"Introduction to *Tito Andronico (Titus Andronicus)*." *Early Modern German Shakespeare: and : Tito Andronico and Kunst über alle Künste, ein böß Weib gut zu machen in Translation*. Shakespeare, William. Erne, Lukas, Florence Hazrat, and Maria Shmygol, eds. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2022. 1–82. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350094741.0009>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 14:02 UTC.

Copyright © Lukas Erne, Florence Hazrat and Maria Shmygol 2022. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

INTRODUCTION TO *TITO ANDRONICO* (*TITUS ANDRONICUS*)

Until not so long ago, *Titus Andronicus*, first published in London in 1594, was considered a barbarous and savage play. Generations of critics were repulsed by what they saw as its excessive violence, and passed it off as a piece of Shakespeare's juvenilia or denied that he wrote it at all.¹ Yet it was that very violence which made the story of Titus Andronicus immensely popular in its own day, both in England and on the Continent. When English travelling actors performed plays in their native tongue in the Netherlands and in Germany, the audience's lack of linguistic comprehension was compensated for by physical action and, in the case of versions of *Titus*, by displays of spectacular violence: bloodshed, torture, rape and mutilation. That the Titus material was popular in Germany from at least the early seventeenth century is suggested by a German collection of *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (*English Comedies and Tragedies*, Leipzig, 1620) which contains *Eine sehr klägliche Tragædia von Tito Andronico vnd der hoffertigen Kâyserin* (*A Very Lamentable Tragedy of Tito Andronico and the Haughty Empress*). The play's action largely corresponds to what we find in *Titus*, although *Tito* is much shorter, written entirely in prose, and differs from the English play in intriguing ways. Since the nineteenth century, *Tito Andronico* has sporadically attracted the interest of scholars, but, prior to the present edition, it has never received the attention it deserves.² It is a play that has much to teach us and is an important witness to the early history of Titus plays on the English stage.

¹ See Metz, *Studies*, 17–43.

² The most comprehensive studies of *Tito* are Fuller and Braekman.

The German play is only 1,154 lines long, whereas *Titus*, now commonly believed to have been co-authored by Shakespeare and George Peele, comes in at approximately 2,500 lines.¹ Unlike the early quarto texts of *Titus*, which have no formal act or scene divisions, *Tito* is divided into eight acts.² While the plot is similar to that of *Titus*, the action in *Tito* is more streamlined and some elements are absent, including the classical references: no mention is made of Philomel and Tereus (2.2.43; 2.3.38–43; 4.1.47–53; 5.2.194), and no copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* appears on the stage (4.1.42). The language of *Tito* is simpler than that of *Titus*, but it is not without moments of rhetorical force, particularly in Tito's outrage at Aetiopissa (4.3.8–20) and his moving response to the futile loss of his hand (4.3.21–7), as well as his lamentations over his dead sons (4.3.28–33) and his defiled daughter (4.3.60–76). Throughout the play, there are parallels with the language and imagery of *Titus*, a number of which are discussed below, and many more in the commentary.

The number of roles in *Tito* is significantly smaller than in *Titus*. The German play omits Mutius, Young Lucius, Publius, Sempronius, Caius, Valentine, Emillius and Alarbus; all that remains of Quintus and Martius are their heads: those of two unnamed sons of Tito are brought on stage in Act 4, Scene 3.

¹ Hart counts 2,522 lines (21), which includes the Folio-only 'Fly Scene' (3.2), of which *Tito* shows no trace, so the quarto text of *Titus* has approximately 2,435 lines. For Shakespeare and Peele's co-authorship of *Titus*, see Vickers, 148–243, and Taylor and Loughnane, 490–3.

² Quarto editions of *Titus Andronicus* appeared in 1594, 1600 and 1611. The First Folio collection of Shakespeare's dramatic works, which divides the play into five acts, was published in 1623, three years after the first edition of *Tito*. Four plays in the 1620 volume are divided into five acts (and one of them, *Sidonia und Theagene*, is further divided into scenes). *Julio und Hyppolita* is in four Acts, while two plays in the collection, *Von dem verlorenen Sohn* (*The Prodigal Son*) and *Von eines Königes Sohne auß Engellandt vnd des Königes Tochter aus Schottlandt* (*A King's Son of England and a King's Daughter of Scotland*), have six acts. It is most unusual for early modern plays in Germany or England to be divided into eight acts, and we know of no other instance.

Yet all the major characters are present, although with the exception of *Tito* their names are entirely different: Vespasianus (Lucius), Victoriades (Marcus), Andronica (Lavinia), Aetiopissa (Tamora), Helicates (Demetrius), Saphonus (Chiron) and Morian (Aaron).¹ *Tito*'s equivalent of Saturninus has no name but is simply referred to as the Roman Emperor. As we will see below, the characterization of Morian and Aetiopissa differs substantially from that of Aaron and Tamora, and there are other, subtler differences that impact the other characters, notably *Tito*, Andronica and Vespasianus.

Despite these differences, *Tito Andronico* can shed much light on the English play, and recent editors of *Titus Andronicus* have shown some awareness of this. Jonathan Bate's Arden edition bases a crucial stage direction on *Tito*. In Act 3, Scene 1, Titus is tricked by Aaron into cutting off his hand in the hope of saving the life of his sons Quintus and Martius. But they are executed nonetheless, and their heads are sent to Titus along with his hand, as recorded in a startling stage direction, '*Enter a Messenger with two heads and a hand*' (3.1.234 SD). The remaining Andronici, Titus, Marcus, Lucius and the mutilated Lavinia, are aghast. Commenting on an unscripted stage action, Marcus says, 'Alas, poor heart, that kiss is comfortless / As frozen water to a starved snake' (3.1.251–2).² No early edition clarifies what action prompts Marcus' words, leading editors to speculate about various possibilities: 'Lavinia kisses [Marcus]', 'Lavinia kisses Lucius' or 'Lavinia kisses Titus' (Ard³ *TA*, 47). Yet the stage direction in the German version states that Lavinia '*goes to the heads and kisses them*' (4.3.80 SD), which Bate adopts and slightly adapts: '*Lavinia kisses the heads*' (3.1.250 SD). Arrestingly, the 'tongueless woman', Lavinia, thus 'kisses the severed heads of her

¹ For the names of the characters in *Tito*, see below, pp. 168–70. *Tito* can be performed by a minimum of ten actors as opposed to the much larger number needed for *Titus* (see the Appendix).

² All references are from Ard³ *TA* unless indicated otherwise.

brothers', Quintus and Martius (Ard³ *TA*, 47). Close attention to the German version here leads to the insertion of poignant stage business into an authoritative edition of Shakespeare's play.

Gary Taylor and his fellow editors of *The New Oxford Shakespeare* have similarly given prominence to *Tito*. Like Bate, they draw on the German play to make Lavinia kiss her brothers' severed heads, and, unlike Bate, they quote directly from a translation of *Tito* when doing so (5.248 SD). Later in the scene, when Titus invites Lucius, Marcus and Lavinia to swear an oath with him, the editors of *The New Oxford Shakespeare* use evidence from *Titus*, namely the protagonist's 'You heavy people, circle me about' (5.275), as the basis for their inserted stage direction: 'They form a circle and make a vow' (5.277 SD). The equivalent stage direction in *Tito* does not call for a circle and is somewhat different in how it handles the swearing of the oath, yet the editors of the *New Oxford Shakespeare* demonstrate the value of the German play as an early witness of theatrical practice by reproducing the corresponding stage direction in the margin (see *Tito*, 5.1.61 SD) in one of the edition's 'Performance Notes', whose purpose it is 'to call attention to more complex staging possibilities' (47) than those embedded in the stage directions of the main text.

Despite this incipient awareness of *Tito*'s importance, the German play remains a vastly underused resource in the study of *Titus Andronicus*. For while recent editors of *Titus* incorporate one or two of its stage directions, they take no account of many others that are no less important. For instance, in the opening scene of both plays, the Moor character, Morian in *Tito* and Aaron in *Titus*, is silent during the succession crisis but remains on stage when all the other characters leave and speaks a soliloquy. In *Tito*, the play's opening stage direction points out that Morian 'has a humble cloak pulled over his magnificent clothes' (1.1.0 SD), and when the other characters have left, another stage direction informs us that 'He pulls off the old cloak' (1.1.83 SD) to reveal his magnificent clothes. There is no

equivalent stage direction in *Titus*, but Aaron's words are suggestive: 'Away with slavish weeds and servile thoughts! / I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold' (1.1.517–18). Does Aaron remove his 'slavish weeds' at the same time as he mentions them? At the very least, Morian enacts a version of what Aaron says, and it is not impossible that Aaron's words were accompanied by a similar costume change.

There are other moments in the play when a stage direction in *Tito* may reflect how *Titus* was performed. When Aaron arrives to announce that the Emperor will spare Titus' sons in exchange for a chopped-off hand, Marcus and Lucius plead with Titus to let one of them undergo the ordeal. When Titus declines the offer, they keep pleading (3.1.151–83). At the equivalent point, Tito's brother and son '*fall on their knees before him*' (*Tito*, 4.1.32 SD) as a way of intensifying their pleas. A stage direction close to the end of *Tito* similarly conveys how a moment of emotional crisis was staged. When Aetiopissa, as *Tito*'s Empress is called, has been informed by Tito that the pie from which she has been eating contains her sons' remains, she '*shakes and trembles violently in fright*' (8.2.51 SD). Neither stage direction has an equivalent in *Titus*, but the action they designate is perfectly compatible with the English play and may reflect what happened in early performances.

Similarly, after Tamora has given birth, the Nurse enters to Aaron, Demetrius and Chiron with the '*blackamoor child*' (4.2.51 SD). Tamora's sons are dismayed and want to 'dispatch' (4.2.88) the baby. The conflict comes to a head when Demetrius demands, 'Nurse, give it me' (4.2.88), yet the baby is rescued by Aaron. There is no stage direction in the early editions of the English play to indicate how the moment was staged. The English dramatist Edward Ravenscroft, who produced an adaptation of *Titus Andronicus* in 1678 (published 1687), inserted a stage direction, '*Aron takes the child from the Woman*' (Ard³ TA, 265), and Hughes comments that 'Aaron probably takes the child from the Nurse' (126). The stage action in *Tito* is

different, however, and arguably more dramatic: Saphonus ‘takes the child from the midwife, draws his sword and is about to kill the child’ (6.1.47 SD) when it is snatched from him by Morian. Here and elsewhere, *Tito* provides the best evidence we have of how the English play may have been performed, and the stage action is different from and arguably more complex and more interesting than that mediated to us through modern editions of *Titus*.

Other stage directions in *Tito* that may reflect the early performance history of *Titus* concern the character of Andronica (*Tito*’s Lavinia). When Andronica and her husband enter in the scene that will lead to the former’s rape and the latter’s murder, they do so ‘hand in hand’ (3.3.0 SD). The equivalent stage direction in *Titus* (‘Enter BASSIANUS and LAVINIA’, 2.2.50 SD) does not convey this detail, although physical intimacy between Lavinia and her husband is suggested in the allusion to the newlyweds’ consummation of their marriage (2.1.14–17). When the husband is murdered, *Titus* has no stage direction that tells us what she does, but *Tito* informs us that ‘*She goes to sit on the ground with the corpse*’ (3.3.69 SD). After Lavinia/Andronica has been raped, she reappears on stage with the rapists who have mutilated her, and now make cruel fun of the fact (*Titus*, 2.3.1–10; *Tito*, 4.2.1–9). When the brothers have left, she remains on stage alone, and a stage direction in *Tito*, with no equivalent in *Titus*, informs us that she is ‘*sighing and looking wretchedly up to heaven*’ (4.2.9 SD2). When the mutilated Lavinia has been found by her uncle and brought by him before her father and her brother, Lucius responds verbally to the sight of his sister – ‘Ay me, this object kills me’ (3.1.65) – and the following line, spoken by Titus, implies that he has responded physically, too, for Titus asks him to ‘arise and look upon her’ (3.1.66). According to an editorially added stage direction in the Arden edition, Lucius ‘*fall[s] to his knees*’ (3.1.64 SD), whereas the editors of the *New Oxford Shakespeare* comment that ‘Lucius must have sat, fallen, or knelt, or perhaps

fainted at the sight of Lavinia's injuries' (215). Neither edition mentions that *Tito* supports this last possibility, for a stage direction spells out that Vespasianus, as the Lucius character is called in *Tito*, 'falls to the ground in a swoon' (4.3.59 SD).

