 'real'

Davy Crockett -- evidence which does not exist for King Arthur. The fact is, the search

for evidence and proof of Arthur's existence is likely to continue despite grim predictions

on its effectiveness.

We can see the enduring nature of this search for Arthur in the quest for the

material remains of Arthur through archaeology. The desire to connect Arthur to the

material world is something that has driven professionals and amateur archaeologists

alike in their excavations, and Arthurian sites are scattered throughout Britain. In the next

chapter, we will look at some of the most well-known archaeological searches for Arthur.

---

[45] Ibid., 50

CHAPTER 3

ARTHURIAN SITES IN BRITAIN

The legend of King Arthur becomes a part of a fascinating research paradox: how does one begin to look for something that in all likelihood doesn't exist? Archaeologists have drawn from the meager sources available in attempts to discover the material evidence of King Arthur's reign. "Up and down Britain, from the Isles of Scilly far into Scotland, there are at least one hundred and sixty places with Arthurian lore attached to them. This imposition of Arthur on the landscape had begun by the ninth century," write Lacy and Ashe in the *Arthurian Handbook.* Arthurian sites fall into several categories: those connected to Arthur by name, those mentioned in different versions of the legend, and those not explicitly mentioned, but associated by various claims in the past. This chapter will offer a brief assessment of some sites where the Arthurian connection has resulted in a search for material evidence of his presence.

One early example of a site that was associated with part of the Arthurian legend is Glastonbury Abbey in England. In 1193, Gerald of Wales wrote of the discovery of the grave of Arthur at the Abbey in 1191. Apparently, when Henry II heard of this

discovery he ordered the excavation of the grave and the monks found the grave of

Queen Guinevere as well as an iron cross with the inscription "*Hic iacet sepultus inclitus*

Rex Arturius in Insula Avalonia".[46] Conveniently, the bones and the cross had

disappeared by the sixteenth century, making it impossible to corroborate the monks'

claims with more recent accounts.[47] What we see here is the start of an alarming trend in

Arthurian archaeology playing upon the Arthurian connection for recognition and

funding. It is alarming because it conveys the sense that these sites are more worthy of

archaeological inquiry for their Arthurian connection, not for what they can tell us about

the history of the United Kingdom.

This tendency to conflate the legend of King Arthur with archaeological sources

in order to promote a certain narrative is not the sole realm of archaeologists and

journalists. It can happen in popular culture, like in the 2004 film *King Arthur.* The

movie poster tagline reads "The Untold True Story That Inspired the Legend." One does

not have to wait long for the film to begin offering "evidence" for such a claim. The

opening title page of the film says, "Historians agree that the classical 15th century tale of

King Arthur and his Knights rose from a real hero who lived a thousand years earlier in a

period called the Dark Ages. Recently discovered archaeological evidence sheds light on

his true identity." The film then jumps into the battle between the Romans and Sarmatia

to explain the origins of Lancelot. Not only is this written introduction patently false,

there is no disclaimer anywhere in the movie that this introduction solely serves the

purpose of differentiating this film from the countless other films about Arthur. To start,

---

[46] The lantin translates to "Here lies buried the renowned King Arthur in the Isle of Avalon"
Ashe and Lac, *Handbook,* 61
[47] Ibid., 61

the claim that historians agree that our current understanding of King Arthur came from the story of one man in the Middle Ages is laughable. The origins of Arthur are a major source of debate between Arthurian scholars- some believe he was a single man, some believe he is a composite figure with the traits of multiple folk heroes, and some do not believe any kind of historical Arthurian figure ever existed. Secondly, there is no definitive material evidence that Arthur existed, and there certainly was not a major discovery in the early 2000s that proved otherwise. For a general audience, this is not enough clarification about the actual development of Arthurian legend or the political and cultural climate of Britain at the end of the Roman era. As Roger Ebert put it, "I would have liked to see deeper characterizations and more complex dialogue…but today's multiplex audience, once it has digested a word like Sarmatia, feels its day's work is done."[48] People do not go to the movies and expect to go home and research the facts later. They want to hear a story, and many people trust that if it is shown in a movie and said to be historical than it must be true. While the movie *King Arthur* attempted to promote a new storyline with "archaeological evidence," there are also examples where the search was for new archaeological evidence to support the existing narrative.

This practice of using the Arthurian narrative to promote excavation can be found in the work of Leslie Alcock. Alcock had a long career in archaeology, spanning the years following World War II to his retirement in 1990. He is most well-known among archaeologists for his work on Arthurian archaeology. His fieldwork at Cadbury Castle began in 1966, at the behest of the Camelot Research Committee. Led by Sir Mortimer Wheeler, the Committee was founded in 1965 after the excavations by Ralegh Radford at

---

[48] Roger Ebert, "King Arthur," *RogerEbert.com*, July 07, 2004, hhtp://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/king-arthur-2004

Tintagel had renewed interest in Arthur and his possible material record.[49] Alcock met

Wheeler in 1950 as an attaché in Pakistan when, in the words of Wheeler himself, Alcock

had "decided to attach himself" to the then-advisor to the new Pakistani government[50].

This connection clearly proved useful later on when the Camelot Research Committee

was founded. Alcock claims that he was prepared to look at Camelot and Arthur as

historical fact[51], but his flippancy towards the possibility of a real Arthur appears quite

early in his book on the 1966-1970 excavations at Cadbury. The book is entitled *Was

This Camelot?* and is a thorough report of the archaeological fieldwork done at Cadbury.

It is not, however, a book that confirms what the title seems to suggest to the lay reader-

that Alcock is about to confirm the claims that Cadbury could be Camelot.

Quite early in the book, Alcock dashes the expectant reader's hopes, as he says

quite bluntly, "It is well to say outright that Camelot has no historical authenticity: it is a

place that never was."[52] In that case, that ought to be the end of the book. But what

Alcock is doing is something that continues to happen today. He has harnessed the name

brand power of Arthur in order to promote his archaeological work to people. Alcock

even goes so far as to say that Camelot is simply a "medieval anachronism"[53], and that

"the historical reality of Arthur himself is in no way linked to that of Camelot, and to

impugn the authenticity of the one is not to cast doubt on the other"[54]. However,

Alcock's belief in Arthur comes from lines in records from "some British monastery",

---

[49] N. J. Hingham, *King Arthur: Myth-making and History,* (London, Routledge, 2002), 27
[50] Leslie Alcock, *Was this Camelot?: Excavations at Cadbury Castle, 1966-1970*, (New York, Stein and Day, 1972), 7
[51] Alcock page number
[52] Ibid., 14
[53] Ibid., 15
[54] Ibid., 17

which refer to Arthur at the battle of Badon and his death at Camlann[55]. Alcock says that while these quotes may come from a twelfth-century copy of a tenth-century abstract and the original documents are lost, they are still "unimpeachable" sources[56]. This is a weak argument for a historical Arthur, but it appears to be necessitated by Alcock's need to convince his reader that his research at Cadbury is still tied to Arthur.

He does this through an attempt to connect the evidence of settlement at Cadbury in the post-Roman period to references to Cadbury as Camelot because the sources he cites to not explicitly name Arthur's court or its location. He claims that it "seems legitimate to use 'Camelot' as the name of this hypothetical Arthurian stronghold".[57] Alcock had financed this dig in part through the support of the *Observer*. The newspaper was granted exclusive access to information from the 1967 season, to the tune of twenty percent of the expected field budget[58]. Alcock writes, "Presumably the *Observer* hoped for sensational 'Arthurian' revelations; but in fairness I should stress that they continued to make grants in a wholly disinterested manner even after it had become obvious that there are few sensations or revelations in British archaeology"[59]. It sounds like someone at the *Observer* heard the words "Camelot" and "Arthur" in connection to the Camelot Research Committee's funding request, and not Alcock's claim that Camelot is not a historical place and does not exist. Alcock's explanation of the situation in which the dig at Cadbury was started falls in line with the tradition of pulling on the popularity of

---

[55] Alcock 17; while Alcock does not specify which sources this information comes from, it sounds like he is referring to [source]
[56] Ibid., 17
[57] Ibid., 17
[58] Ibid., 63
[59] Ibid., 64

Arthur and the mystery surrounding his material world in order to boost interest and funding, which in some ways continues to this day.

This is not to say that Alcock's work is unimportant. In fact, the abundance of evidence he uncovered at Cadbury tells the story of ongoing occupation spanning 5,000 years, from the Neolithic period to the Middle Ages. During the 1970 season, the dig uncovered what Alcock calls "the richest and most macabre archaeological deposit I have ever excavated."[60] They were working on what Alcock dubbed "the Ultimate Iron Age passage-way", the area of the south-west entrance before the Roman occupation.[61] It was in this spot that they uncovered over one hundred bronze brooches, iron pikes, javelins, a bronze plaque depicting a human face, and bone fragments belonging to the bodies of over thirty men, women, and children.[62] For Alcock and his team, this seems to be evidence of a battle between native residents of Cadbury and early Roman forces, resulting in a pile of corpse that was then ravaged by wolves. If this was the case, the conquering Romans either did not remain in Cadbury or they did not care whether or not the conquered residents received their burial rites. Then, during the late fifth and sixth centuries, Cadbury was refortified, and a large hall added to the site.[63] Alcock uses this evidence, in conjunction with information from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to postulate that Cadbury may have been a Dumonian base against Wessex in the late sixth century.[64]

Alcock also used a new procedure for archaeological prospection at the site, which he affably called the banjo. The banjo "consists of a carrying boom with a radio-

---

[60] Ibid., 105
[61] Ibid., 105
[62] Ibid., 105
[63] Ibid., 175
[64] Ibid., 182

transmitter at one end, and a receiver coil at the other. The transmitted signal is picked up by the coil, and is fed into a meter which displays the signal visually".[65] Originally they called it the Soil Conductivity Meter, but after realizing that local magnetic fields were influencing the readings, Alcock ends up referring to it as the Soil Anomaly Detector.[66] As this was a new procedure, Alcock had equipment brought in from Oxford, like a proton magnetometer, a fluxgate gradiometer, and a pulsed magnetic induction locator during the 1968 season.[67] At the time, archaeologists were not as likely as now to do their own geophysical surveys, and Alcock was able to harness a technique that was not only cost effective, but time effective and easily accessible as well. By using magnetometry for archaeological prospection, Alcock and his team were able to quickly survey the landscape to find anomalies in the geophysical survey that could yield evidence of human occupation, instead of walking field transects which takes longer and is subject to simple human error.