If, with Bate and the editors of the *New Oxford Shakespeare*, we assume that, in some instances, *Tito*'s stage directions reflect how *Titus* was performed, then we have reason to suppose that they may do so in other instances too. *Tito* thus has much to offer to editors, critics and actors who want to come to a fuller understanding of *Titus Andronicus*, of how it may be staged now and of how it may have been staged in Shakespeare's time.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF *TITO* *ANDRONICO TO TITUS* *ANDRONICUS*

Other early modern German plays edited for Arden Shakespeare – *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*, *Romio und Julieta* and *Kunst über alle Künste* – are adaptations of Shakespeare's plays. *Tito* is special insofar as it may be based not on the surviving *Titus Andronicus* at all, but an earlier version of the play or a common source play (see below, pp. 36–40). Nonetheless, the relationship between *Tito* and *Titus* is close, and the aim of this section is to explore it.

In *Tito*'s first scene, eight of the nine principal characters are onstage (only Victoriades is not), and the only extras called for are unspecified 'Romans'.¹ The first scene of *Titus*, by contrast, calls not only for fourteen named characters to be onstage (Saturninus, Bassianus, Titus, his brother, his four sons and his daughter, Tamora, her three sons and Aaron) but also for a

¹ Victoriades may be absent from the opening scene because the actor who plays his role later in the play is needed in this scene as one of the unnamed 'Romans' (see Appendix, pp. 417–19).

series of unnamed characters: Tribunes, Senators, Soldiers, Goths and a Captain. The opening scene of *Tito* is short compared to that of *Titus*. It focuses on a single issue, the selection of the new emperor, before concluding with Morian's soliloquy. Vespasianus identifies Tito as the most deserving candidate for the imperial crown, to which the future Emperor (who is given no proper name) angrily objects, prompting Tito to recuse himself; as a result, the Emperor is crowned and Tito's prisoners are presented to him. The action of the first scene thus ends harmoniously, without any physical confrontations or deaths, and the only indication of future complications is the Emperor's volatile hot-headedness and the suggestion that he has a romantic interest in Aetiopissa despite his betrothal to Andronica (1.1.51–3). The English play, by contrast, dramatizes many issues: the contest for the imperial crown (1.1.1–66); Titus' arrival in Rome and the sacrifice of Alarbus (1.1.66–171); Titus' candidacy for the crown and his promotion of Saturninus (1.1.172–237); the fray following the disagreement over Lavinia (1.1.238–342); the burial of Mutius (1.1.343–95); Tamora's deceitful peace-making between the Andronici and Saturninus (1.1.404–99); Aaron's soliloquy (1.1.500–24); and Chiron and Demetrius' quarrel about Lavinia (1.1.525–635).¹ Two important episodes in *Titus* have no equivalent in *Tito*, namely the sacrificial murder of Alarbus and the disagreement about Lavinia, which leads to Titus' murder of his own son, Mutius. The opening scene of *Tito* is thus considerably more streamlined than the complex action found in *Titus*.

In *Titus*, Saturninus rejects Lavinia in favour of Tamora because of the altercation with Bassianus and the Andronici (1.1.280–325), but the Emperor in *Tito* does not have the same motivation for rejecting Andronica. He simply states that he loves Aetiopissa far more than Andronica. He then crowns his

¹ The Folio introduces an act division after 1.1.499, so that Aaron's soliloquy and the quarrel between the two brothers form the opening of the second act.

new consort onstage, whereas Saturninus only expresses his intention to make Tamora his consort (1.1.320–5). *Tito* thus dramatizes what *Titus* verbalizes.

Although *Tito* is much shorter than *Titus*, there is one element of the opening scene that is more substantial in the German play: the Moor's soliloquy. In *Titus*, Aaron's soliloquy reveals his tendencies for villainy and ill will in general terms (1.1.500–24), whereas Morian's longer speech (1.1.81–130) provides an account of the speaker's background and history. Morian's presentation is also more dramatic than Aaron's; he throws off the old cloak that covers his fine clothing before sharing his hopes for Aetiopissa's seduction of the Emperor. He reveals that he had cuckolded the King of Ethiopia, whom Aetiopissa poisoned with a cup of wine, boasts of his villainies (such as secret murders at the Ethiopian court) and military prowess (noting that he was known as the 'Thunder and Lightning of Ethiopia', 1.1.111–12), and recounts Tito's invasion of his homeland, his engagement with Tito in combat and the Romans' devastation of Ethiopia. Whereas *Titus* introduces Aaron as the stock type of the black villain, *Tito* thus provides a fuller sense of who Morian is.

The action that follows corresponds more closely to *Titus*: Helicates and Saphonus declare their love for Andronica and quarrel over who shall have her (2.1.38–66) in much the same way as Chiron and Demetrius do (1.1.525–44). Both plays highlight the problem that the object of the brothers' desire is already married, and in both plays the Moor is instrumental in devising the rape plot. A hunt is called for, and the apparent pleasantness of the new day is offset by a foreboding dream (*Tito*, 3.2.1–5; *Titus*, 2.1.1–2, 9–10). This is followed by the rape and mutilation of Andronica/Lavinia and the imprisonment of two Andronici sons. Whereas in *Titus* significance is placed on Aaron's plot to frame Titus' sons for Bassianus' murder by means of a pit, a forged letter and a bag of gold (2.2.1–50), in *Tito* the focus is exclusively on the attack on Andronica.

In *Tito* there is no reason for Morian and Aetiopissa to cross paths before meeting Andronica and her husband as there is in *Titus* (2.2.1–50), which means that the couple do not witness the Empress' dalliance with the Moor, and therefore have no cause to berate them. In *Tito* 3.3, Aetiopissa enters to Andronica and, without any provocation, mocks her for not having a large retinue of servants. Andronica responds by commenting on the Empress' 'haughty spirit' (3.3.28), which causes Aetiopissa to fly into a rage. In *Titus* the equivalent exchange takes a different course: Lavinia and Bassianus mock Tamora after seeing her dalliance with Aaron (2.2.51–88), and it is this that enrages her. Aetiopissa's attack on Andronica and her subsequent vow for revenge (3.3.41–6) thus lack Tamora's justification. The two versions of the confrontation between Andronica/Lavinia and the Empress reveal how the characters differ in the two plays. Tamora's amorous dalliance with the Moor, which is absent from *Tito*, arises from her sexual licentiousness. The emphasis in the German play is on Aetiopissa's arrogance, as the title's reference to the 'haughty Empress' suggests.

After the murder of Bassianus and Lavinia's rape, Titus' younger sons are lured into a pit containing Bassianus' corpse, and the evidence which seemingly corroborates their guilt (actually forged by Aaron) seals their fate (2.2.192–306). This episode is not in *Tito*, where Andronica's husband is never mentioned again, and it is thus unclear what happens with his body.

In fact, no sons other than Vespasianus are mentioned in *Tito* until the beginning of Act 4, when we learn that two unnamed sons have, in fact, been imprisoned, not for murder but on the charge of having insulted Aetiopissa with 'mockery and libels' (4.1.7).¹ Their imprisonment not only leads to their beheading,

¹ Aetiopissa's reference to 'brothers' (3.3.75) is the first indication in the play that Tito has more than one son.

which is necessary for the plot, but also draws further attention to Aetiopissa's pride and cunning. Her responsibility for the sons' imprisonment logically follows her threat to Andronica in the previous scene, where she vows to 'murder your entire kin, including your parents and brothers' (3.3.74–5). The difference between *Tito* and *Titus* thus highlights the status of the Empress as the chief villain in the German play.

In both plays, Tito/Titus is tricked into cutting off his hand on the promise of his sons' liberty, only to have it returned to him with their heads. This happens in close proximity to the protagonist's discovery of his ravished daughter, but the order of events is different in the two versions. In *Titus*, Marcus discovers Lavinia and delivers a long speech (2.3.11–57); after Titus attempts to plead with the Tribunes for his sons' lives (3.1.1–58), Marcus presents the ravished Lavinia, who is lamented over and comforted by her brother and father (3.1.59–150); Aaron arrives bearing a message from the Emperor, and Titus sends his brother and son to cast lots, while the Moor helps him to cut off his hand onstage before taking it away (3.1.151–206). Later in the same scene, a messenger brings back the heads and hand (3.1.235–41), which precipitates the Andronici's oath for revenge. In *Tito* 4.1, Morian arrives to deliver the Empress' offer to pardon the sons if Tito sacrifices his hand (16–20), and Tito severs his hand offstage after he tricks Vespasianus and Victoriades into drawing lots for the sacrifice (33–41). The next scene shifts to Andronica, who is left in the forest by her attackers and is discovered by her uncle. Act 4, Scene 3 returns to Tito, who receives his severed hand and sons' heads from Morian. His grief is compounded when Victoriades presents him with the ravished Andronica (4.3.55–76). The order of events in *Titus* means that after the protagonist pleads in vain for his sons' lives and is confronted with his ravished daughter, there is a glimmer of hope: Aaron arrives with his message. The hopes are then dashed with the revelation that Titus and his kin have been tricked, which leads them to

swear an oath of revenge. In *Tito*, the hopefulness that accompanies the severing of his hand is dashed by Morian's return with the hand and severed heads, and Tito's grief and outrage are compounded by the revelation that his daughter has been raped and maimed.

Differences between the two plays in the Moor's delivery of his message have a significant effect on his character. In *Titus*, where he is the principal villain, the Moor tells Titus that Saturninus proposes to let his sons live in exchange for a hand (3.1.151–7), but his comments to Lucius later in the play suggest that Saturninus had no knowledge of Aaron's proposition (5.1.111–20). Thus, Aaron not only tricks Titus, but also usurps Saturninus' authority. Furthermore, the fact that it is Aaron who physically severs Titus' hand cements the fact that he is the play's chief villain. In *Tito*, Aetiopissa is the principal antagonist, and she rather than Morian is responsible for tricking Tito. Morian delivers the message on Aetiopissa's orders (4.1.16–20), which he confirms later when confessing to Vespasianus (7.1.84–9).¹ Morian does not express anything akin to Aaron's ghoulish glee at seeing Tito realize that he has been deceived. On the contrary, Morian twice expresses sympathy for Tito: when Tito exits to cut off his hand, he says, 'even though I have a pitiless heart, I pity you, old Tito Andronico' (4.1.45–6); when he returns the body parts he adds, 'I pity you, for you have been tricked out of your noble and valiant hand' (4.3.1–2). While that last could on its own be thought feigned pity, Morian's first expression of sympathy for Tito, made when alone, suggests that it is genuine. Morian thus does not share Aaron's motivations and boundless maliciousness, and the play's villainous agency is firmly centred on Aetiopissa.