Not all of these proposed Arthurian sites are backed by any archaeological work. A more recent proposal for an Arthurian site comes from Peter Field, a retired professor of English from the University of Bangor in Wales. Field has proposed a new Camelot site at Slack in West Yorkshire. He told the BBC in 2016, ""It was quite by chance. I was looking at some maps, and suddenly all the ducks lined up. I believe I may have solved a 1,400-year-old mystery."[68] Field's evidence to support Slack as Camelot stems from the fact that in Roman Britain, Slack was home to the fortress Camulodonum, and that "[o]ver the years, well-recognized linguistic processes would have reduced

---

[65] Ibid., 52
[66] Ibid., 52
[67] Ibid., 54
[68] "Ex-Bangor University Professor reveals true Camelot", *BBC News,* March 30, 2013, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-wales-north-west-wales-38330272

Camulodunum to Camelot".[69] Since the end of 2016, there does not seem to be much

more investigation into Field's claims, probably because his claims have little to

substantiate them.

One of the more prominent locations connected to Arthurian legend is Tintagel

Castle in Cornwall. First mentioned in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regnum*

Britanniae as the birthplace of King Arthur, its notoriety as such has only grown over the

following centuries. Located on a rocky promontory, and accessible only by steep stairs,

it is a striking site. Ruins and stone foundations dot the landscape of Tintagel, giving it an

obvious material connection to the past. Tintagel has long fascinated archaeologists and

been the location of several excavations, the most recent of which started in the summer

of 2016. It is currently managed as a tourist destination by English Heritage, a

government trust which controls many other historic sites in England. Tintagel Castle,

with its history of excavation and current issues, is an excellent case study for examining

the various forces at play which have shaped modern understandings and meanings of

King Arthur. The next chapter will be about two important excavations at Tintagel and

their findings.

---

[69] "Ex-Bangor University Professor reveals true Camelot", *BBC*

CHAPTER 4

ARCHAEOLOGY OF TINTAGEL CASTLE

Tintagel was introduced to Arthurian legend by Geoffrey of Monmouth. In *Historia Regnum Britanniae* Geoffrey tells his readers how King Uther was so overcome by his desire for Ygerna, wife of Gorlois, Duke of Cornwall that it started a minor war. Gorlois tried to hide Ygerna away in Tintagel Castle, but the wizard Merlin disguised Uther as Gorlois so he could safely enter the Castle and seduce Ygerna. Thus was Arthur conceived.[70] While Geoffrey only explicitly mentions Tintagel as the site of Arthur's conception and makes no mention of whether his birth happened there, the reputation of Tintagel as the birthplace of Arthur has continuously grown in prominence since then. Through the years, multiple excavations have attempted to determine the role played by Tintagel in medieval history, both through its association with the legend and its true material history.

We begin our discussion of the archaeological history of Tintagel Castle with the work of C. A. Ralegh Radford, a noted British historian and archaeologist who was instrumental to the development of the field of archaeology in Britain. In 1937, he published *Tintagel Castle, Official Guide* through the Ancient Monuments and Historic Building's Commission of His Majesty's Office of works (the same division that became

---

[70] Norris J. Lacy and Geoffrey Ashe, *The arthurian encyclopedia*. Vol. 585, (New York: Garland Pub., 1986)

English Heritage half a century later). Radford was the former Inspector of Ancient Monuments for Wales and in Tintagel Castle he describes for his readers the history of the site, its medieval Norman buildings, and the Celtic site that was excavated in order to see if Geoffrey of Monmouth's claimed connections to Arthur were valid.

Radford's conclusions were that the original Castle was built in 1145, by Reginald Earl of Cornwall. After that, around 1235, Richard, "Earl of Cornwall and King of the Romans, brother of Henry III", added to the existing Great Hall with the main gate, and a walled courtyard.[71] By the fourteenth century, when the Black Prince had control of the Castle, the previous structures were in such disrepair that a new great hall had to be built. Tintagel reverted to its ruinous state.[72] Other ruins at the site belong to what Radford identifies as the Celtic Site. These are "a series of dry-built rectangular chambers" which, in conjunction with nearby graves, indicated to Radford that these were the remains of a Celtic monastery, the construction of which spanned from 400 CE to 750 CE.[73] Radford emphatically states that that "No evidence whatever has been found to support the legendary connection of the Castle with King Arthur" and he suggest that Geoffrey of Monmouth was inspired by these Celtic ruins, although his description of Tintagel must have been supplied by his "vivid imagination."[74] At the time when Geoffrey of Monmouth was writing his *Historia Regnum Britanniae,* the noble seat of Tintagel was actually at Bossiney, half a mile from the current location of the Castle, and the Castle whose ruins we see today was just being built.[75] Radford dedicates about half of the pages remaining after the introduction to the medieval Castle, and half to the Celtic

---

[71]Radford, *Tintagel Castle,* 3
[72] Ibid., 3-4
[73] Ibid., 4
[74] Ibid., 4
[75] Ibid., 5

ruins in other areas of the larger site. The focus on the Celtic part of the site, for the

purpose of this paper, stems from the fact that these ruins were likely the ones familiar to

Geoffrey of Monmouth when he was relaying the story of King Arthur.

Radford uses material evidence and historical papers to inform his interpretation

of the Castle portion of the site. He is able to trace the list of owners and differentiate

between what their individual contributions to the site were. But for the Celtic portion of

the site, Radford must rely on material evidence and his knowledge of similar sites in

Great Britain. In his description of Site A, he writes, "This site consisted of a complex of

over a dozen small rooms belonging to four different building periods. The foundations

of the 12th-century Chapel cut across the centre and the trial trenches showed that the

earlier settlement had long been ruinous when the Chapel was built."[76] He also points to

the discovery of a leachta (high grave) found on Site A. He writes that it was "originally

3 feet high and surmounted by a standing cross. The type, well known in Ireland, was

used to mark the graves of important members of the monastery."[77]   Radford postulates

that the first period of building on the site is from a small, pastoral settlement, similar to a

site in Wales, and dateable to 350-450 CE because of the absence of Roman coins and

later periods of buildings.[78] He relates the later buildings of the Celtic site with a

monastery because of the "bewildering irregularity of the plan with its many small

chambers", which he interprets as monastic cells, the "scattered grouping of the whole

---

[76] Ibid., 17
[77] Ibid., 24
[78] Ibid., 25

settlement", the presence of graves, and Leland's record of the dedication to St. Julitta, perhaps a form of a local St. Juliot.[79]

Radford addresses the Arthurian connection at the end of his guide, in a somewhat exasperated tone. He addresses the face that the material evidence of the site gives a fairly comprehensive overview of its history, and that "Further research will certainly amplify the details, but will not alter the broad outlines of the story. Yet Tintagel, in popular association, is best known for its Arthurian connections, and some attempt must be made to explain the origin of these traditions."[80] He notes that the "Dark Ages" are not known for their record keeping and reliance on fact, and the legend of King Arthur had grown in reputation from his first mentions to when Geoffrey was writing, to be a possible point of pride for the Britons.[81] Radford ends his guide by writing, "The present fame of Tintagel is due to the romantic scenery which provides a perfect setting for the Arthurian story rather than the weight or authority of genuine tradition."[82] Radford's assessment of the modern interest in the site is astute, and more and comes across as more cynical than one might expect when learning about the weight other archaeologists put on the Arthurian connections to their sites.

More recently, in the summer of 2016, the Cornwall Archaeological Unit was brought in by English Heritage to begin a five-year excavation project at Tintagel. The archaeologists were working on "one area on the southern terraces, and one on the eastern side of the headland", in an area that was not excavated by Radford or any previous

---

[79] Ibid., 25
[80] Ibid., 27
[81] Ibid., 28
[82] Ibid., 29

archaeologists.[83] According to the English Heritage blog post written by Susan Greaney, "The aim for this year was to evaluate what survived in these two locations, and so two small trenches were opened up in each area."[84] The trenches at the Eastern site yielded "a confusing jumble of stone rubble and natural outcrops, but the second trench had…a large wall about 1 metre thick" while "the southern side of the headland, the two trenches revealed a series of stone walls, some areas of paving and also a series of steps."[85] Some of the artifacts recovered from this dig included "[a]round 200 sherds of imported Mediterranean pottery" and "several pieces of fine glass vessels (some decorated), which suggests that we are looking at early medieval buildings that formed part of the high-status settlement."[86] More work will be needed at the site, and the team will be out excavating again next summer.

Even after the 2016 excavation, Tintagel still lacks any of the definitive proof of King Arthur's presence that would seem to justify the massive tourist industry that has sprung up around the site. English Heritage, the charitable trust that now owns and manages the site, utilizes any and all means of enticing visitors and tourists, and these excavations merely add fuel to the fire. At the end of the webpage explaining the basics of the dig this past summer, there is an open invitation to come visit Tintagel Castle itself – "why not explore the site for yourself"- as well as a handy list of the tickets prices of Tintagel. It is not hard to imagine a well-meaning Arthurian tourist taking this invitation too far, and meddling in an open excavation. English Heritage makes no mention on the page of how they plan to keep people away from the site on a regular basis. In exploring

---

[83] Kevin Stone, "Discoveries and excavations at Tintagel Castle," *English Heritage Blog*s, August 9, 2016, http://blog.english-heritage.org.uk/discoveries-excavations-tintagel-castle/.
[84] Stone, "Discoveries", http://blog.english-heritage.org.uk/discoveries-excavations-tintagel-castle/
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid.

the history and characterization of English Heritage's actions at Tintagel, one can see

how the coverage of the summer excavations reflects the sensationalizing character of

their presentation of Arthur. The next chapter will explore the creation of English

Heritage, and their current role managing historic sites across England.

CHAPTER 5

EXPLORING ENGLISH HERITAGE

The charitable trust that currently manages Tintagel Castle is English Heritage, created in April 2015 as an offshoot of the previously government-run English Heritage[87]. But the history of English Heritage, the successor to several government entities including the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission in the 1980s, can be traced back to the end of the nineteenth century, with the introduction of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act.

The Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1882 was introduced under Queen Victoria to allow for the protection of sites that were, for the most part, prehistoric or medieval. This could be done in several ways. The first was through the appointment of the Commissioners of Works as guardians of a monument, as designated by the monument's owners. Section 2 of the Act states that,

"Where the Commissioners of Works have been constituted guardians of a monument, they shall thenceforth, until they shall receive notice in writing to the contrary from any succeeding owner not bound by such a deed as aforesaid,

---

[87] "Our History", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-history/

maintain such monument, and shall, for the purpose of such maintenance, at all reasonable times by themselves and their workmen have access to such monument for the purpose of inspecting It, and of bringing such materials and doing such acts and things as may be required for maintenance thereof" [88].

The Act then goes on to clarify what is meant by "maintenance." The second way in which the government could take control of a monument was through the purchase of such a site through a Treasury Fund and the incorporation of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts into the Ancient Monuments Protection Act- albeit, without the provisions from the Lands Clauses Consolidations Acts that allowed the seizure of lands without an agreement between the owner and the Commissioners of Works[89]. The third way the Act allowed for the Commissioners of Works to take over a monument was simply by bequest of the owner. The official title of the Commissioners would be "Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings" in Great Britain, and "Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland" in Ireland[90]. The Act also stipulates, in Section 10, that,

"Her Majesty may, from time to time, by Order in Council, declare that any monument of a like character to the monuments described in the Schedule hereto, shall be deemed to be to an ancient monument to which the Act applies, and thereupon this Act shall apply to such monument in the same manner in all respects as if it had been described in the Schedule Here to"[91].

---

[88] *Ancient Monuments Protection Act,* 1882, Ch. 73
[89] Ibid.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.

So, in reality, there were actually four ways in which the Commissioners of Works could acquire monuments and properties. The Act was also the first piece of legislation to outline punishments for those who willfully damaged or defaced ancient monuments. At the end of the Act is included a Schedule, which is a list of sites that were to be designated as Ancient Monuments under the Act in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. Included in this Schedule are some monuments still managed by English Heritage today, like Stonehenge, and monuments with ties to Arthurian legend, including Arthur's Quoit in Glamorganshire County, Arthur's Round Table in Penrith, and Cadbury Castle in Somerset (Leslie Alcock's Camelot)[92]. The introduction of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act marks a shift in the way people were looking at history and their heritage.

Legislation continued to pave the way for the future English Heritage Trust throughout the twentieth century. The Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act of 1913 followed the first Ancient Monuments Protection Act, and allowed the Commissioners of Works more power when working with and acquiring sites. It provided for the creation of the Ancient Monuments Board to oversee the sites and for the first time granted the public access to monuments under its care[93]. The Act also allowed for the issuing of preservations orders by the Board which required all work and maintenance on monuments that were under guardianship by the board, and those that were not but were deemed historically important, to be approved by the Board before they could be carried out[94]. It also offered a more precise definition of the classifications

---

[92] Ibid.
[93] Charled Mynors, *Listed Buildings, Conservatio Areas and Monuments,* (London, Sweet & Maxwell, 2006), 9.
[94] Mynors, *Listed Buildings,* 9

of a historic or ancient monuments, clarifying that monuments were "any structure or erection other than one in ecclesiastical use," and that ancient monuments included any listed on the Schedule of the 1882 Act, any monuments similar to monuments included in the 1882 Schedule, and any monument whose preservation was of special interest because of its historical, architectural, or archaeological interest[95]. The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act served to further regulate the monument and historic places of Great Britain. The Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act of 1953 made provisions for the Historic Buildings Council for England and the Historic Buildings Council for Scotland (which were later repealed in 1983 to make room for the Historic Monuments and Buildings Commission)[96]. Various acts followed over the course of the thirty years following the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act of 1953, including a 1968 version of the Town and Country Planning Bill.

The most recent act which currently influences the management of historic sites in England is the 1983 National Heritage Act. This act would "establish Boards of Trustees of the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Science Museum, the Armouries and the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew" and "establish a Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, to confer functions on the Commission" among other provisions[97]. The functions and services of the Commission are fairly straightforward, and fall in line with some of the recognized purposes of English Heritage today. Article 33 of the Act, Section 1, lists the Commission's duties, which are:

---

[95] Ibid., 9

[97] *National Heritage Act,* 1983, c. 47

(a) to secure the preservation of ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England,

(b) to promote the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of conservation areas situated in England, and

(c) to promote the public's enjoyment of, and advance their knowledge of, ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England and their preservation.[98]

This marks the first time that the government is explicitly concerned with promoting buildings and monuments to people as attractions. In the years following 1983, tourism at sites like Tintagel Castle flourished, resulting in museums and gift shops across the country.

The functions of these duties are listed in Article 33, Section 2, which states that the Commission:

(a) shall (so far as practicable) provide educational facilities and services, instruction and information to the public in relation to ancient monuments and historic buildings, with particular reference to those in England, and in relation to conservation areas situated in England;

(b) may give advice to any person in relation to ancient monuments, historic buildings and conservation areas situated in England, whether or not they have been consulted;

---

[98] Ibid.

(c)may, for the purpose of exercising their functions, carry out, or defray or contribute towards the cost of, research in relation to ancient monuments, historic buildings and conservation areas situated in England;

(d) may, for the purpose of exercising their functions, make and maintain records in relation to ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England[99].

There is no reference here to what a "practicable" education system at a historic monument looks like, so it is really up to the Commission how and where they want to teach the public about each site. While the variety of sites managed today by English Heritage makes a set system of education impossible, there should be some criteria about the basic information that needs to be prominently displayed.

In addition to these functions, the Act was amended in 2002 to include that the Commission:

(e)may produce souvenirs relating to ancient monuments or historic buildings situated in England and sell souvenirs.

f) may defray or contribute to the cost of any activity undertaken by another person if the activity—

(i)relates to ancient monuments or historic buildings, and

(ii)is of a kind which the Commission may itself undertake.[100]

There appears to be a correlation between these 2002 amendments and the change in status of English Heritage to a national trust, as the English Heritage website states that

---

[99] Ibid.
[100] Ibid.

"by the mid-2000s, income from the collection was beginning to make a contribution to their maintenance and conservation. In 2011, for the first time, the national heritage collection made an operational surplus"[101]. This is related to another interesting 2002 amendment, one that probably has the most influence on the current management of Tintagel Castle. It can be found in Article 33B, Sections1-2, and 4, explaining the Commission's power to exploit intangible assets:

(1) The Commission may exploit any intellectual property, or any other intangible asset, relating to ancient monuments or historic buildings.

(2) In subsection (1) the references to "ancient monuments" and "historic buildings" are to ancient monuments and historic buildings within the meaning of section 33(8) that—

(a)are situated—

(i)in England, or

(ii)in the case of monuments, in, on or under the seabed within the seaward limits of the United Kingdom territorial waters adjacent to England, or

(b)are foreign ancient monuments or foreign historic buildings within the meaning of section 33A(2)(b).

(4) In this section "intellectual property" means—

---

[101] "Our History", English Heritage, http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-history/

(a)any patent, trade mark, registered design, copyright, design right, right in

performance or plant breeder's right, and

(b)any rights under the law of a country outside the United Kingdom which

correspond or are similar to those falling within paragraph (a).[102]

What this means for Tintagel Castle is that English Heritage, as the Historic Monuments

and Buildings Commission for England, has a protected legal right to repurpose any and

all Arthurian materials relating to Tintagel and use them in their management of the site.

They appear to be taking full advantage of this clause, releasing new Arthurian themed

exhibits and artworks at Tintagel Castle. Additionally, they can use artwork relating to

Arthur in any way they see fit and sell Arthurian themed gifts in their shops, because they

have a legal right to "exploit" it. The combination of Article 33, Section 2e and 2f, with

Article 33B set English Heritage up for a successful commercial enterprise in the form of

souvenirs and an online shop, and it likely the catalyst for the surplus generated in 2011.

As for how the Commission became English Heritage, the answer can be found in

an anecdote supplied by the English Heritage website. In the section titled *Our History,*

English Heritage recounts how it got its name: "Its name [the Historic Buildings and

Monuments Commission for England] was not thought to be very snappy by its first

Chairman, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, and so it was re-christened English Heritage"[103].

Since then, English Heritage has continued to administer to hundreds of historic building

and monuments across England, and currently operates as a charitable trust. Its status as a

charitable trust was achieved in 2015, when the British government agreed to offer £80

---

[102] Ibid.
[103] "Our History", English Heritage, http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-history/

million in funding to English Heritage as a result of the operational surpluses of the past few years, but only if they transferred their holdings to a trust[104].

The number of sites of managed by English Heritages is currently 441 sites, and includes Roman sites, Prehistoric sites, gardens, churches and the statues of London. Many of the sites managed by English Heritage were acquired before it became a national trust, some as early as 1882 with the creation of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act. Others are more recent acquisitions, as English Heritage continues to acquire and maintain sites across England. Some their most popular sites include Dover Castle in Kent, Hadrian's Wall at the border between Scotland and England, Stonehenge, and of course, Tintagel Castle. [105] English Heritage hosts a variety of events at their various holdings, designed to draw in tourists, especially families. These include Easter events, St. George's Day events, and jousts. They also rent out spaces for weddings, corporate events, and event holiday cottages. At each site they manage a variety of facilities, including museums and gift shops. At Tintagel Castle, the facilities include parking, cafes, a picnic area, shops, restrooms, exhibitions, gardens, and outdoor attractions[106]. The amenities and facilities here are not surprising considering Tintagel's popularity as a tourist destination, to be further explored in the next chapter.

---

[104] Ibid.