In *Titus*, the return of Titus' hand and his sons' heads leads to the first of two oaths sworn by the Andronici. The first oath

¹ Aetiopissa's responsibility for the trick is corroborated by the Emperor, who congratulates her on her ingenious plan in 5.2.1–6.

(3.1.276–80) follows the gruesome delivery of the severed heads (which arrive after the raped Lavinia has been discovered and presented to her father), and the second oath is sworn once the identity of Lavinia's attackers has been revealed (following 4.1.78). In *Tito*, there are not two oaths but one: Act 4 ends with Victoriades' proposal to 'consider how we can find out who has abused her thus' (4.3.83–4), and Act 5 opens with the Andronici's re-entry and Andronica's revelation of her attackers' identities, which prompt the Andronici to swear an oath.¹ This means that the main catalyst for Titus' first oath is a desire to revenge his sons' deaths rather than his daughter's attackers. By contrast, it is Andronica's revelation that is the call to arms in *Tito*.² *Tito*'s plot construction is thus such that it arguably gives greater importance to the protagonist's daughter than does *Titus*.

Although the means by which Andronica and Lavinia reveal the names of their attackers are almost identical, the circumstances surrounding the disclosure are different. In *Titus*, Lucius is not present on account of his banishment, and it is his son, Young Lucius, who enters running from Lavinia, who chases him and attempts to seize the book that he clutches: a copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (4.1.1–43). When she points to the tale of Philomel, Marcus invites Lavinia to take his staff in her mouth and write the names of the perpetrators on a 'sandy plot' (4.1.69). It is seventy-eight lines into the scene before the names are finally written. The circumstances leading up to the

¹ It is possible that in performance there was a break between Acts 4 and 5, given that this is the midway point of the play, which would explain the immediate re-entry. Victoriades' comment and Tito's response, 'Let us go in and have no rest until we have found them out' (4.3.85–6), may anticipate the passage of stage time spent during the interval.

² In fact, she provides only one name in writing: 'There is "Helicates" and also "hunt"' (5.1.28–9). Tito infers that Saphonus was also involved and that the Empress was likewise to blame. While the dialogue in *Titus* implies that Lavinia makes arm gestures to indicate that there was more than one attacker (4.1.37–9), there is no such indication in *Tito*.

revelation of the names in *Tito* 5.1 are more direct, and the initiative to communicate them does not come from the female victim but from her brother. The scene opens with *Tito* lamenting and attempting to comfort *Andronica*, and *Vespasianus* enters with a basket of sand and a stick, stating that his sister should attempt to write the names by this means (5.1.18–20).¹ *Tito* places the stick between *Andronica*’s stumps and she immediately succeeds in writing with it (5.1.21–7). *Tito* is thus less elaborate than *Titus*, and the two plays differ substantially in terms of the agency ascribed to the ravished daughter. Whereas *Lavinia* actively seeks to reveal her ordeal to her relatives, *Andronica* is prompted to do so by them.

A possible reason why *Tito* foregrounds *Vespasianus*’ agency at this important moment is that it reinforces his status as a worthy successor to the Roman crown. After the oath of revenge is sworn, *Tito* entrusts his son with the weighty task of taking the ‘vast store of my treasury’ (5.1.65) in order to raise an army. *Vespasianus* rises to the task and proclaims, ‘by the god Mars that I shall not cease my rage and fury until pale Death has triumphed over my heart’ (5.1.69–71). *Tito*’s faith in his son is reiterated in his recollection of their recent military exploits:

[I]n the recent battle with the Moors I saw him fight
like a fierce tiger. In you I place all my hope, and if I
must end my old life here, I know that you will take
vengeance on our enemies.

(5.1.79–82)

In *Titus*, *Lucius* is not present in the equivalent scene, and though *Marcus* has his other family members swear to ‘prosecute by good advice / Mortal revenge upon these traitorous Goths’ (4.1.92–3), no military plan is made at this point. Conversely, in *Tito*, *Andronica*’s revelation leads directly

¹ An advantage of bringing a basket of sand that is then poured onto the floor is that it makes the action easier for the audience to follow.

to a call to arms, and Vespasianus is called upon to raise an army with which to destroy Rome.

The events at the end of Act 5, Scene 1 and in Act 5, Scene 2 loosely correspond to *Titus* 4.3.76–120 and 4.4.39–67, where Titus meets the Clown, who is on his way to the court with a basket of pigeons. Titus bids him deliver a letter with a knife enfolded within it to Saturninus. Saturninus does not read the letter aloud, but has a strong reaction to it, presumably prompted by the knife, and orders the Clown to be executed. *Tito* devotes more attention to the message intended for the Emperor. Tito dictates a message that he wants delivered orally to the Emperor, and further asks the messenger to deliver a ‘letter together with its contents’ (5.1.96) and a sword. At court, the messenger recounts Tito’s words and offers the sword to the Emperor. When the Emperor opens the letter he finds in it the ‘naked blade’ (5.2.52–3) and immediately orders that the messenger be turned over to the hangman. The presentation of the sword may be the result of a conflation of the Messenger’s letter with a different episode from the source play, preserved in *Titus* 4.2.1–16, where Young Lucius provocatively presents swords to Chiron and Demetrius. *Titus* thus has two kinds of objects (knife and sword) in two passages which *Tito* dramatizes in one.

Following Tito’s declaration of war at the end of Act 5, Act 6 shifts to the domestic concerns of the Empress, namely the birth of the mixed-race child. The action is similar to *Titus* 4.2.52–148, where the Nurse enters to Aaron, Chiron and Demetrius, and presents them with the child, telling Aaron that Tamora has ordered him to kill it; Aaron refuses and instead kills the Nurse. In *Tito*, the Midwife enters with the infant, noting that Aetiopissa wishes Morian to ‘secretly put it out of the way’ (6.1.2–3). Yet after Saphonus and Helicates discover the Midwife and question her about her ward, we learn that the child’s mother has ordered her to take the child to Morian ‘so that he can have it brought up in secret to make sure that no-one knows about it’ (6.1.28–9). Just as the outraged brothers are about to kill the child, Morian

enters and dismisses them, and the Midwife is able to deliver Aetiopissa's message in full, bidding him 'take it in secret to Mount Thaurin, where your father lives, so that he can raise it; no-one must know that it was born of the Empress' (6.1.85–8).¹ Thus, the respective plans of Tamora and Aetiopissa for dealing with the child are starkly different: where the former proposes death, the latter plans for future life.

Morian's attempt to deliver the infant to his father is cut short when he is captured on Mount Thaurin (7.1.16–18). Although *Titus* has a similar moment where Aaron and his son are apprehended (5.1.20–39), the Moor's reaction to his capture is different. Whereas Aaron refuses to answer Lucius' questions until his infant is threatened with hanging (5.1.47–60), Morian immediately begins to bargain for his own life, promising not only to reveal the Empress' crimes, but also to serve Vespasianus and help him to overthrow the Emperor (7.1.30–5). Morian's lengthy summary of earlier events reveals that Aetiopissa bade him keep watch on Andronica's husband and 'kill him, so that [Saphonus and Helicates] could satisfy their lust on her' (7.1.57–8), but that he was unable to find a suitable opportunity for doing so. No equivalent of Morian's blame of his paramour is found in *Titus*, where Aaron confesses his villainies and boasts of his ingenuity in devising them (5.1.89–144). The dramatization of Morian's capture thus contributes to making the Empress rather than the Moor the play's chief villain.

The following scene, Act 7, Scene 2, shifts to Rome, where the Emperor expresses his alarm at Vespasianus' military success. The Emperor divulges Aetiopissa's plan to disguise herself and her sons in order to 'weaken [Tito] with cunning and treachery' (7.2.17). In the scene that follows, Aetiopissa further clarifies her intentions when she orders her sons to stay with Tito and '[l]end careful attention to the cunning stratagems he

¹ For Mount Thaurin, which has no equivalent in *Titus*, see below, p. 220.

will use in battle' and murder him if the bloodshed does not cease (7.3.3–5, 6–9). Tamora's plan, on the other hand, is to trick Titus into persuading Lucius to a parley with Saturninus (4.4.88–98, 107–11); she does not originally intend to leave her sons with Titus until he demands it. In the English play, Titus' feigned madness gives Tamora hope that the disguise plot will succeed, and in a substantial exchange between the two, Tamora attempts to persuade Titus that she is Revenge, accompanied by Murder and Rapine, while Titus' asides alert the audience to the fact that he is not fooled (5.2.9–120). Ultimately, Tamora departs because she thinks that her plan has succeeded. In the German play, Tito does not pretend madness when Aetiopissa presents herself and her sons: they are accepted by Tito seemingly without question, as being 'ordained by the gods to help . . . with good counsel in these wars' (7.3.18–19). The brevity of the scene in *Tito* quickens the pace of the action that leads up to the climax of the scene, where the brothers are executed.

Having been tricked into thinking that he has fallen for the disguises, Aetiopissa leaves her sons with Tito, who slaughters them and states his intention to bake their heads into a pie. The murder is dramatized similarly in the two plays: the brothers are bound, their mouths gagged, their throats slit, and their blood collected into a receptacle (*Tito* 7.3.40 SD–45 SD; *Titus* 5.2.164–5, 196–203). A difference with profound implications, however, is that whereas in *Titus*, Lavinia is present and collects the brothers' blood, in *Tito*, Andronica is absent. Instead, Tito is assisted by two unnamed soldiers, one of whom holds a vessel to collect the blood. Andronica's absence undermines the gruesome sense of justice that Lavinia can be said to receive in *Titus*. On the other hand, her absence may result from a desire not to taint her character by association with such a violent murder.

The ending of *Tito* is more streamlined than that of *Titus*. Tito calls a conciliatory banquet, whereas it is the disguised Tamora who suggests a feast in the English play (5.2.111–19).

Since peace has already been proclaimed in *Tito*, the banquet commences without incident. Tito serves the pies, is questioned about his melancholy by the Emperor, kills Andronica, proclaims that Aetiopissa is to blame, reveals that the pies are made of her sons' flesh, kills Aetiopissa and is in turn killed by the Emperor. Vespasianus takes revenge on the Emperor, and Victoriades asks Vespasianus to take the crown; he initially protests but then agrees to do so. The pace of the ending in *Tito* is fast, and there is not much action that follows the spectacular deaths that occur onstage.

Titus has a much longer conclusion. Once Lavinia, Tamora, Titus and the Emperor have been killed, Aaron is brought back to be punished (5.3.175–89). In *Tito*, Morian is not mentioned again after Vespasianus orders him to be hanged at the end of Act 7, Scene 1, and, given that Aetiopissa is the principal antagonist, he is not brought back in the last act. Lucius' promotion to emperor receives more attention in *Titus* than that of Vespasianus in *Tito* and is rooted in a public bid for his candidacy (5.3.145). This differs from the hasty promotion of Vespasianus in *Tito*, in which no address is given to the populace. The initial reluctance to take the crown is not in *Titus*. It may underscore Vespasianus' humility, echoing Tito's lack of political ambition at the beginning of the play. It also contrasts with Aetiopissa's pride: now that the haughty Empress is dead, a humble Emperor ascends the throne.

In sum, *Tito* and *Titus* essentially provide different dramatizations of the same basic plot. The German play is substantially shorter than the English and is more fast-paced at critical moments in the action. The plot of *Tito* is not as complex as that of *Titus*, which includes episodes such as the competition over Lavinia, the sacrifice of Alarbus, Aaron's plot to frame Titus' younger sons for the murder of Bassianus, and the 'arrow-shooting' scene. *Tito*'s streamlined plot goes together with the fact that it uses fewer characters than *Titus*. The German play also frequently provides a different interpretation

of the prompts for characters' interactions. *Tito* thus constitutes a fascinating alternative version of *Titus*.