[105]"Top 10 Days Out", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/familydaysout/top-10-family-days-out/

[106] "Tintagel Castle Facilities", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/tintagel-castle/facilities

CHAPTER 6

ENGLISH HERITAGE AT TINTAGEL CASTLE

The takeover of Tintagel Castle by English Heritage Trust began in the early twentieth century. The Office of Works, one of the predecessors of English Heritage, assumed management of the site in 1929[107]. Since that time, Tintagel Castle has risen to become one of English Heritage's top five attractions[108]. Even with Tintagel's legendary role in Arthurian literature, when one considers that English Heritage manages over four hundred sites and that the location of Tintagel on the Cornish coast makes it more difficult to access from high population centers like London and Birmingham, the popularity of Tintagel among English Heritage visitors can at first seem surprising. However, when one learns of the money and effort put into Tintagel's attractions and exhibitions by English Heritage, this popularity isn't surprising at all. This chapter will attempt to explain this popularity by illustrating how English Heritage has created an almost totally Arthurian-themed attraction here and commodified the Arthurian Legend for their gift shop

---

[107] "Our History" *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-history/
[108] "Top 10 Days Out", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/familydaysout/top-10-family-days-out/
"Top 10 Castles," *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/familydaysout/top-10-castles/

Tintagel Castle has been a part of English Heritage's holdings since the early twentieth century. The tourist experience at Tintagel has evolved from a jaunt around the village to take in the exquisite coastal scenery to an all-out affair, with exhibits featuring 3D models, oversized books, hidden Merlins and mystical Arthurs, a quaint Beach Café and walking trails across the island. The economy of the Cornish village has been subjugated to the legend of King Arthur and the role of Tintagel in his story. The tourism industry has spawned such businesses as Pendragon Gifts, the famed Camelot Castle Hotel, and the absurdly named King Arthur's Car Park. Entrance to the actual castle ruins and exhibits can be had for the low price of £7.90 for an adult, £4.70 for a child, or £20.50 for the whole family[109]. Exhibits at Tintagel include *Where History Meets Legend,* in depicting the castle's "literary links", an outdoor walk where one can follow a stone compass to "places connected with the tales of King Arthur", explore the beaches surrounding the site, and eat at the Beach Café, where children can eat their cream teas with a spade from a bucket[110]. The English Heritage exhibits at the site Tintagel do refer quite often to the legendary status of Arthur, but not always in the best way. In *Where History Meets Legend*, "artefacts discovered at the site, on display for the first time" go hand in hand with "book sculptures which illustrate the castle's literary links" Susan Greaney, the Senior Properties Historian at English Heritage, was in charge of installing the exhibit, writing the text that accompanies it, commissioning reconstructions and models, and working with artists who interpreted the archaeological evidence in a way

---

[109] "Tintagel Castle Prices and Opening Times", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/tintagel-castle/prices-and-opening-times
[110] "Tintagel Castle Things to Do", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/tintagel-castle/things-to-do/#Section1

that was easily presented to the public[111]. Of the exhibit, she says, "I'm trying to explain

to visitors how history and legend at Tintagel are completely intertwined – you can't

understand one without the other"[112]. The exhibit contains a new 3D reconstruction of

the island and sculptures dedicated to Malory's *Le Morte D'Arthur* and Tennyson's *Idylls*

of A King. The two literary sculptures are designed to look like large, modified books. It

is almost a representation of the way characters from Arthurian legend lift themselves

from the pages and enter the readers minds as soon as they open a book. The include flat

figures on a white background with print running across it to really drive the point home.

However, it is important to note that the literary traditions of Tintagel appear

around the twelfth century, and the site was occupied well before that, which plays into

the controversy surrounding English Heritage's management of the site, to be discussed

in further chapters. Two new statues at the site have also been at the center of much

controversy. In April 2016, an 8-foot-tall bronze statue named *Gallos* was placed on the

site. The statue is a ghostly representation of a knight, holding a sword and wearing a

crown. While not openly referencing King Arthur, its placement and design suggest no

one else. The other new statue is more explicit in terms of identifying its subject.

Merlin's Face was carved onto the side of the cliff just outside the popular tourist spot,

Merlin's Cave, and revealed to the public in February 2016. Both of these works are part

of the "ongoing historical re-interpretation and investment at Tintagel."[113]

---

[111] Susan Greaney, "Archaeology at Tintagel…on the edge of a cliff!", *Day of Archaeology,* August 2, 2016, http://www.dayofarchaeology.com/archaeology-at-tintagel-on-the-edge-of-a-cliff/
[112] Greaney, "Archaeology at Tintagel", *Day of Archaeology,*
http://www.dayofarchaeology.com/archaeology-at-tintagel-on-the-edge-of-a-cliff/
[113] "Merlin's Face Revealed at Tintagel Castle", *English Heritage,* February 11, 2016, http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/search-news/merlin-carving-tintagel

The emphasis on Arthur continues in the gift shop. Comparisons between the physical gift shop and the online shop are difficult without a visit to the site; however, the Tintagel gift shop online offers surprising insight into the role of King Arthur in selling the story of Tintagel. As of spring 2017, there are twenty-five items available online under the heading "Gifts from Tintagel" on the English Heritage website. Out of the twenty-five items offered, only five of them are not explicitly connected to the legend of King Arthur. These include a set of commemorative stamps and a children's shirt and mug with the slogan "I conquered the steps at Tintagel Castle". The rest of the gifts found online reference the version of Arthur popularized by Geoffrey of Monmouth to varying degrees. The most common recurring image is a "Sword in the Stone" graphic design found on tote bags, coffee mugs, and mouse pads. While the graphic does incorporate the ruins of Tintagel and the word Kernow (Cornish for Cornwall), it also prominently features the sword in the stone, bathed in a ray of light and approached by a raven. These are direct references to the folkloric beliefs about Arthur. This is not the only reference to Merlin's role in Arthurian legend. English Heritage also offers a wizard's hat and book of spells journal, a reference to Merlin's powers of sorcery. This is problematic because Merlin's role in the conception of Arthur was to magically disguise Uther as Igraine's husband, Gorlois, so he could sleep with her and steal her from her husband. By today's standards, this does not fall under the category of informed consent, so the promotion of Merlin by English Heritage as a character for selling souvenirs is an example of their propensity for ignoring pieces of the legend that do not fit with their family friendly presentation of Tintagel Castle.

But these gifts seem tame when compared to those available at the price of £40 or above. Six of the souvenirs offered online fall into this price range, and they all pander to Arthurian legend. The only two offerings that mention Tintagel are a pewter tankard and charger, each bearing the inscription, "The Legend of King Arthur Pendragon/ Tintagel Castle, Kernow" and the sword in the stone motif. The remaining gifts in this category include a Knights of the Round Table chess set, and a £250 Avalon Replica sword. These gifts, as standalone souvenirs of Arthurian legend, are an accurate portrayal of how the majority of the world sees King Arthur. It is their explicit connection to the site of Tintagel Castle which causes concern. References to Arthurian legend, in which Tintagel is the birthplace of Arthur, overwhelm the offerings which display or comment on the actual conditions of the site. The majority of the offerings connected to Tintagel and Arthurian legend depict events or people who are connected to Arthur in other locales, such as Camelot, and as such really have no place in the Tintagel gift shop.

 It isn't as though the Tintagel collection is the sole place to buy Arthurian themed gifts. A general search of the English Heritage online shop for King Arthur reveals even more merchandise featuring the mythical monarch -- fourteen additional items to be exact. For the low price of £165, one could order the official English Heritage Excalibur sword, or for £100 each buy a tapestry depicting a joust at Camelot or the search for Knights of the Round Table. Expanding the search criteria to include Merlin adds to this list with books and figurines. It is important to realize that these items do, in a way, represent English Heritage and that a critique of these items comes from a place of academic concern. Arthur has become a major part of the fabric of the culture of Great Britain, but his popularized image is that of the medieval king concerned with courtly

ways and the quest for the Holy Grail. For an organization who presents the importance

of authenticity on their website, stating "We seek to be true to the story of the places and

artefacts that we look after and present. We don't exaggerate or make things up for

entertainment's sake. Instead, through careful research, we separate fact from fiction and

bring fascinating truth to light"[114], they do not do a good job making the distinction on

their online shop between the archaeological site of Tintagel and the fabled birthplace of

Arthur. English Heritage is catering to the public in a way that defies their own

purported stance towards promoting a factual experience. This is an ongoing concern

surrounding Tintagel Castle and the narrative encouraged by English Heritage. The next

chapter will explore the concept of heritage tourism and explain why English Heritage is

controversial with several local Cornish groups.

---

[114] "Our Values", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-values/

CHAPTER 7

Heritage Tourism at English Heritage

The tourist experience promoted by English Heritage at Tintagel and other sites they manage can be seen as a form of heritage tourism. In a 2003 study on "Heritage tourism and staged authenticity," Chhabra, Healy and Sills offer this definition of heritage tourism:

> In terms of demand, heritage tourism is representative of many contemporary visitors' desire (hereafter, tourists) to directly experience and consume diverse past and present cultural landscapes, performances, foods, handicrafts, and participatory activities. On the supply side, heritage tourism is widely looked to as a tool for community economic development and is often actively promoted by local governments and private businesses.[115]

Based on this definition, and the Tintagel experience as discussed is a separate study, "A Disgruntled Tourist in King Arthur's Court: Archaeology and Identity at Tintagel,

---

[115] Deepak Chhabraa et al., "Staged authenticity and heritage tourism", *Annals of Tourism,* (Sacremento, California State University, 2003), 703

Cornwall," there is little doubt that the current heritage tourism industry at Tintagel is a result of input from past visitors but not locals.

Hilary Orange and Patrick Laviolette, the co-authors of this article, are attempting to understand how the physical experience of the site compares to preconceived expectations and imagination.[116] They make the argument that "without its legendary associations Tintagel would be like many of the other coastal villages in the area — relatively unknown except to hardy coastal walkers who venture inland off the coast path in search of victuals."[117] They also point out that the tourism industry boom in Tintagel coincided with the decline of the tin and copper mining industries in Cornwall. Post-industrial economic shifts and a cultural revival coincided in Cornwall, creating an environment conducive to the formation of a tourism industry.[118]

While Orange and Laviolette published their article in 2010, with some data from 2006, the changes evident in their report and the current presentation of Tintagel show that English Heritage has been pushing a more commercialized, sensationalized experience at the site in recent years. When this article was published, visitors were mostly left on their own to wander, with little to no guide to the archaeological remains.[119] Orange and Laviolette write that this allows visitors to substitute their own alternative explanations for the use of the site. One of the points brought up about this experience at the site is that, in 2001, English Heritage kept guiding information about

---

[116] Hilary Orange and Patrick Laviolette, "A Disgruntled Tourist in King Arthur's Court: Archaeology and Identity at Tintagel", *Public Archaeology,* 2010, 85.
[117] Orange and Laviolette, "Disgruntled", 86
[118] Ibid., 90
[119] Ibid., 101

visible ruins at a minimum to "avoid intruding into the wild character of the site".[120] This

is the complete opposite of their stance on exhibitions at the site today.

English Heritage in the past was not as active about promoting archaeology,

history, or even Arthurian events at Tintagel. This resulted in visitors feeling that the

entrance fee was too high for the amount of information they were getting.[121] The

visitors surveyed by Orange and Laviolette in 2006 said they wanted more maps, more

guides, and more information about the actual history of the site. One of the visitors

surveyed was a man named Mike, from the Midlands, who had this to say about his

experience at Tintagel, "The information is very poor. I think archaeologists fail to pass

on to the general public their findings and conclusions. There's evidence for lots of

buildings — what were they used for? Who lived in them? What did people who lived in

them do for their duties?[122] Based on the findings of Orange and Laviolette regarding

visitor experiences at the site, it becomes clear that English Heritage's push for an

expanded tourist experience at Tintagel, one which offers more things to do, more

information, more all-around entertainment as provided by English Heritage comes from

feedback from previous visitors. However, this has led to conflict in recent years, as the

desired visitor experience and the opinions of local groups do not match up -- one of the

unfortunate side effects of a strong heritage tourism industry today,

English Heritage has been facing opposition to their management of Tintagel

since 1984, a year after they were officially designated English Heritage.[123] This seems

---

[120] Ibid,.101
[121] Ibid,.102
[122] Ibis,.102
[123] On 20th November 1984 a member of CSP questioned English Heritage's administration of Tintagel
Castle. http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/heritage-signs.html

to be the beginning of their struggle with the Cornish Nationalist group, the Cornish Stannary Parliament. While they have faced, and currently face, other groups who disagree with their management of the site, the Cornish Stannary Parliament has been one of their longest lasting and most vocal opponents.

The Cornish Stannary Parliament see themselves as the "original governing body of Cornwall's historic Tin mining community," whose current role is "ensuring that the people, land and heritage of Cornwall is treated fairly in the eyes of a UK legal system that appears to be failing in it's [sic] capacity to recognise Cornwall's distinct and lawful position."[124] Their website is littered with aggressive and somewhat conspiratorial claims about the actions of the British government in regards to Cornwall. One of their most fantastic claims is that there is a "Secret Constitution" in Great Britain, which provides for such injustices as "The denial of the right to a national minority political opinion." As they put it,

> The Cornish are informed by an ever increasing number of official bodies that they are 'English'. The U.N. right to self-identify is blatantly ignored. In effect, there is in progress a modern attempt to repeat the enforced conversion by order of the state as under the tyranny of Henry the Eighth. The freedom of choice is selectively denied to ensure that the Cornish are not legally recognised as a national minority. A case of the abuse of power to promote English nationalism.[125]

---

[124] "The Cornish Stannary Parliament" *Cornish Stannary Parliament,*
http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/
[125] Ibid.

Concerning Tintagel Castle, the Cornish Stannary Parliament takes an aggressive stance. They believe in a conspiracy theory involving a deal between the British monarchy (namely Prince Charles, Duke of Cornwall) and English Heritage, in order to intentionally strip the Cornish people of a legitimate cultural presence in British history through control of the site of Tintagel[126]. This is a largely unverifiable claim. Another source of their anger is the name English Heritage. Prior to the 1980's, the previous government organizations which English Heritage stems from included the word Britain or British. "British" refers to the various countries that make up the island of Britain, which are then incorporated into the United Kingdom with the addition of Northern Ireland. England and English, however, refers only to the southern part of the island of Britain, not including Scotland and Wales, but including Cornwall. The word England originated at the end of the ninth century CE and meant "Land of the Angles", in reference to the Angles tribe from Schleswig[127]. With the nationalist views of the Cornish Stannary Parliament, it would be easy to interpret this as another example of the erasure of their Celtic roots, similar to the changes made to the Arthurian legend. This can also be seen in the place name Tintagel, which is not Cornish but rather Norman-French.[128]

The actions of the Cornish Stannary Parliament towards the trust have become more aggressive over time. Their website provides a timeline of how the "Cornish Stannary Parliament tackles English cultural aggression in Cornwall"[129]. Beginning in 1998, the Cornish Stannary Parliament contacted the British government over their

---

[126] Ibid.
[127] Davis Mills, *A dictionary of British place-names,* (Oxford University Press, 2011)
[128] Radford, *Tintagel Castle,* 5
[129] "Cornish Stannary Parliament tackles English cultural aggression in Cornwall", *Cornish Stannary Parliament,* http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/heritage-signs.html

concerns that English Heritage was managing the site, instead of an explicitly Cornish group. They see the response of English Heritage that "EH (English Heritage) will continue to finance the preservation and promotion of the built heritage in Cornwall to the same degree as for other parts of the country" in the sense that "country, presumably meaning "England" not Britain"[130]. From March to December 1999 the Cornish Stannary Parliament continuously approached English Heritage about the fact that "English Heritage was an English organization and therefore completely unsuitable in promoting Cornish and Celtic archaeological sites as Cornish."[131] In an example of their situational manipulation, they state on their website that the fact that English Heritage did not change the subject headers of their reply letters from re:English Cultural Aggression in Cornwall is "virtually conceding that the subject matter title was applicable."[132] After their demand in early 1999 that English Heritage take down all of their signs on Cornish sites (which did not happen), the Cornish Stannary Parliament began taking down the signs themselves in January, 2000. The Cornish Stannary Parliament reports that "Subsequently, no attempt was made by English Heritage to enter into meaningful dialogue."[133] Quite frankly, given the radicalism of the Cornish Stannary Parliament, it is not too hard to see why they might think no longer engaging in discourse might be the best way stop the Cornish Stannary Parliament from taking further action against them.

Unfortunately for English Heritage, the "admission" by the Cornwall Archaeological Unit in May of 2000 that "English Heritage had omitted in it's [sic] press report on a discovery on the Isles of Scilly that the artifacts concerned were 'Celtic'"

---

[130] "Cornish Stannary Parliament tackles English cultural aggression in Cornwall", Cornish Stannary Parliament, http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/heritage-signs.html
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Ibid.

seems to have prolonged the feuding, as the summer of 2000 is listed as one of their most active periods of resistance against English Heritage. The Cornish Stannary Parliament writes that they saw this as "deliberately hiding Cornish Celtic history in typical English Heritage and School History Curriculum fashion."[134] On the 21st of August, 2000, the Cornish Stannary Parliament got around to removing the English Heritage sign at Tintagel Castle. According to their website, this did not make the national news like they had hoped. For the Cornish Stannary Parliament, these issues were not over in 2000, although this was the last date given in their timeline against English Heritage. In a poll posted on their website, which is still currently open to the public, which asked whether respondents agreed with the Cornish Stannary Parliament's policy of removing English Heritage signs, 82.94% (870 votes) said yes, while 17.06% (179 votes) said no. In the comments below the poll, which are open to the public, one user posted in 2007 that the actions of English Heritage were comparable to the actions of Hitler because "THEY ARE TAKING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS TO TALK OR ASK QUESTIONS , ABOUT A "SO CALLED " HISTORY."[135] This is clearly a very heated topic for some people.

While the tactics and rhetoric used by the Cornish Stannary Parliament may seem overly aggressive and manipulative, they are somewhat mitigated when one considers the historic relationship between the lands now known as Cornwall and England. In *Cornwall: A Concise History,* Bernard Deacon gives us some background into the historic treatment of Cornwall, and it is important to note that Cornwall was one of the

---

[134] Ibid.

[135] "Do you agree with the Cornish Stannary Parliament's policy of removing English Heritage signs?", *Cornish Stannary Parliament,* http://cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk//resources//polls/index.php?qid=EH01&aid=-1#comments

few places where Romanization never became the norm. The battle of Hingston Down in 838 CE "marked the end of a phase of resistance that had fostered a sense of identity amongst the Britons of the far south-west—the people known to the English as the 'West Welsh', the 'foreigners' of the west."[136]   From that point on, the Cornish were subjects of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Wessex, where, historically, they were not viewed favorably. During the reign of Athelstan, around 930 CE, the recognized border between the English and the Cornish was set at the River Tamar, and Athelstan attempted to cleanse Exeter by "purging it of the vile people" -the Cornish.[137] Remnants of the tensions between the Cornish people and those who consider themselves ethnically English can be seen today. Bernard Deacon tells us of a study done in 2004 by Morgan Stanley, where 44% of Cornish residents feel more Cornish than English, British, or European. There are also a higher number of Cornish residents who would consider themselves Cornish over English, instead of Cornish and English.[138]

This current divide between the idea of being Cornish and the idea of being English has led to another political organization who, like the Cornish Stannary Parliament, are campaigning for the recognition of Cornish citizens as a national minority and are against the current management of Tintagel by English Heritage called Kernow Matters to Us. Unlike the Cornish Stannary Parliament, Kernow Matters to Us is not quite as aggressive in their language and rhetoric found on their website. Kernow Matters to Us has their own constitution (adopted in November 2015), in which they spell out their goals (including making Cornwall a better place for the Cornish minority to live

---

[136] Deacon, *Concise History,* 4
[137] Ibid., 19
[138] Ibid., 228

and work in, and educating the general public about the Cornish language, history and culture) and their membership criteria (anyone 16 and older who pays £1).[139]

Their issues with English Heritage stem from the recent additions and changes English Heritage has made to the visitor experience at the Tintagel since 2015. In a letter on their website, dating from February 2016 and addressed to members of the Cornish Council, they raise their issues with "'English' Heritage's intention to install 28 items at Tintagel Castle which will, in effect, "theme-park" what is arguably Cornwall's most iconic and important historic site, while submerging its true history under a plethora of mythology, some of which is spurious and having little or no connection with the site itself."[140] Theirs is a valid concern, as they point out in their letter that the Cornwall Archaeological Unit apparently "submitted a report in which its expert officers judged that 19 of these 28 items would have a "negative effect", that is to say, they would be potentially harmful to the archaeology and/or the visual amenity of Tintagel."[141] While Craig Weatherhill, author of this letter, remarks that he contacted English Heritage about removing the harmful items from their proposal, it didn't make a difference. English Heritage began unveiling new exhibits and attractions in 2016, which attracted a lot of media attention- good and bad.