ISSUES OF RACE IN *TITO* *ANDRONICO*

Titus figures prominently in scholarly discussions of early modern theatrical representations of blackness and racial difference.¹ Aaron, whose soul is apparently as black as his face, in many ways conforms to the stock type of the malevolent black villain found elsewhere in early modern drama (as, for instance, in Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar*). But while he remains an unrepentant villain until the end, Aaron is more than a simple stereotype: his display of paternal tenderness and affection towards his child humanizes him, and he draws attention to his skin colour in ways that engage meaningfully with early modern theories of racial difference. *Tito* engages with issues of race in different but no less interesting ways, and the play has much to contribute to the study of race in the early modern period.

A major difference between *Tito* and *Titus* is the fact that the non-Roman characters in the former are not Goths but Africans, hailing from 'Mohrenlandt' (literally, 'Land of the Moors') or 'Aethiopia'.² This difference has significant implications for the black villain's position in the play, and indeed for the enemy faction as a whole. Jonathan Bate and Sonia Massai have commented on the difference between the Goths in *Titus* and the Ethiopians in *Tito*:

¹ For example, see Hall; Jones; Barthelemy; de Sousa; Bartels, 'Making'; and Vaughan and Vaughan.

² 'Mohrenland' is defined by Grimm as 'a land where Moors live, notably Mauritania and Ethiopia' (*n. land worin die mohren wohnen; vornehmlich Mauritanien und Aethiopien*).

In the Renaissance Goths were synonymous with Germans; if you are an English company touring in Germany, you would be ill advised to have a barbarous Gothic/German queen and her rapist sons, and, therefore, you turn them into more distant barbarians, namely Ethiopians (this also means that you avoid the scandal of miscegenation between the empress and the Moor, a change that is in accordance with a certain moral cleansing of the text appropriate to Luther's Germany . . .).¹

There are yet more points to be made about the complexity of race in *Tito*. Even if we suppose that the transformation of 'Germanic' Goths to 'more distant barbarians' was simply an act of problem-solving by the travelling players, it raises its own new problems which need to be addressed. That 'the scandal of miscegenation' is avoided does not hold because a mixed-race infant appears in the play. Aetiopissa's sons are outraged when they discover that she is the mother of the dark-skinned child that the Midwife holds in her arms at the beginning of Act 6. It is clear from their exchange with the Midwife that Aetiopissa and Morian do not belong to the same racial category. Saphonus asks, 'Who is this child's mother? I see that he is the father, so with whom has our Morian slept?' (6.1.14–15), drawing attention to Morian's racial singularity. This is confirmed by the Midwife's report of Aetiopissa's reaction following the child's birth: 'when she saw that the child was black she was very frightened' (6.1.26–7). The child's pigmentation is starkly different from Aetiopissa's and provides visual proof of its parentage.

So Bate and Massai's suggestion conflates ethnicity and race. A shared ethnic or national origin (Ethiopia) does not

¹ Bate and Massai, 140. The long-standing assumption that Goths are synonymous with Germans has recently been challenged by Ndiaye, 'Aaron's Roots'.

necessarily mean that Aetiopissa and Morian belong to the same racial category, as the anxiety about their son's appearance makes clear, and the issue of miscegenation is by no means 'cleansed' from the play. Even before the birth of the child, a contrast between Morian and Aetiopissa's skin colour is firmly established. The opening stage direction insists as much on Aetiopissa's whiteness as it does on Morian's blackness: '*Also enter AETIOPISSA, the Queen of Ethiopia, who is lovely and white, . . . and MORIAN, who is black*' (1.1.0 SD). Although the term 'Ethiopian' was typically associated with very dark skin, the plot requires a white queen.¹ Her whiteness, evident in performance, is here spelled out for the reader to avoid confusion. In Act 1 the speech prefixes are variously 'Königin auß Mohrenlandt' ('Queen of Africa') and 'Ætiopis.', but after she is crowned in Act 2 she is largely 'Käyserin', which removes any reminders of her African origins. In Morian's case, the reader is invited to visualize a black body, and the speech prefix ('Morian' from the German word for Moor) reiterates his racial difference throughout.² As the text insists on Morian's blackness, it seems likely that the travelling players capitalized on the sensational nature of this 'black devil' ('schwartzter Teufel', 7.1.22) by performing him in blackface.

But what is one to make of a white Ethiopian queen? The depiction of Aetiopissa's skin-colour might seem unexpected –

¹ 'Ethiopia' cannot be read as applying exclusively to the Ethiopian empire; in light of common usage it is reasonable to assume that Ethiopia here refers to sub-Saharan Africa more generally, which was often associated with black Africans. See Vaughan and Vaughan, Hall and Bartels.

² Vaughan (9–15) discusses various strategies for performing blackness, including blackface make-up, masks, stockings and gloves. As Vaughan demonstrates, blackface was commonly used to represent Moors on the early modern English stage, so it is reasonable to assume that the travelling players would have replicated the technique in *Tito*. It seems more likely that the white actor who played Morian pigmented his face than that he hid it behind a mask. He has a substantial speaking part, and it might have been impeded by a face-covering, but see Smith for uses of sartorial blackface.

perhaps an oversight or a lapse in logic on the play's part, arising from a hasty and arbitrary switch from Goths to Ethiopians. Yet there is a literary and visual tradition concerning white Ethiopian princesses, among them the mythical princess Andromeda, Chariclea (from Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, an ancient Greek prose romance) and Clorinda (from Torquato Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*).¹ Chariclea in particular had a vibrant afterlife: Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* underwent an impressive number of translations across early modern Europe, which in turn gave rise to a range of stage adaptations.² Thomas Underdowne's English translation of the *Aethiopica* was published in 1569, and it probably influenced the lost play, *Chariclea* (1572).³ Further evidence of white Ethiopian princesses on the stage is found in the titles of other lost plays such as *Perseus and Andromeda* (1574) and *The Queen of Ethiopia* (1578), which may have been another adaptation of Heliodorus' romance.⁴ Although the whiteness of the African female characters in these narratives was anomalous, dramatizations such as these established a theatrical precedent for the staging of white Ethiopian royal women.

That does not mean that Aetiopissa's whiteness is straightforward, and it is possible that the term 'white' is applied to her in a relative way, given the complex and often contradictory early modern European conceptions of sub-Saharan Africans. In the seventeenth century, terms such as 'Ethiope' and 'Moor' are by no means stable or clear-cut, and in *Tito* they are especially difficult to pin down. It is possible to

¹ See Spicer and Iyengar.

² See Ricquier, 15–22. On European stage adaptations, see Ndiaye, 'Everyone'.

³ Prior to Underdowne's translation, material from the *Aethiopica* was available in John Sanford's *The Amorous and Tragical Tales of Plutarch Wherevnto is Annexed the Hystorie of Cariclea & Theagenes* (London, 1567, STC 20072). On the lost play, see Wiggins, 2.91–2.

⁴ See Wiggins, 2.109–10 and 2.183.

envisage Aetiopissa as a 'tawny' African, since distinctions were sometimes drawn between people from different parts of Africa and the degree of their 'blackness' in early modern literature.¹ A claim could even be made about Ethiopia as a Christian stronghold, which would make it imaginatively 'easier' to identify Aetiopissa and her sons as set apart from Morian, whose name carried Muslim connotations.² However, the play makes no allusions to religious difference and presents Aetiopissa as Queen of Ethiopia and 'Mohrenlandt' interchangeably, which makes claims about such fine differences problematic. Francesca T. Royster has argued that in *Titus* the trajectory of Moor, Goth, and Roman encapsulates a 'denaturalization of whiteness . . . and its construction along an unstable continuum of racial identities' (432). The German play, while not as explicitly interested in drawing attention to the polarized nature of black and white as *Titus*, nonetheless problematizes whiteness through the presence of a white African queen.

The continuum of racial identities is complicated further through the character of Morian. Virginia Mason Vaughan has demonstrated that Aaron conforms to many of the stereotypes of the black villain figure and echoes the associations between sin and blackness found in medieval drama.³ To some extent, Morian, in his capacity as 'black devil' (7.1.22), performs the same function as Aaron, but he bears a rather different relationship to both his fellow captives and his homeland. Unlike *Titus*, the play does not contain *invading* Goths, some of whom were captured, kept alive and brought to Rome. Instead, we have *invaded* Ethiopians, whose country was attacked and

¹ The slipperiness of terms used to describe northern and sub-Saharan Africans are addressed in Vaughan and Vaughan, 19–29; Loomba, 44–59; Barthelemy, 6–10; and Bartels, 'Making', 433–4.

² For a discussion of Christianity in Ethiopia, see Salvatore, and Lowe, 'Representing'.

³ Vaughan, 2, 43–50.

ravaged by the Romans. Aaron, whether as a slave or as a free man serving the Goth queen, is an outsider.¹ Morian, on the other hand, is his mistress's countryman and has a powerful set of connections to their homeland.²

Morian's lengthy speech at the end of the first act provides an account of his affair with Aetiopissa, which implies that he had privileged access to the Ethiopian court (1.1.89–91). In the first part of this long speech, Morian shares details of his affair (including how Aetiopissa poisoned her husband in order to be with Morian), noting that he killed those who looked unfavourably on them, and that he has 'committed thousands and thousands of villainies and robberies' (1.1.102–3). Morian thus conforms to stereotypical associations of blackness with lasciviousness and villainy before his speech takes a different turn. He boasts of his martial prowess and establishes his background as a soldier: 'In battles and perilous wars I fought like a formidable lion – not like a man but like a very devil' (1.1.107–9). Morian tells us that his skills as a soldier became known throughout the world and earned him the title of the 'Thunder and Lightning of Ethiopia' (1.1.111–12). In fact, the reason why the Romans invaded Ethiopia, according to Morian, is because '[m]y fame finally reached the Romans, who armed themselves mightily and came for us in Ethiopia, devastating and destroying the land with unheard-of cruelty' (1.1.112–15).

Morian's narration of his encounter with Tito and the Roman army on the Ethiopian battlefields implies that he was acting in the capacity of general: 'I went out against them with *my* army' (1.1.115–16, emphasis added). The fact that the Romans invaded Ethiopia gives Morian and Aetiopissa reason enough to be revenged on Tito, who played a key role in the attack. More importantly, Morian's speech establishes a clear rivalry

¹ For a discussion of Aaron and his skin-colour, see Fiedler.

² The play does not specify whether Morian was born in Ethiopia, but it is clear that he identifies powerfully with his erstwhile homeland.

between him and Tito: ‘Before long, old Tito rushed at me and – something that no man had ever done before – struck me off my horse with his lance so fiercely that I didn’t know whether I were dead or alive’ (1.1.123–7). Although Morian emerges as a powerful military figure, his account makes clear that he was finally overcome and humiliated by the superior skills of the Roman warrior.¹

The play’s representation of Morian as a military champion calls to mind popular cultural associations of black Africans with martial skills and expert horsemanship.² However, the most immediate means of situating Morian within a familiar framework is achieved visually through his wearing of luxurious attire. The opening stage direction tells the reader that Morian wears ‘magnificent clothes’ under his cloak, which he dramatically casts aside as ‘old rags’ (1.1.81). His splendid attire stresses his former supremacy in Ethiopia, but also places him in a visual tradition in which black bodies are shown sumptuously dressed in order to heighten the contrast between black and white, juxtaposing the supposed dullness of the dark skin with the shimmering sartorial finery.³ Interestingly, this kind of contrast can be seen in the Peacham drawing (see below, p. 29), which is generally thought to be an illustration of *Titus*. In the drawing, the blackness of the Moor’s body and hair is sharply offset by the clothes and headband that he wears (see Fig. 1). This sort of contrast can be found in paintings, coats of

¹ See below (pp. 43–4) for a discussion of how this encounter echoes material in the chapbook. In Jan Vos’ Dutch adaptation, *Aran en Titus* (*Aran and Titus*, 1641), the Moor publicly declares himself to be a supreme warrior (Buitendijk, II. 176–9), and the List of Roles identifies him as the ‘Veldheer der Gotten’, which places him on an equal military footing with Titus, who is ‘Veldtheer der Romeinen’ (Buitendijk, I. 114).