One of the new attractions was the rock carving of Merlin near the entrance of what's known as Merlin's Cave. Kernow Matters to Us's response to this new addition was recorded in the article, "English Heritage accused of 'vandalism' after Merlin

[139] "Our Constitution and Aims", *Kernow Matters to Us,* 2015, http://kernowmatterstous.weebly.com/constitution.html

[140] Craig Weatherhill, "Save Tintagel From English Heritage", *Kernow Matters to Us,* February 26, 2016, http://kernowmatterstous.weebly.com/save-tintagel-from-english-heritage.html

[141] Weatherhill, "Save Tintagel", *Kernow Matters to Us,* http://kernowmatterstous.weebly.com/save-tintagel-from-english-heritage.html

sculpture at Tintagel Castle causes outrage". A spokesperson for the organization has

this to say,

> We are deeply shocked that the inappropriately named 'English' Heritage has
>
> installed a sculpture of Merlin in our Cornish Tintagel Castle. This is nothing but
>
> 'false' history and diminishes our heritage. It is a disgrace. No doubt it will
>
> enhance tourist numbers for a season or two - but at the cost of further denuding
>
> the Cornish cultural and historical context of this location.[142]

In another article, we hear the opinions of Bert Biscoe, a councilman for Cornwall. He

told *The Guardian,* "This is one of the most heavily designated pieces of landscape and

archaeology in Britain…If we start carving comic book characters into the geology,

where do we stop? This is not Disneyland, it's Cornwall."[143]

This is one of the main points that the Cornish Stannary Parliament does try to get

across. Their website states that, "The Cornish identity and culture is being throttled to

death by Duchy 'property' interests which even includes such Celtic icons as Tintagel

Castle 'leased' or 'given' to English Heritage without regard to the basic principle of

authenticity."[144] Under the Vision and Values section of the English Heritage website,

they state, "We seek to be true to the story of the places and artifacts that we look after

and present. We don't exaggerate or make things up for entertainment's sake. Instead,

through careful research, we separate fact from fiction and bring fascinating truth to

---

[142] "English Heritage accused of 'vandalism' after Merlin scuplture at Tintagel Castle causes outrage", *The Telegraph,* Feburary 16, 2016, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/12159673/English-Heritage-accused-of-vandalism-after-Merlin-scuplture-at-Tintagel-Castle-causes-outrage.html

[143] Steven Morris, "'This is not Disneyland, it's Cornwall': the battle of Tintagel Castle", *The Guardian,* March 18, 2016, https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/mar/18/this-is-not-disneyland-its-cornwall-battle-tintagel-castle

[144] "The United Nations Against Cultural Aggression", *The Cornish Stannary Parliament,* http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/

light." This high standard is one that, if public outcry is to be believed, they cannot seem to uphold at Tintagel. The next chapter will explore the ways in which media coverage of Arthurian archaeology, especially at Tintagel, contributes, and is informed by, misinformation about Arthurian legend.

CHAPTER 8

Media Coverage of Arthurian Archaeology

While finding every article that covered the 2016 summer digs at Tintagel is

beyond the scope of this thesis, a sampling of the headlines easily accessible through

Google reveals an alarming trend towards sensationalizing journalism. The majority of

the top articles that appear when searching for "Tintagel excavations 2016" lead with a

headline that explicitly mentions King Arthur. *National Geographic* has relegated

Tintagel to the "King Arthur Site" in its headline, ironic because the first line of the

article says, "A recent discovery in southwest England is making headlines for its

association with King Arthur, but archaeologists are hailing it as an incredibly important

find regardless of any connection with Britain's greatest legendary ruler"[145]. To anyone

reading the most sensational of these headlines, the physical existence of King Arthur is

all but confirmed with the coverage of this dig. *The Daily Mail* led with "Has the real

birthplace of King Arthur been found? Archaeologists unearth Dark Age royal palace -

just where legends said he was born - but which had already vanished by the time they

---

[145] Kristin Romey, "Not-So-Dark Ages Revealed at King Arthur Site", *National Geographic,* August 10, 2016, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/08/tintagel-arthur-knights-england-castle-medieval-royalty-merlin-archaeology/

were written down"[146] while the *Plymouth Herald,* a local paper serving the area around

Plymouth, reported that "Arthurian secrets to be uncovered as time team starts digging

into the past"[147]. While these stem from the commonly known literary and legendary

connections of Tintagel to Arthur, it does a disservice to the archaeology happening at the

site.

Archaeologists depend on a variety of intermediaries to convey their findings to

the public. Whether this is through the media, including newspapers and television, or

through museum exhibits, archaeologists often rely on those without archaeological

training to share their finds. Archaeology is a very specialized field, and one of the

positive aspects of the intervention of media and museums is the increased outreach of

excavation data. Journalists and curators know how to best approach the public, and this

increased output of archaeological information allows for greater interest in specific sites,

as well as renewed interest in the field of archaeology. Most museum curators have

experience with the topics their museums cover, but many journalists do not, which is

where confusion between the archaeological data and public information comes from.

This leads to more sensationalized headlines, like that of the *Independent,* which

followed a more moderate headline, "Dark Ages royal palace discovered in Cornwall – in

area closely linked to the legend of King Arthur" with the overly sensational "Exclusive:

Discovery will ignite debate in Arthurian research circles because, in medieval tradition,

[146] Abigail Beall, "Has the real birthplace of King Arthur been found? Archaeologists unearth Dark Age royal palace - just where legends said he was born - but which had already vanished by the time they were written down", *Daily Mail,* August 3, 3016, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3721915/Has-Camelot-Royal-palace-Dark-Ages-unearthed-legendary-site-King-Arthur-s-birth.html

[147] L. Barton, "Arthurian secrets to be uncovered as time team starts digging into the past", *Plymouth Herald,* July 17, 2016 http://www.plymouthherald.co.uk/arthurian-secrets-to-be-uncovered-as-time-team-starts-digging-into-the-past/story-29521775-detail/story.html

Arthur was said to have been conceived at Tintagel"[148]. The content of the article is actually a fair summary of the dig at Tintagel. The reporter, David Keys, writes, "What the archaeologists have found is of major historical significance – irrespective of the veracity of any Arthurian connection." This phrase is contradictory to the feeling the reader derives from the headline of the article. The point here is not that the media coverage surrounding the site of Tintagel is inherently bad, but that even the somewhat scholarly articles fall victim to their sensationalized titles. In the era of "clickbait," hyperbolic titles are used to draw in readers[149], but they can be misleading about the articles' real content. In an effort to appeal to people who may not even read the full article, the reporting about the dig at Tintagel Castle is falling victim to the same forces that sustain the tourist industry at the site. The dig at Tintagel is important in and of itself, for the methods being used and the artifacts being found, and not just for its connection with the twelfth century version of Arthur's origins. ITV offers readers one example of what responsible archaeological journalism looks like in the article, "Tintagel Castle: archaeologists begin vital dig to find out about historic site's past"[150].

The sensationalizing of archaeological finds, especially where related to King Arthur, is not a new phenomenon. During his dig in the 1960s Leslie Alcock sold the exclusive rights to coverage of excavations at Cadbury Castle to *The Observer,* a British newspaper, something extremely rare in archaeology. Today, there are many news outlets

---

[148] David Keys, "Dark Ages royal palace discovered in Cornwall – in area closely linked to the legend of King Arthur", *Indeendant,* August 2, 2016, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/archaeology/king-arthur-castle-cornwall-tintagel-dark-ages-palace-camelot-a7168761.html

[149] Jiaxi Lu, "What is 'click bait' and why Facebook wants to display less of it", *Washington Post,* August 26, 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/technology/wp/2014/08/26/what-is-click-bait-and-why-facebook-wants-to-display-less-of-it/?utm_term=.39f94f957aa9

[150] "Tintagel Castle: archaeologists begin vital dig to find out about historic site's past", *ITV News,* July 26, 2016, http://www.itv.com/news/westcountry/2016-07-26/tintagel-castle-archaeologists-begin-vital-dig-to-find-out-about-historic-sites-past/

and television programs which cover sites like this, including *Digging for Britain,* a program on BBC 2 in which Dr. Alice Roberts takes viewers through a year of digs and artifact analysis, all neatly packaged into a one-hour episode. *Digging For Britain* covered the excavations at Tintagel Castle in the first episode of series 5.

What does all of this media coverage tell us about Tintagel? Firstly, the connection of King Arthur to Tintagel and Tintagel to archaeology is a marketable commodity. Some of these sensationalized pieces were clearly designed to pull in readers. Secondly, this could be a result of the fact that academic papers, especially scientific ones, have become more difficult to read over the past century or so. A recent study done by researchers in the Department of Clinical Neuroscience, at the Karolinska Institutet in Stockholm, Sweden, profiled 707,452 abstracts from scientific papers published between 1881 and 2015[151]. Their findings pointed to an interesting conclusion: the readability of scientific papers has gone down over the years. Over time, the researchers found an increase in the number of syllables per word, and increase in the percentage of difficult words, and after 1960, and increase in overall sentence length[152]. They also used established methods of testing readability, the Flesch Reading Ease and the New Dale-Chall Readability Formula, to make their statements about scientific abstracts. There was an increasing use of subject specific jargon, and using the Flesch Reading Ease method, they found that 26.5% of the abstracts from 2015 have a reading level beyond that of the ability of a college graduate[153]. What this means overall is that

---

[151] Plavén-Sigray et al., "The Readability of Scientific Texts Is Decreasig Over Time", *Biorxiv*, March 28, 2017, 1, http://biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2017/03/28/119370.full.pdf
[152] Plavén-Sigray et al., "Readability", *Biorxiv*, 2, http://biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2017/03/28/119370.full.pdf
[153] Ibid., 5

there is less accessibility for non-specialists in scientific papers[154]. The authors studied

twelve fields of scientific papers, and twelve journals within each field, and one of their

fields was the Social Sciences.[155] The implications of this paper, which is currently in the

process of becoming peer-reviewed, for archaeology are that archaeologists need to do a

better job of communicating their findings to the public, or they run the risk of becoming

another sensationalized headline or having valuable information lost beneath flashier

finds.

The ways in which most people are introduced to Arthurian legend are typically

not able to capture the complexity of a legend that has evolved over a thousand years.