² See Lowe, ‘Stereotyping’, 32–3.

³ This visual tradition is discussed by Korhonen. Examples of this type of contrast are found in Bindman and Gates, vol. 3, part 1.

arms, impresas and decorative objects such as Christoph Jamnitzer's 'Moor's Head' cup.¹ As Anu Korhonen suggests:

In [European] popular culture, blackness was fictionalised into a highly abstract but simply observable bodily category. Proverbs, sayings, biblical quotations and many passing remarks in Renaissance texts all come together to construct blackness as an absolute, without differences or degrees, juxtaposed with a whiteness similarly simplified and categorized. Black skin was perceived as a spectacle produced by this opposition, particularly when it was coupled with something white, be it white skin or white clothes, or with something precious and beautiful, such as gold, silver or jewels. Creating the dichotomy between black and white was essential to judging black as black, the conceptual and 'racial' black, not just a darker hue.

(99)

In *Titus*, Aaron invokes this sort of contrast when he imagines himself rising to a position where he will cast off his 'slavish weeds and servile thoughts' and instead be 'bright, and shine in pearl and gold' (1.1.517–18). In *Tito* this image is literalized when Morian reveals the finery hidden under his cloak, setting up precisely the kind of contrast that Korhonen describes, given Morian's probable blackface.²

¹ See Seelig, 183.

² Another play in the Leipzig volume, *Eine schöne lustig triumphirende Comædia von eines Königes Sohne auß Engellandt vnd des Königes Tochter auß Schottlandt* (*A Pleasant, Merry, Triumphant Comedy of the King of England's Son and the King of Scotland's Daughter*), sees the King of England's son temporarily disguise himself as a Moor in order to gain access to the King of Scotland's daughter. While the character wears the disguise, his speech heading changes from 'Sohn' to 'Morian', but this disguise does not involve the use of make-up. A stage direction tells us that he dons a long black garment ('ein schwartzen Rock', sig. U7v) and covers his face with a type of veil ('bindet einen Flor vor Angesichte', sig. U7v). He then introduces himself to the King as a true-born Moor ('ein geborner Aetiopis',

Unlike Aaron, Morian is presented as a character with a powerful sense of the past through a personal narrative that makes clear his former importance in Ethiopia. The speech he delivers is filled with anecdotal specificity, unlike the general and unspecific glimpses of Aaron's past and background as a perpetrator of villainies not rooted in any particular time or place. More importantly, the narrative delivered by Morian at the end of Act 1 offers a rival construction of his character as his country's champion that is quite distinct from Vespasianus' later identification of him as a 'black devil'. Morian's identity as the 'Thunder and Lightning of Ethiopia' is predicated on ferocity in battle and the honourable defence of his country, and the audience is made aware of this early on in the play. By contrast, in *Titus*, 'nothing but the blackness of his skin seems to link Aaron to a place of origin . . . Aaron displays no sense of a cultural past and seems to possess no memories' (de Sousa, 104). As Emily C. Bartels points out, in appearing without a past, without a distinct culture, and being left to shape his identity from the quality of blackness, 'the "raven-coloured" Moor appears to be a self-contained, self-incriminating sign system – a darkness that seems undeniably visible' (*Speaking*, 80). Morian, however, renders such a sign system more complex, because his identity is shaped by more than the colour of his skin.

The vision of racial difference in *Tito* is complex. Morian's status as the black villain is complicated by the fact that he is a celebrated warrior. *Tito* treats the issue of miscegenation in a

sig. U8v) who has sailed from Ethiopia to trade jewels. With this disguise he manages to fool the King's daughter until he removes the veil from his face ('Zieh den Flor vom Gesicht', sig. X2r). Although in both cases 'Morian' hails from Ethiopia, it is clear that in this play, where the disguise needs to be put on and removed with speed, the Moor's race is figured sartorially by means of a veil rather than through cosmetic blackface. See Wiggins, *British Drama*, 4.21–2, and the Lost Plays Database entry on *The King of England's Son and the King of Scotland's Daughter* (c. 1598). Wiggins suggests that the disguise in the English play would have entailed 'presumably dark skin' (22), but in light of the German play, this seems unlikely (but see Smith on the use of vizors for blackface).

different way from *Titus* and the chapbook prose history (see below, pp. 44–5). Whereas Tamora is eager to eradicate the child born of her amorous indiscretion, Aetiopissa hopes to preserve her son's life by sending him to live with his paternal grandfather, who may be imagined to be a sub-Saharan black African like Morian. The baby is not an aberration that needs to be killed off as in *Titus*. Rather, the infant can be integrated into a vision of the Roman Empire that hosts a diasporic community represented by an African patriarchal figure. This may suggest that the source play on which *Titus* is based (see below, pp. 36–40) had a more hopeful and inclusive vision of racial difference than it did after being reworked by Peele and Shakespeare.

THE SOURCE OF *TITO* *ANDRONICO*

The relationship between *Tito* and *Titus* has been examined in this introduction. The main action of the two plays is similar, and many echoes between the English play and *Tito* are detailed in the Commentary, but there is reason to believe that *Tito* was not directly based on the English play as we know it. Some scholars have been keen to identify *Tito* as an adaptation of *Titus*, including Creizenach (5) and Fuller (12). Yet from Albert Cohn in his 1865 edition of *Tito* onwards, other scholars have voiced serious doubt about a direct line of descent. Most importantly, Jonathan Bate, in his revised Arden edition of *Titus Andronicus* (2018), has changed his earlier view that *Tito* is 'a translation of Shakespeare's play into plain German prose, with heavy cutting and a reduction of the cast to twelve parts' (Ard³ TA, 43). Instead, he now suggests that *Tito* may be based on an earlier version of the English play called *Titus and Vespasian* (Ard³ TA, 138–9). In what follows, we discuss this possibility in relation to several pieces of interrelated evidence, in particular

the Peacham drawing, early references to *Titus and Vespasian*, and the chapbook prose history and ballad of Titus Andronicus.

The Peacham drawing

There is a single-leaf manuscript in the library of the Marquess of Bath at Longleat House (Wiltshire, Great Britain) commonly referred to as ‘the Peacham drawing’.¹ The manuscript is of importance to scholars of early modern drama because it is a rare early modern document that may provide insights into Elizabethan costuming and theatrical practice. The leaf contains a pen and ink illustration (see Fig. 1) that depicts, from left to right, two male figures in military attire, a male figure in Roman

1 The Peacham drawing (Longleat House, Warminster, Wiltshire, Great Britain).

¹ The document is among the Harley Papers (Harley Papers I, fol. 159v). An overview of the provenance of these papers is provided by Schlueter, ‘Rereading’, 171, and Waith, 26–7.

dress wearing a laurel wreath and holding a standard or staff while what appears to be a sceptre lies on the ground, a crowned, kneeling female figure in an apparent show of supplication, two kneeling men with their hands bound, and a black male figure gesturing with his right hand at the sword that he holds in his left hand.¹ The illustration is separated by a horizontal line from a stage direction, ‘*Enter Tamora pleadinge for her sonnes going to execution*’ (not in Shakespeare’s play), followed by a speech by Tamora that largely corresponds to *Titus* 1.1.107–23, and a reply from Titus that combines lines 124 and 128 from the same scene, with an additional two invented lines directed at Aaron that warn him to prepare for his death. Then follows a speech by Aaron that corresponds to *Titus* 5.1.124–44, where he boasts of his villainies, and, following Aaron’s speech, there is a speech prefix for Alarbus (who never speaks in *Titus*). Near the bottom left of the leaf is a signature, ‘Henricus Peacham’, with a date rendered in roman numerals, which has generally been identified as 1594 or 1595.² An annotation opposite the drawing

¹ Metz, in agreement with Wilson (21), suggests that the staff may be ‘a spear or a Roman *hasta*, a ceremonial staff’ (*Studies*, 233). For a discussion of the military attire and armour depicted in the drawing, see Holmes, 150–3.

² Chambers interpreted the date as either 1594 or 1595 (Metz, *Studies*, 234), as did Adams (33), given that the terminal ‘qt’ could be read as *quinto* or *quarto*. Foakes (*Illustrations*, 48) interprets the date more firmly as 1595, following Wilson (19), and Waith (23), who provides the most detailed interpretation. Metz (*Studies*, 235) notes that 1595 is ‘probably correct’. Bate (Ard³ *TA*, 39) does not overrule the 1595 interpretation but offers an alternative set of dates as possibilities (1604, 1614, 1615). The date was reinterpreted as 1594 by Berry (5–6). The signature has generally been associated with Henry Peacham (b. 1578), author of *The Complete Gentleman* (1622), who would have been sixteen or seventeen in 1595. Peacham’s abilities as a draughtsman are attested in his collections of emblems, among them *Minerva Britanna* (London, 1612, STC 19511). Waith (24) draws comparisons between the Peacham drawing and some of Peacham’s emblem drawings that survive in manuscript (three were based on the 1603 edition of James I’s *Basilikon Doron* and were carried out between 1603 and 1619: Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson Poetry 146; British Library MS Harleian 6855, art. 13, and MS Royal 12 A lxvi; a later collection from c. 1621 is at the Folger Shakespeare Library: MS V.b.45).

reading ‘Henry Peachams Hande 1595’ was probably made by the nineteenth-century scholar and forger John Payne Collier and therefore cannot be trusted (Waith, 23; Ard³ *TA*, 39).

The fact that the drawing does not appear to depict any one given moment from *Titus* has given rise to a number of interpretations that attempt to make sense of the drawing and the circumstances of its composition. For instance, R. A. Foakes supposes that the ‘drawing does not fit any point in the action, and was probably not drawn from life’ (50), whereas Eugene Waith (25) conjectures that Henry Peacham may have been present at a performance of *Titus* at Burley-on-the-Hill in January 1596 and based the drawing on that performance. John Dover Wilson suggests that the drawing depicts a performance that the artist saw first-hand (20), and G. Harold Metz (*Studies*, 243) concurs, arguing that the drawing is a representation of a performance, either at Burley or one of the commercial theatres in London. A particular difficulty is the relationship of the image and the text underneath it. Although the interpolated stage direction and the lines from *Titus* that are found under the drawing make it tempting to assume that the drawing in some way represents the first scene of *Titus*, the discrepancies between text and image are great. Indeed, the text as it appears in the manuscript does not fully agree with any of the quartos or the Folio version of *Titus*.

For this reason, commentators such as Waith (22, 25) argue that the drawing is ‘comprehensive’ in that it depicts multiple episodes simultaneously, whilst Metz (*Studies*, 243–5) suggests that the image works in an emblematic way.¹ Like Metz, Bate invites us to consider the drawing as a ‘composite representation’ that offers not just a depiction of several distinct episodes from *Titus* but ‘an emblematic reading of the whole play’

¹ Waith follows Munro’s initial suggestion about the technique of simultaneous representation.