Most modern examples of Arthurian tales gloss over Arthur's problematic tendency

towards impetuous killing when referencing earlier works, and tend to gravitate towards

the chivalrous fairytale king he has evolved into. Authors throughout the ages have

subverted the tale for their own purpose, emphasizing certain themes over others. King

Arthur has been built up so much by Western popular and historic culture that separating

fact from fiction becomes increasingly more difficult- especially when we consider that

the small amounts of fact surrounding the legend point out that there may not even have

been any Arthur at all. Certain people and industries have conveniently been glossing

over this fact in a way that can only those with an intimate knowledge of the development

of the legend. Archaeologists and caretakers alike have conveniently been able to use the

name brand stability offered by King Arthur in order to cash in their chips. Doing so

offers presents us with the double-edged sword of archaeology. The ethical issues raised

by the increased promotion of a probable fictional character in order to spark interest in

---

[154] Ibid., 7
[155] Ibid., 15

archaeology, and therefore raise more money for the funding of future digs and

excavations, are not so easily resolved. It is necessary to be mindful of the narrative

promoted to the public, or to those with only the most basic access to information and a

desire to look no further. The next chapter will explain why understanding the

development of the legend of Arthur is important in today's current political climate, and

end with suggestions for future exhibits at Tintagel that convey a broader sense of the

history of the site based on archaeology.

CHAPTER 8

Contemporary Connections

That our current popular idea of the story of King Arthur is more in line with the medieval romances than the older Celtic stories only serves to highlight the subtle forces at play in the transformation and transmission of the legend, forces which become not so subtle in the presentation of Arthur as tourism. The concept of Arthur as a representation of "British-ness" in many ways ignores the various ethnic groups that historically have made up Great Britain, and the varied experiences of people across the country today. However, there is a certain validity conferred onto this telling of the legend through Arthur's existence in a shared, Western cultural consciousness. To many people the figure of King Arthur looms large in the history of Britain, as a symbol for justice and a romanticized past. The instinctive reaction to term King Arthur a falsehood is, perhaps, a reaction to the increasingly sensationalist world of today, a world that sometimes does not seem to feel the need to recognize the facts of the past.

Given the current state of politics in Britain, it seems as though the need for education about the origins of Arthur is perhaps more necessary than ever. Understanding how dominant cultures co-opt the tales of those they invade, or even how

the history of England was shaped by people who came first from other lands, could change the way we talk about current events, especially in light of Great Britain's unprecedented move to leave the European Union, a move commonly known as the Brexit. The vote for Great Britain to leave the EU took place on June 23, 2016, and the Leave side won by a small margin—Leave took 51.9% of the vote, while Remain had 48.1%[156]—but still a win nonetheless. One of the major driving forces behind the Brexit was a rising sentiment of nationalism and anti-immigration feelings. George Friedman, a geopolitical forecaster and intelligence expert wrote for *Forbes* that, "The immigration crisis in Europe was a trigger. Some EU leaders argued that aiding the refugees was a moral obligation. But EU opponents saw immigration as a national issue, as it affected the internal life of the country"[157]. But these Leave supporters would do well to remember that the country in which they live is one built on the shoulders of invaders and immigrants.

The connection between King Arthur and the Brexit is tied to the idea of a national identity of Britain. If we break down the votes throughout Britain, we find that only England and Wales actually voted Leave, with 53.4% to 46.6% and 52.5% to 47.5% respectively.[158] Scotland and Northern Ireland were firmly on the side of Remain, with Scotland voting 62% to 38% to Remain, and Northern Ireland voting 55.8% to 44.2% to Remain[159]. What this means is that the southern part of Britain decided for the rest of the country that they would leave the EU. In turn, Scotland has toyed with the idea of having

---

[156] Alex Hunt and Brian Wheeler, "Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU", *BBC News,* March 30, 2017, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887
[157] George Friedman, "3 Reasons Brits Voted For Brexit", *Forbes,* July 5, 2016, https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnmauldin/2016/07/05/3-reasons-brits-voted-for-brexit/#189143031f9d
[158] Hunt and Wheeler, "Brexit", *BBC NEWS,* http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887
[159] Ibid.

a second referendum, something which further highlights the dangerously ethnocentric

nationalism that Brexit has brought to the forefront. Current British Prime Minister

Theresa May, who was elected to office after the Brexit vote, took Scottish Prime

Minister to task over her proposal of a second referendum, saying "Instead of playing

politics with the future of our country the Scottish government should focus on delivering

good government and public services for the people of Scotland. Politics is not a

game"[160]. In the article "Brexit unleashed an English nationalism that has damaged the

union with Scotland for good" in the *Independent,* Patrick Coburn writes that, "This

immediately begs the question about the nature and location of this 'country' to which

such uncritical loyalty is due. If the state in question is the UK, then why do the

advocates of Brexit ignore the opposition – and take for granted the compliance – of

Scotland and Northern Ireland in leaving the EU?"[161] This is the kind of tunnel vision

that created problems in Cornwall over English Heritage signs. The argument here is that

there needs to be more acknowledgment given to the many cultures and ethnicities that

make up Great Britain, both now and in the past.

    Criticism over the presentation of King Arthur at sites such as Tintagel stems

from the belief that presenting the medieval storyline of Arthurian legend enables this

sort of nationalism. It is important to recognize that the contemporary version of Arthur

is the result of various political forces from the past. Different traits were added to his

character in an attempt to connect the often unfamiliar ruling elite with the masses and

---

[160] Jon Stone, "Theresa May accuses Nicola Sturgeon of playing a 'game' with second Scottish independence referendum", *Independant,* March 13, 2017, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/scottish-independence-referendum-second-nicola-sturgeon-theresa-may-response-a7627496.html

[161] Patrick Cockburn, "Brexit unleashed an English nationalism that has damaged the union with Scotland for good", *Independent,* March 17, 2017, http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/brexit-scottish-referendum-english-nationalism-damaged-union-for-good-a7635796.html

the history of the land they were trying to control could potentially open up an important dialogue about the impact that imported beliefs and ways of life have had on the creation of the modern nation of Great Britain. There is a lack of accessible education about the origins of Arthur, or the realities of material culture of the Arthurian age at the site. These resources could help highlight the process of changing cultural identity that is so important to Arthur's story. If the UK and English Heritage want to keep the relationship strong between archaeological sites like Tintagel and the cultural hero King Arthur, it is time for more education all around.

If English Heritage wants to convey the true history of Tintagel, while still holding onto it as a popular tourist destination, they will have to find new ways to exhibit the ruins, teach about archaeology, and make real history commercially viable in their gift shop. After going through the reviews of Tintagel Castle on TripAdvisor, an online forum where users can find reviews of visitor attractions, restaurants, hotels and more, a general trend seems to emerge. Of those who are more critical of the site, the lack of information about the site's history and current state is an issue. Some of these reviews suggest that visitors would like to see more from the site, saying,

> "Done it once, probably wouldn't do it again. Obviously castle ruins, however, thought it was expensive for what it was. Disappointed that there wasn't more information boards around." -louisa d.

> "Overall we enjoyed our visit here and it's certainly good value but I felt that more could be done to help the visitor. There's no guidance as to where to go and people are left to organise queuing for themselves which meant that it was far

slower than needed. The castle itself doesn't really have enough information

boards but I guess that's an incentive to buy a guide book." -Paul H.

"The ruins are interesting but unfortunately there isn't much of them. I would like

to have more free information boards regarding the history of the location- you

have to pay £5 for a book..."-Sbhl4090

"Tintagel Castle was definitely not what we expected. We expected to see a

castle, but I think more than 90% of the castle was already in ruins."-Goomba81

"Whilst this was a good place to visit it was not a castle like you might expect.

The castle elements are largely ruined and I would describe it more as a fortified

settlement. So my daughter who was doing castles as a topic at school was sorely

disappointed."-Ashley P[162]

Despite their efforts to draw people in with additions like the Merlin Carving and the
Gallos statue, there are people who feel disappointed in what they see as a lack of
information surrounding the actual ruins of the site.

Perhaps utilizing new technologies and advances in virtual reality would help then

convey the changing nature of the site, without having to lure people in with revealing

secrets of King Arthur. Marketing an innovative technological tour would be a draw in

and of itself and would fulfill the needs of those who want more information about the

Castle. One program being developed for such use is called Dead Men's Eyes by Dr.

Stuart Eve, an Honorary Research Associate at University College London. His doctoral

---

[162] "Tintagel Castle Reviews", *TripAdvisor,* https://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g186245-d188523-Reviews-Tintagel_Castle-Tintagel_Cornwall_England.html

thesis, titled *Dead Men's Eyes: Embodied GIS, Mixed Reality and Landscape Archaeology*, explores the use of a Mixed Reality approach to site exploration.

Mixed Reality is "an opportunity to merge the real world with virtual elements of relevance to the past, including 3D models, soundscapes and immersive data."[163] Eve gives his readers an overview of the types of Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality methods available before moving on to discuss their applications for archaeology. The transmission of Augmented Reality can be done through a Head-Worn Display -- Projection Mapping or a handheld device -- which seems to be the best option for a tourist experience. "The user holds the tablet up to view the AR content, producing a less immersive experience, but it has the advantage of being a lowcost approach, and, as many people now have smartphones, it enables the experience to be accessed by a much larger number of people."[164] Handheld devices also have the ability to support Location Based AR and Marker Based AR through their GPS capabilities and integrated camera.