(Ard³ *TA*, 41). Bate proposes that read left to right, the first two figures should be taken as Roman soldiers, ‘who represent Titus’ victory in war and service to the state’ (Ard³ *TA*, 41), and that the third figure is Titus wearing a laurel bough and holding in his left hand a ‘ceremonial spear or staff’, dressed in a toga and breastplate, which signal his civic dignity and martial prowess (Ard³ *TA*, 41).¹ The figure kneeling before him is Tamora, whose ‘flowing dress of the exotic Goth’ (Ard³ *TA*, 41) and physical posture sets up a powerful contrast with Titus, while the two kneeling figures behind her are ‘emblems of all the play’s sons’ (Ard³ *TA*, 42). The final figure, Aaron, brandishes a sword ‘to indicate the deaths he has instigated’ (i.e. of Titus’ sons), which may also echo the drawing of his sword to protect his new-born son (Ard³ *TA*, 42), although Metz notes that Aaron here ‘personifies the indignation of the Gothic queen and princes’ (*Studies*, 244). In his interpretation of the drawing, Bate (Ard³ *TA*, 41) calls attention to the general division of Romans and Goths: the triumphant, virtuous Romans stand to the left, and are visually separated from the cruel, villainous Goths by Titus’ upright staff, thus setting up an opposition that sits at the very heart of the play.

Although such an interpretation generally reflects scholarly orthodoxy,² it nevertheless remains open to challenge because the emblematic and symbolic approaches do not fully explain the apparent discrepancies between the image and the text, which sit uneasily alongside one another. Part of the problem may be, as Foakes (*Illustrations*, 48) observed, that the drawing

¹ Ard³ *TA* (41) agrees with Wilson (20–1), who identified the figures on the left as soldiers because they, unlike the central figure (Titus), are not wearing Roman costume as one might expect. Wilson (21), in light of the text below the drawing, assumes that Titus’ sons are offstage with Alarbus, but this takes for granted that the drawing and the text correspond to one another. In his discussion of armour on the early modern stage, Holmes (150–3) identifies the figures as Titus’ sons.

² See Waith, 23–7.

could have been made first and the text added later, perhaps by a different hand. June Schlueter subscribes to Foakes' suggestion and argues that the drawing is a representation of a Titus play that pre-dates *Titus* and is preserved in the German *Tito*, which she claims was based on the lost play, *Titus and Vespasian* ('Rereading'). It is for this reason, she argues, that there is an awkward relationship between the image and the text: 'we must conclude that the Shakespearean lines were added by someone whose assumption about the drawing confused and misled generations of scholars' ('Rereading', 176).

Schlueter states that there is a 'clear correspondence' (176) between the Peacham drawing and Act 1 of *Tito*. Although *Tito* calls for all principal characters except Victoriades to be present at the beginning of the play, Andronica, who ought to be in the drawing by this logic, is not depicted, perhaps, Schlueter argues, on account of her silence in this scene ('Rereading', 174). Schlueter invites us to see the figures, from left to right, as corresponding to Vespasianus, Titus, the Emperor, Aetiopissa, Helicates and Saphonus, and Morian, which would account for the absence of Victoriades (who is absent from Act 1). Schlueter's argument is attractive. The kneeling female figure and the bound men behind her certainly correspond more closely to Aetiopissa and her two sons in *Tito* than to Tamora and her three sons in *Titus*. Furthermore, the sword Morian brandishes may be a visual representation of his former military status, which he describes at the end of Act 1 and which is not in *Titus*.¹

Schlueter's suggestion that the drawing was based on a lost play that served as the source for *Tito* yields interesting insights into the disagreements between the drawing and the text in the Peacham manuscript. However, despite its insights, Schlueter's reading of the drawing is not without its problems. In particular,

¹ Waith (23) notes the disjunction between Aaron's apparently lacklustre apparel in *Titus* and the magnificent attire of the Moor in the Peacham drawing.

the identification of the central figure as the Emperor rather than Titus is open to question, as Richard Levin has demonstrated ('Longleat', 325–9). Levin challenges the idea that the bearded male figure, who is wearing a laurel bough, could be anyone but Tito, given that the stage directions and the dialogue in Act 1 differentiate between the bough worn by Tito and the imperial crown that is eventually given to the Emperor (327–8). Levin (326) also takes issue with Schlueter's proposition that the drawing is a literal representation of Act 1 of *Tito*. For instance, he draws attention to Morian's sword, which is present in the drawing, although the text says nothing about it at this point, so it must either be read as a symbol of his former military exploits, or as a literal rendering of Morian later in the play. Furthermore, in the text Morian is alone when he delivers his speech on his past villainies, so the presence of other characters in the drawing only makes sense if we assume that the drawing represents different moments from Act 1 simultaneously (Levin, 326).

Where Levin rejects Schlueter's argument in its entirety, we suggest that the Peacham drawing may be a composite representation of the first scene of an early Titus play that served as the basis for *Tito* and was later reworked into *Titus*. Read left to right, the figures may represent Titus' son and brother, Titus wearing his laurel bough, the supplicant captive Queen, who kneels and holds up her hands in an action that is suggestive of her subordinate position and reliance on Titus' mercy, her two sons, also bound to signify their status as prisoners, and the Moor as he appears at the end of the Act, no longer wearing a 'humble' cloak and boasting of his military supremacy. In fact, the Moor's right hand is raised, the index finger pointing in the direction of the Queen (suggestive of their amorous dalliance) and towards Titus (recalling the hand-to-hand encounter the two men have had in *Tito*; see 1.1.123–7). The presence of the Moor's sword is a detail that may be symbolic, but otherwise, the depiction of this figure agrees with what he wears in *Tito*. If we accept that the drawing may be a

composite and, given Andronica's absence, also selective representation, it corresponds remarkably well to what comes down to us textually in Act 1 of *Tito*.

Such a reading raises the question of why Titus' brother would be present in the drawing when he is not called for in the opening stage direction of *Tito*. A possible answer is that *Tito* is not a perfect translation of the lost play. Indeed, even if *Tito* correctly records the characters present in the opening scene of the play as it was performed in Germany, there is no guarantee that the equivalent of Victoriades would have been missing from the source play as performed in England, all the more so as the constraints of a travelling company often necessitated a trimming of certain roles on account of doubling.¹

Given the disagreements between image and text in the Longleat manuscript, Metz proposes that the drawing 'should be studied directly, not through or under the guidance of or influence of the appended verses' (*Studies*, 242). If we follow this invitation to think about the drawing without the impediment of reconciling it with the text that follows, it is easy to imagine that what we have in front of us is a representation of an *Ur-Titus*. Given the other evidence to support a lost *Ur-Titus* presented below, it seems plausible that the drawing is based on a performance of that play.² If Foakes and Schlueter are right that the text was added by a different, and perhaps later, hand, this would account for the discrepancy between the opening scene of *Titus* and the illustration. Schlueter's call to reinterpret the Peacham drawing in the light of evidence preserved in *Tito*

¹ As noted above (p. 3), *Tito* could be performed with a minimum of ten actors, and if this was the case then it may not have been possible to have Victoriades on stage.

² Metz (*Studies*, 241) quotes Foakes on the likelihood that the drawing was done from memory, although there is no reflection on the amount of time that could have elapsed between the performance and the drawing (i.e. it could have been a number of years, in which case the date on the manuscript may reflect the year in which the artist executed the drawing, not the year in which he saw the play).

is thus useful, even though the evidence is too complex to allow for more than a tentative conclusion.¹

Titus and Vespasian *and the* Ur-Titus

Schlueter's argument that *Titus and Vespasian* is an early Titus Andronicus play revives an old set of assumptions about the content of this lost play and its possible relationship to *Titus* and *Tito*. Cohn proposed that in *Tito* 'the original form of Shakespeare's tragedy . . . may still be distinctly seen to glimmer through' (cxii), and that 'original form' he assumed to be the lost *Titus and Vespasian*. Cohn's point was based on the agreement of the characters' names – Vespasian and Vespasianus – and not much else, yet it does not follow that he was necessarily wrong.

The existence of *Titus and Vespasian* is attested by a series of entries in Philip Henslowe's 'diary' that notes performances in the early 1590s. The first entry records a performance of the play by Lord Strange's Men at the Rose theatre: 'ne – Rd at tittus & vespacia the 11 of ap'ell 1591 [i.e. 1592] iij^{li} iijj s' (Foakes, *Diary*, 17). Henslowe's use of 'ne' has generally been taken to refer to a play that was new or possibly newly licensed after revisions (Foakes, *Diary*, xxxiv–xxxv; Knutson, 1–3). Six more entries for the same title (two of them omit the extra 't' from 'tittus') follow between 20 April and 6 June in the same year. After a six-month interval the season was resumed for a further month, and there are three more entries that refer only to 'Titus' without 'Vespasian' between 6 and 25 January 1593

¹ Note that Schlueter, in a so far unpublished essay, has recently revisited the Peacham drawing and its relationship to *Tito*. She proposes a new interpretation of the date (in the 1570s, if the third letter in the date is taken as a 'g', or in the 1570s or 1560s if the third letter is taken to be a long 's'), and argues that Henry Peacham senior, not his son, may have been responsible for both drawing and text, which record 'visually and literally, an early scene from *Titus and Vespasian*' ('Longleat', 10). We are grateful to Schlueter for sharing her essay with us.

(‘titvs’, ‘tittus’, ‘titus’) (Foakes, *Diary*, 19–20). Under the entries pertaining to the Earl of Sussex’s Men for the year 1594, there is found a ‘ne’ play performed on 23 January: ‘titus & ondronicus’, two more performances of which are noted (‘titus & ondronicus’ on 28 January and ‘tittus & ondronicus’ on 6 February) (Foakes, *Diary*, 21).

Apart from Henslowe’s entries and the presence of Vespasianus in the German play, early allusions may point to a connection between the lost play, *Tito*, and *Titus*. *A Knack to Know a Knave* was first entered in Henslowe’s diary as ‘ne’ on 10 June 1592, when it was performed by Lord Strange’s Men. The quarto of *Knack*, published in 1594, contains three direct references to Emperor Vespasian¹ and an allusion to Titus that may point to subject matter found in *Titus*:

My gracious Lord, as welcome shall you be,
To me, my Daughter, and my sonne in Law,
As *Titus* vnto the Roman Senators,
When he had made a conquest on the Goths:
That in requitall of his seruice done,
Did offer him the imperiall Diademe:
As they in *Titus*, we in your Grace still fynd,
The perfect figure of a Princelie mind.

(*Knack*, sig. F2v)

It is tempting to suppose that this refers to *Titus Andronicus* or an early version thereof. If so, the fact that *Knack* combines references to both Vespasian and Titus may be reason to suspect that *Titus and Vespasian* was indeed an early version of *Titus*, and therefore the version that served as the source for *Tito*.

¹ ‘Lyke wise *Vaspasian*, *Romes* rich Emperour’ (sig. A2r); ‘Or lyke *Vaspasian*, *Romes* vertuous gouernour, / Who for a blowe his sonne did giue a Swaine, / Did straight commaund that he should loose his hand. / Then vertuous *Edgar*, be *Vaspasian* once,’ (sig. B3v).

Henslowe's entries tell us that the play was popular, but they are unable to tell us what the play was about. For Cohn, the name *Vespasianus* was evidence enough to show that the lost play must have focused on the same material as the German play. For others, such as Eleanor Grace Clark, the link was too tenuous. She argued instead that the lost play was about the historical emperor *Vespasian* (AD 9–79), and the siege of Jerusalem by his son *Titus* in AD 70, who was promoted to joint emperor on his return to Rome (Clark, 524). More recently, Martin Wiggins has also identified the lost play with the siege of Jerusalem story, suggesting that the play may have drawn 'on the medieval romance version of the story (*The Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian*, printed c. 1508)'.¹ Yet Bate has argued that *Titus and Vespasian* may have been the *Ur-Titus*. If it was, he suggests (Ard³ TA, 138–9), the conjunction 'and' in the original title may explain why Henslowe misnamed the revised play 'Titus & Ondronicus' when it was performed by the Earl of Sussex's Men on 23 January 1594 (Foakes, *Diary*, 21).² Scholarly opinion on the subject matter of the lost *Titus and Vespasian* thus remains divided.³

¹ Wiggins, 3.172–3 (172). Thomas Nashe's *Christ's Tears Over Jerusalem* (1593), which discusses the historical *Titus* and *Vespasian* and the siege of Jerusalem, contains a number of important parallels with *Titus*, such as the presence of a rival named 'Saturninus', an act of cannibalism where a mother eats her own son, and a hand being cut off (see Tobin, 186, and Streete, 56).