For his dissertation, Eve worked with a landscape scale project at Bodmin Moore, but started his work with a smaller model environment to experiment with his application. He writes, " My aim was to use AR techniques to populate the paper model with digital content, to enable the user to explore the fort and consider how certain buildings would have functioned."[165] Eve built a physical model as well as a 3D model in an online gaming platform, Unity3D, and synced them so that they could be displayed on an iPad. "When the iPad application is running, it displays the normal feed from the

---

[163] Stuart Eve, "Dead men's eyes: embodied GIS, mixed reality and landscape archaeology", PhD diss., University College London, 2013, 5, http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1419267/1/Eve_Stuart_thesis.pdf.%20COMPLETE.pdf

[164] Eve, "Dead men's eyes", 73, http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1419267/1/Eve_Stuart_thesis.pdf.%20COMPLETE.pdf

[165] Ibid., 81

video on the screen. As the user moves the camera to see the physical fort the application

and the image recognition algorithm recognises the image marker and overlays the virtual

elements onto screen, so that they appear to be part of the fort itself."[166] The virtual

elements that Eve included are moving people and animals, interior layouts, and image

markers that function like information boards.[167] The Mixed Reality aspect of this, which

makes it different from Augmented Reality, is that Eve proposes to include other senses

in the presentation of sites. He acknowledges that visual aspects of Augmented Reality

are better developed than other aspects like auditory or olfactory augmentation, but

proposes that including these would allow for a better understanding of the

phenomenology of a site.[168]

In the context of Tintagel, it is easy to see how a Mixed Reality approach when

promoting tourism could be useful. It would allow visitors to have a more engaged

experience with the archaeological remains and would fulfill English Heritage's need to

present the site in a way that ensures its popularity as a tourist destination. Any visitor

with a smartphone or tablet could use an application like Dead Men's Eyes. English

Heritage could virtually reconstruct the castle and visitors could get a glimpse of the true

scale of the site and the realities of day-to-day live in Medieval Britain. It would be both

educational and innovative, and if done in a manner that maximizes the effect of real

history at the site, it would not face the backlash of their current projects. As their

website states, imagination is key. English Heritage says they "seek to be imaginative in

the way that history is brought to life, thinking creatively, using the most effective means,

---

[166] Ibid., 85
[167] Ibid., 86
[168] Ibid., 283

surprising and delighting people. We want each experience to be vivid, alive and unforgettable."[169] Being the frontrunners for a pioneering project to implement Mixed Reality at Tintagel Castle could result in the positive public reaction they were hoping for from their new Arthurian attractions and perhaps improve their reputation in the eyes of those who currently oppose them.

---

[169] "Our Vision and Values", *English Heritage,* http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-values/.

Works Cited

Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882, Ch. 73

Ashe, Geoffrey. *The quest for Arthur's Britain*. Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers, 1994

Alcock, Leslie. *Was this Camelot?: Excavations at Cadbury Castle, 1966-1970*. New York: Stein and Day, 1972.

Barton, L. "Arthurian secrets to be uncovered as time team starts digging into the past." *Plymouth Herald*. July 17, 2016. http://www.plymouthherald.co.uk/arthurian-secrets-to-be-uncovered-as-time-team-starts-digging-into-the-past/story-29521775-detail/story.html.

Beall, Abigail. "Has the real birthplace of King Arthur been found? Archaeologists unearth Dark Age royal palace - just where legends said he was born - but which had already vanished by the time they were written down." *Daily Mail Online*. August 04, 2016. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-3721915/Has-Camelot-Royal-palace-Dark-Ages-unearthed-legendary-site-King-Arthur-s-birth.html.\

Chhabra, Deepak, Robert Healy, and Erin Sills. *Staged authenticity and heritage tourism*. Annals of Tourism Research 30 (3) 2003: 702-19.

Cockburn, Patrick. "Brexit unleashed an English nationalism that has damaged the union with Scotland for good." *The Independent*. March 17, 2017. http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/brexit-scottish-referendum-english-nationalism-damaged-union-for-good-a7635796.html.

"Constitution." *Kernow Matters To Us*. http://kernowmatterstous.weebly.com/constitution.html.

"Cornish Stannary Parliament Archives - Do you agree with the Cornish Stannary Parliament's policy of removing English Heritage signs?" *Cornish Stannary Parliament.* http://cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk//resources//polls/index.php?qid=EH01&aid=-1#comments.

"Cornish Stannary Parliament tackles English cultural aggression in Cornwall." *Cornish Stannary Parliament.* http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/heritage-signs.html.

Deacon, Bernard. *A Concise History of Cornwall*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press,

2007.

Ebert, Roger. "King Arthur." *RogerEbert.com*. July 07, 2004.
    http://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/king-arthur-2004.

"English Heritage: Our Vision and Values." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-
    heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-values/.

"English Heritage accused of 'vandalism' after Merlin sculpture at Tintagel Castle causes
    outrage." *The Telegraph*. February 16, 2016.
    http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/12159673/English-Heritage-accused-
    of-vandalism-after-Merlin-scuplture-at-Tintagel-Castle-causes-outrage.html.

Eve, Stuart. "Dead men's eyes: embodied GIS, mixed reality and landscape archaeology".
    PhD diss. University College London, 2013.
    dihttp://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1419267/1/Eve_Stuart_thesis.pdf.%20COMPLETE.p
    dfTitle

"Ex-Bangor University professor reveals 'true Camelot'". *BBC News*. December 18, 2016.
    http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-wales-north-west-wales-38330272.

Friedman, George. "3 Reasons Brits Voted for Brexit." *Forbes*. July 05, 2016.
https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnmauldin/2016/07/05/3-reasons-brits-voted-for-
brexit/#189143031f9d.

Greaney, Susan. "Archaeology at Tintagel… on the edge of a cliff!" *Day of Archaeology*.
    August 2, 2016. http://www.dayofarchaeology.com/archaeology-at-tintagel-on-
    the-edge-of-a-cliff/.

Hingham, N. J., *King Arthur: Myth-making and History*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Hunt, Alex, and Brian Wheeler. "Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the
    EU." *BBC News*. March 30, 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-
    32810887.

Keys, David. "Dark Ages royal palace discovered in Cornwall – in area closely linked to
    the legend of King Arthur." *The Independent*. August 02, 2016.
    http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/archaeology/king-arthur-castle-
    cornwall-tintagel-dark-ages-palace-camelot-a7168761.html.

Lacy, Norris J., Geoffrey Ashe, and Debra N. Mancoff. *The Arthurian Handbook*. New
    York: Routledge, 2009.

Lacy, Norris J., and Geoffrey Ashe. *The Arthurian encyclopedia*. Vol. 585. New York:
    Garland Pub, 1986

Leland, John. *The itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543*. Edited by Lucy Toulmin Smith. London: George Bell and Sons, 1907.

Lu, Jiaxi. "What is 'click bait' and why Facebook wants to display less of it." *The Washington Post*. August 26, 2014. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/technology/wp/2014/08/26/what-is-click-bait-and-why-facebook-wants-to-display-less-of-it/?utm_term=.39f94f957aa9.

Lupack, Alan. 2005. *The oxford guide to Arthurian literature and legend*. New York; Oxford [England]: Oxford University Press, 2005.

"Merlin's face revealed at Tintagel Castle." *English Heritage*. February 11, 2016. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/search-news/merlin-carving-tintagel.

Mills, David. *A dictionary of British place-names*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Morris, Steven. "'This is not Disneyland, it's Cornwall': the battle of Tintagel Castle*." The Guardian*. March 18, 2016. https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/mar/18/this-is-not-disneyland-its-cornwall-battle-tintagel-castle.

Mynors, Charles. *Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Monuments*. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2006.

National Heritage Act, 1983, c. 47

Orange, Hilary, and Patrick Laviolette. "A disgruntled tourist in king Arthur's court: Archaeology and identity at Tintagel, Cornwall." *Public Archaeology* 9 (2) 2010: 85-107

"Our History." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/our-history/.

Plavén-Sigray, Pontus, Granville James Matheson, Björn Christian Schiffler and William Hedley Thompson. "The Readability of Scientific Texts Is Decreasing Over Time". *Biorxiv*. March 28, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1101/119370

Radford, C. A. Ralegh. *Tintagel Castle*. London: HM Stationary Office, 1937.

Robson, William Wallace. "Alfred, Lord Tennyson." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. July 13, 2011. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Alfred-Lord-Tennyson.

Romey, Kristin. "Not-So-Dark Ages Revealed at King Arthur Site." *National Geographic*. August 10, 2016. http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/08/tintagel-arthur-knights-england-castle-medieval-royalty-merlin-archaeology/.

Sanders, Kevin. "Discoveries and excavations at Tintagel Castle." *English Heritage Blog*. August 09, 2016. http://blog.english-heritage.org.uk/discoveries-excavations-tintagel-castle/.

Stone, Jon. "Theresa May accuses Nicola Sturgeon of playing a 'game' with second Scottish independence referendum." *The Independent*. March 13, 2017. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/scottish-independence-referendum-second-nicola-sturgeon-theresa-may-response-a7627496.html.

"The Cornish Stannary Parliament." *The Cornish Stannary Parliament*. 2008. http://www.cornishstannaryparliament.co.uk/.

"Tintagel Castle: archaeologists begin vital dig to find out about historic site's past." *ITV News*. July 26, 2016. http://www.itv.com/news/westcountry/2016-07-26/tintagel-castle-archaeologists-begin-vital-dig-to-find-out-about-historic-sites-past/.

"Tintagel Castle Facilities." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/tintagel-castle/facilities.

"Tintagel Castle Prices and Opening Times." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/tintagel-castle/prices-and-opening-times.

Tintagel Castle Reviews", *TripAdvisor,* https://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g186245-d188523-Reviews-Tintagel_Castle-Tintagel_Cornwall_England.html

"Tintagel Castle Things to Do." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/tintagel-castle/things-to-do/#Section1.

"Tintagel Castle: archaeologists begin vital dig to find out about historic site's past." *ITV News*. July 26, 2016. http://www.itv.com/news/westcountry/2016-07-26/tintagel-castle-archaeologists-begin-vital-dig-to-find-out-about-historic-sites-past/.

"Top 10 Castles." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/familydaysout/top-10-castles/.

"Top 10 Days Out." *English Heritage*. http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/familydaysout/top-10-family-days-out/.

Weatherhill, Craig. "Save Tintagel from English Heritage." *Kernow Matters To Us*. February 26, 2016. http://kernowmatterstous.weebly.com/save-tintagel-from-english-heritage.html.

Author's Biography

Elizabeth G. Proctor was born in Waltham, Massachusetts on October 21, 1994. She was raised in Newbury, Massachusetts and graduated from Triton Regional High School as Valedictorian in 2013. Majoring in anthropology, Elizabeth has minors in art history and medieval and Renaissance studies. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Alpha Lambda Delta, and the president of the All Maine Women. She received the Presidential Scholarship from the University of Maine four years in a row, and was the Charles Stanhope '71 Study Abroad Fellow for the 2015-2016 academic year.

Upon graduation in May 2017, Elizabeth plans to attend Cornell University and pursue a Master's degree in Archaeology through the Cornell Institute of Archaeology and Material Studies.