² Chambers (*William Shakespeare*, 1.319) notes the 'appearance of a *Titus and Vespasian* in a Revels list of plays about 1619' and suggests that it 'gives some confirmation to the view that the titles are equivalent'. For a discussion of the list and the titles found therein, see Chambers, 'Review'. The fragment that bears the title 'Titus and Vespasian' is digitally reproduced on the Lost Plays Database: https://lostplays.folger.edu/Titus_and_Vespasian.

³ McCarthy and Schlueter propose that *Titus and Vespasian* was written by Thomas North (1535–1603?) in 1562 in response to Jasper Heywood's *Thyestes* (1560) and Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville's *Gorboduc* (1561). They argue that this play was later adapted by Shakespeare and Peele into *Titus Andronicus*, and that traces of North's original are preserved therein. Their evidence for this comes from an analysis, using EEBO and the plagiarism software WCopyfind, of 'rare or

If we suppose that Titus' son was called Vespasian in an earlier version of the English play, we need to ask why he would have been a titular character. W. W. Greg pointed out that the title of the German play, *Tito Andronico and the Haughty Empress*, is not the same as that of the lost English play, and argued that the role occupied by Vespasianus therein is subordinate rather than equal to that of Tito.¹ Yet the title of the play may have been changed by the travelling players or when *Tito* was prepared for publication in 1620. Moreover, although Tito is clearly the main protagonist in the German play, his son is not necessarily as 'subordinate' as Greg suggests. The play begins and ends with a powerful visual pairing of Vespasianus and the Roman crown: in Act 1, he holds the crown in his hand and announces his father's candidacy for the honour (1.1.1–13), and at the close of the play, Vespasianus exits with his uncle, who now holds the crown that he will bestow upon his nephew before the populace (8.2.75–7).² As demonstrated

exclusive phrases' (90) common to *Titus* and North's earliest surviving work, *The Dial of Princes* (1557). McCarthy and Schlueter also note the agreements between the chapbook prose history and *Tito* against Shakespeare and Peele's *Titus*, proposing that these shared elements refute 'the view that the Titus story in the German play and the prose history comes exclusively from the Shakespeare play' (93–4). They argue that all four extant versions of the Titus Andronicus story (*Titus*, *Tito*, the ballad and the chapbook prose history) have a common source, which they believe was most likely to have been North's *Titus and Vespasian*.

¹ Greg, *Diary*, 2.155.

² Braekman argues that the opening speech is wrongly ascribed to Vespasianus, and that Victoriades must have delivered it because it echoes lines spoken by Marcus in *Titus*, where he is a tribune and is thus in a position to act as spokesperson for his brother, whereas 'this is not the case with Vespasianus' (48). This is questionable, given Vespasianus' prominence in the play. If the play was performed with ten actors, perhaps it had to be decided whether it was more important to have Tito's brother or his son onstage at the beginning of the play (see Appendix, pp. 418–19). Having Vespasianus enter holding the crown in the opening scene may serve to foreshadow the play's ending, where Vespasianus exits in order to receive the crown formally.

above (see pp. 14–15), Vespasianus is an important character in *Tito*, perhaps more prominent than his equivalent in *Titus*. It may be significant that the original *dramatis personae* list of *Tito* begins with Vespasianus. The important role played by Vespasianus in *Tito*, together with the fact that *Tito* corresponds to material in the English chapbook prose history that is absent from *Titus*, may indeed be evidence that *Titus and Vespasian* was the *Ur-Titus* that Shakespeare and Peele later reworked.¹

The chapbook prose history and the ballad

The story of Titus Andronicus exists in three extant English versions: Shakespeare and Peele's play, a widely reprinted ballad, and a prose history. The prose history, entitled *The History of Titus Andronicus, the Renowned Roman General, Newly Translated from the Italian Copy Printed at Rome*, is extant in a mid-eighteenth-century chapbook printed by Cluer

¹ The existence of a lost *Ur-Titus* has important implications for the much-debated question of the date of *Titus* (see Ard³ *TA*, 136–9, and Metz, *Studies*, 190–7). The first performance of *Titus* is recorded by Henslowe's 'ne – Rd at titus & ondronicus the 23 of Jenewary [1594]' (Foakes, *Diary*, 21), when it was played by Sussex's Men. Scholars who take seriously the allusion to Titus in *Knack* (see above, p. 37) maintain that *Titus* must already have been in existence by 1592. Others opt for an even earlier date, in order to reconcile the date of *Titus* with Jonson's comment about audiences' tastes in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614): 'Hee that will sweare, Ieronimo, or Andronicus are the best playes, yet, shall passe vnexcepted at, heere, as a man whose Iudgement shewes it is constant, and hath stood still, these fiue and twentie, or thirtie yeeres' (sig. A5v). This would date the two plays mentioned between 1584 and 1589, which has led to speculation about *Titus* being a very early play indeed. However, Jonson might have been conflating the *Ur-Titus* with *Titus* in his appraisal of Andronicus' popularity with audiences. It is plausible that Shakespeare's *Titus* as we know it was composed, in the sense of being adapted from an older play, shortly before Henslowe's first recorded performance, which would warrant the description 'ne'.

Dicey.¹ The prose history largely conforms to the main points of the action found in *Titus*, but there are also some substantial departures and episodes that have no equivalents in the play. The narrative printed in the chapbook undoubtedly reproduces, or is otherwise based on, an Elizabethan source, but it is impossible to date this source.

The discovery of the chapbook led to scholarship that tried to identify the prose history as the source for *Titus*.² Adams (7–9) and Sargent proposed that the prose history must have been printed together with the ballad, citing John Danter's entrance in the Stationers' Register, dated 6 February 1594, of 'a booke intituled *a Noble Roman Historie of Tytus Andronicus*' and 'the ballad thereof' (Arber, 644).³ Most recent scholars consider it more likely, however, that Danter entered the play and the ballad at the same time (Waith, 2; Ard³ *TA*, 82).

The orthodox view today of the relationship between the three iterations of the Titus story is that the prose history was the source for *Titus*, which then served as the source for the ballad (Waith, 28–32; Metz, 'History' and 'Versions'). Yet there have been notable exceptions. Bate expands upon earlier arguments to propose a different order of composition,

¹ There is no evidence to indicate that this, or its Elizabethan precursor, was a translation of an Italian source. The chapbook was printed by Cluer Dicey sometime between 1736 and 1764 (see Adams, 8). The chapbook is in duodecimo and contains three generic woodcuts (a landscape with armoured figures, an interior scene of a couple at a table, and a bust of a woman), as well as some decorative end-pieces. There is only one extant copy of the chapbook, held at the Folger Shakespeare Library (ESTC N33327, call number PR3291.H685 Cage). We quote from and refer to the more easily accessible reprint in Geoffrey Bullough's *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, 6.35–44.

² There was some awareness of the prose history's existence in the nineteenth century (see the Malone-Boswell *Variorum*, 21.381, and Halliwell-Phillipps, 71). J. Quincy Adams was the first to remark at length on the significance of the prose narrative in his 1936 edition of *Titus*, which followed the discovery of the chapbook.

³ The earliest extant version of the ballad is entitled 'Titus Andronicus' Complaint', published by Richard Johnson in *Golden Garland of Princely Pleasures and Delicate Delights* (1620). The ballad is reprinted in Bullough, 6.44–8.

whereby *Titus* served as the basis for the ballad, and the ballad was expanded into the prose history in the eighteenth century (Ard³ *TA*, 82–4). Bate is dismissive of the idea that the chapbook could be the source of *Titus*, but he does add the caveat that ‘there is always the possibility that it drew on some other lost prose narrative or that Shakespeare was reworking a lost old play’ (Ard³ *TA*, 84). Bate does not address *Tito* in his consideration of the play–ballad–chapbook relationship, yet the German adaptation may shed light on it. There are a number of features on which *Tito* and the chapbook agree against *Titus*, which may imply that the prose history served as the source for a lost Titus play that was taken to the Continent by travelling players and is now preserved in *Tito*.¹ If this early version served as the source for *Titus*, this would explain why particular episodes are altered further, shifted or removed altogether.

Aetiopissa’s haughty nature is identified in the play’s full title (she is ‘der Hoffertigen Käyserin’, the haughty Empress) and is repeatedly referenced throughout the play (see note on p. 189). The chapbook likewise describes the Goth Queen, Attava, as ‘an imperious Woman, and of a haughty Spirit’ (38), and her political ambition is noted in the narrative when she ruthlessly plots to have her sons made heirs to the Emperor (39–40). In *Tito*, Aetiopissa is the driving force behind the outrages perpetrated against the Andronici; Morian claims several times that he was sent by Aetiopissa to trick Tito into cutting off his hand, which is also the case in the chapbook, where Attava ‘sent the Moor in the Emperor’s Name’ to cheat Titus out of his hand (41).² Sargent

¹ Braekman (9.38–108) discusses the parallels between the chapbook and *Tito*. Two such parallels that are absent from *Titus* are present in the Dutch *Aran en Titus* (1641): the Moor’s military status (see 1.1.105–12n) and the fact that his paramour murdered her husband in order to be with him (see Buitendijk, ll. 535–8). Braekman suggests that *Tito* and *Aran en Titus* may be based on an *Ur-Titus* (9.37, 110–17; 10.16–17).

² Aaron claims he is sent by the Emperor (3.1.151), although his comments later in the play suggest otherwise (5.1.111–20).

notes that in the prose history ‘the Moor never emerges as an independent character; he remains, until his concluding confession, the instrument of the Queen’ (176), which is also true for Morian in *Tito*, but not for Aaron in *Titus*. There are two other correspondences. For instance, Tito’s plan to sell his property in order to raise an army and be revenged upon the Emperor and Aetiopissa (5.1.62–4) echoes the beginning of the chapbook account, where Titus ‘got together Friends, and sold whatever he had of value to hire Soldiers’ (36) in order to help Rome defeat the Goth invaders. Andronica’s unnamed husband (see p. 169) is likewise unnamed in the chapbook, where he is the Emperor’s son rather than brother.¹

There are likewise a number of transposed echoes between the chapbook and *Tito*.² Morian’s long speech at the end of the opening scene echoes the fortunes endured by the Goth King in the chapbook. The first chapter of the prose history provides an account of how the Goths laid siege to Rome and Titus came to Rome’s rescue. While the Goths are undeniably the aggressors in the chapbook, Titus’ attack on them following the siege calls to mind Morian’s description of the Roman invasion of Ethiopia

¹ In the chapbook narrative (39) and the ballad, Titus’ daughter is betrothed to the son of the Emperor, which is also the case in Hieronymus Thomasius’ *Titus und Tomyris*, a German adaptation of Vos’ Dutch *Titus* play (see below, p. 50). In the chapbook, Attava, her two sons and the Moor invite Lavinia’s consort ‘to hunt on the Banks of the River Tyber, and there murder him . . . by shooting him thro’ the Back with a poisoned Arrow’ (40). In the 1699 performance programme of a German adaptation of Vos’ play, it is noted that the Goth King was killed by Thamera and Aran (i.e. Tamora and Aaron) by means of a poisoned arrow shot by an assassin, which loosely echoes the murder of Lavinia’s consort in the chapbook. Likewise, there may be an echo of this episode in Vos’ adaptation (which might have been based directly or indirectly on an early English or German *Titus* play; see Brackman, 10.11–19). In the chapbook the hunt that heralds the untimely end of Lavinia’s consort is held ‘in the great Forest, on the Banks of the River Tyber’ (40), whilst in *Aran en Titus*, Lucius rushes in to announce that a great boar has been sighted on the banks of the Tiber, and the court then proceeds to the hunt (see Brackman, 10.23).

² See Brackman, 9.43–108, and McCarthy and Schlueter, 93–4.

(1.1.112–30). The chapbook narrative notes how Titus’ forces ‘made such a Slaughter, that the Cry and Confusion were exceeding great’ (36), and relates how during this encounter Tottilius ‘labour’d to rally his flying Men; but being desperately charged by Andronicus, he was thrown from his Horse and much wounded’ (36). When Tottilius escapes, he leaves ‘the rich Spoils of his Camp, the Wealth of many plunder’d Nations, to Andronicus and his Soldiers’ (36). These details are similar to Morian’s description of the Roman invasion of Ethiopia: the Romans ‘devastat[ed] and destroy[ed] the land with unheard-of cruelty’ (1.1.114–15) and ‘took many spoils’ (1.1.128). Morian tells us that ‘I saw my ranks dissolve, beaten like dogs’ (1.1.123), and his demise is similar to that of Tottilius: ‘old Tito rushed at me and – something that no man had ever done before – struck me off my horse with his lance so fiercely that I didn’t know whether I were dead or alive’ (1.1.124–7). The similarities between the fortunes of Tottilius and Morian’s account of his former exploits may suggest that the prose history influenced the character of the Moor in the version of the play that eventually served as the basis for *Tito*.

The circumstances pertaining to Morian’s banishment from the royal court following the King of Ethiopia’s growing suspicions (1.1.90–4) also calls to mind features of the prose history. There, the Moor is first introduced after the Goth Queen has married the Roman Emperor and given birth to a dark-skinned child, which she attempts to explain away by saying it was ‘conceived by the Force of Imagination’ (39).¹ This rouses the Emperor’s anger and leads to the Moor’s banishment and Attava’s later measures to secure access to her paramour once more, which she does by feigning illness and reporting a supposed vision that called for the Moor’s return (39). In *Tito*, according to

¹ The power of the imagination to imprint on the foetus was credited by a number of early modern physicians. For example, Ambroise Paré (sig. 4N3v) considered it a possible cause of unnatural or monstrous offspring.

a passage with no equivalent in *Titus*, the Empress also overcomes the problem of being separated from the Moor, which she does by poisoning her husband (1.1.98–100); this happens before she comes to Rome and becomes pregnant with Morian's child.

There may also be an echo of the chapbook's Roman Emperor raising 'a mighty Army in Greece, Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and England' (35) in the report of Vespasianus travelling across the Roman Empire and raising a diverse army (5.2.37–42). While *Titus* does not specify the number of troops raised by Lucius, *Tito* insists on 'sixty thousand horsemen in full armour' (7.1.3), which may echo the 'threescore thousand' (35) men that the Roman Emperor loses to Tottilius at the beginning of the prose history. There are also instances where the order of the action in *Tito* agrees with that of the chapbook against *Titus*. For example, in the English play, Titus' severed hand and the heads of his sons are returned (3.1.235–301) after Lavinia has been brought to her father (3.1.59–150), whereas *Tito* places the equivalent action before the mutilated daughter is discovered, as does the chapbook.

There is a strong case to be made, then, for rethinking the relationship between the prose history and *Titus* in light of *Tito* and its relationship with the lost Titus play. The similarities between the prose history and *Tito* suggest that an early version of the prose history may have been the source for an earlier English Titus play that was eventually taken to the Continent by travelling players, before it was reworked into Shakespeare and Peele's *Titus*. If we suppose that *Titus* is the play taken to the Continent and then adapted into the version that comes down to us as *Tito*, it would be surprising if *Tito* independently invented material that also happens to be found in the chapbook. It seems just as unlikely that the travelling players would import details of the prose history into their performances after taking the play to the Continent. Indeed, a more plausible way of reconciling the agreements between *Tito* and the chapbook is to suppose that the prose history served as the source for a now lost Titus

play that was taken to the Continent by travelling players but also served as the basis for Shakespeare and Peele's *Titus*.

The preceding sections have demonstrated that *Tito* provides valuable insights into the contested relationship between *Titus* and the Peacham drawing, *Titus and Vespasian* and the chapbook prose history. There are suggestive correspondences between the first Act of *Tito* and the Peacham drawing, and a number of parallels between *Tito* and the chapbook prose history, which agree against *Titus*. The evidence from the preceding sections strengthens the possibility that *Tito* does not derive from *Titus* but is based on an earlier version, a lost *Ur-Titus*, which revision turned into Shakespeare and Peele's *Titus Andronicus*.

GERMAN TITUS PLAYS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Titus plays were very popular in Germany, as surviving evidence demonstrates. Understandably, *Tito* is the most well-known early German adaptation of this material, given that it has been available in English translation since the nineteenth century. There are two known seventeenth-century performances of *Tito*, both of which took place in a school in Kronstad, Siebenbürgen (present day Braşov, in the Transylvanian region of Romania). Evidence of these performances comes from the diary of Johannes Stamm, a chronicler of Siebenbürgen (Klein, 233). In February 1677, Stamm mentions the performance of a play about 'Tito Andronico and his son Vespasiano' ('von Tito Andronico und seinem Sohn Vespasiano') (*Quellen*, 201). This play was performed again in 1687, and Stamm provides a longer description:

These plays are acted, namely the first one about how Abraham wants to sacrifice Isaac at God's command; the other one about Andronico and his son Vespasiano,

how they recruit people from foreign lands to fight against the Emperor, and how they finally invite the Emperor and his godless wife (who was an instigator of this homegrown war) to a feast, and how during the feast Andronica, the Empress, Andronicus himself and finally also the Emperor are killed.¹

The correspondences with *Tito* relating to the recruitment of soldiers in foreign lands and the identification of the Emperor's 'godless wife' as the instigator of domestic strife, as well as the mention of 'Vespasiano' and 'Andronica' make clear that the text used for the performance must have been *Tito*. The school's constitution dictated that two plays be performed every year (and this since 1543; Fassel, 183), so it is reasonable to assume that dramatic texts were collected in the school library, and that they held a copy of the Leipzig volume of *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (1620; 2nd edn 1624).

Tito might also have been performed in Lüneburg in 1666, under the title *Von Tito Andronico, welches eine schöne Romanische Begebenheit, mit schöner Außbildung* (Of *Tito Andronico, which is a goodly Roman Story, of pleasant Making*, Gstach, 644). The fact that no mention is made of a Goth Moor, as is the case in the records of other performances noted below, makes it at least possible that this performance used *Tito* as its basis.

Based on the available evidence of performances and printed material pertaining to Titus plays, it would seem that it was Jan Vos' Dutch adaptation, *Aran en Titus, of Wraak en Weerwraak: Treurspel* (*Aran and Titus, of Revenge and Counter-revenge: A Tragedy*), written in 1638 and published in 1641, that was most

¹ 'Werden diese Comedien agiert, als die erste wie Abraham auf Gottes Geheiss seinen Sohn Isac opfern will; die ander vom Andronico und seinem Sohn Vespasiano, wie sie wider den Kaiser Volk aus fremden Land aufbringen und zuletzt den Kaiser mit seinem gottlosen Weibe (welche ein Anfängerin ist dieses einheimischen Krieges) zu Gast bekommt, und in dieser Gasterei die Andronica, die Kaiserin, und Andronicus selbst und zuletzt auch der Kaiser umbracht werden' (*Quellen*, 210).

popular in seventeenth-century Germany.¹ The popularity of *Aran en Titus* cannot be overstated: the play was frequently performed and went through many editions in its home country. A Latin version was performed at the gymnasium in Tiel in 1658 and survives in a printed edition (the translation was probably made by Caspar van Baerle for the rector, J. van Aelhuisen).² German adaptations of Vos' play were popular throughout the second half of the seventeenth century, both commercially and as school performances. It is unclear how Vos' play was first translated into German, but the German dramatist Georg Greflinger promised a translation of a play entitled *Andronicus mit dem Aron* (*Andronicus with Aron*) in the preface to his translation of Pierre Corneille's play, *The Ingenious Tragicomedy called Cid* (*Die Sinnreiche Tragi-Comoedia gennant Cid*, Hamburg, 1650, sig. *2v). It is unclear whether this translation was ever completed or published, but it is evident that Greflinger was referring to Vos' play, particularly since the reference comes in the context of Spanish and Dutch plays.

The earliest evidence of a performance of Vos' play in Germany comes from a school production in Schwäbisch Hall in May 1656, described in a programme entitled *Aran und Titus, Oder Tragödia von Raach und Gegen-Raach* (*Aran and Titus, or a Tragedy of Revenge and Counter-revenge*).³ The programme was printed by Hans Reinhard Laidigen in a quarto pamphlet of eight pages, which includes a list of roles and the names of the boys who played them, as well as an act-by-act summary. The action as we find it in the summary reflects Vos' play, and the text used by the boys probably came from a troupe

¹ Vos might have based his play on Adriaen Van den Bergh's lost 1621 translation. See Braekman, 10.17–19, and Buitendijk, 64–5.

² This was entitled *Aran en Titus. Mutua vindictio, interprete schola Thielana* (*Aran and Titus. Mutual Revenge, Acted by the Thiel School*). See Fuller, 14, and Worp, 53.

³ This document contains a scene-by-scene summary of the action, a short preamble, an 'epilogue' and a list of roles together with the names of the boys who played them. See Rudin, 'Textbibliothek', for a discussion (79–80) and reproduction of this programme (99–105).

of travelling players, whose presence is noted in Schwäbisch Hall that same year. Bärbel Rudin's research demonstrates that the High German (Hoch Teutschen) comedians sold a Moorish cloak, a sceptre and a crown to the City, and that costs for an unbound book of various comedies ('ein vngebunden Buch von vnderschiedlichen comoedien') were met by the Rector ('Textbibliothek', 79). Some months later, in July 1656, the High German comedians petitioned to perform *Von dem Tapffern Römer Tito Andronico* (*Of the Brave Roman, Tito Andronico*) at Strasbourg, where a note in the hand of the actor Christoph Blümel describes the play as 'a stately, well-written history, for the first time translated into German, and never seen here before' ('eine statliche, wolgeschriebene Histori, die erst ins teutsche gebracht, und noch nie hier gesehen worden'; Rudin, 'Textbibliothek', 79). Whilst the title in Blümel's petition does not explicitly relate to Vos, the fact that the comedians can be traced to Schwäbisch Hall suggests that they were in possession of a German translation of Vos' play (see below, pp. 51–2). Blümel was an educated man, whose handwriting and name can be identified in a number of extant manuscript playtexts from the *Wanderbühne* (Rudin, 'Textbibliothek', 78–9; see p. 51, n. 2), so he may have been responsible for the translation himself, or used a text prepared by someone else like Greflinger.

There is evidence that the High German comedians performed a translation of *Aran en Titus* at Augsburg around 1658. An extant playbill pamphlet entitled *Rach und Gegen-Rach: oder: Titus undt Aran* (*Revenge and Counter-revenge, or Titus and Aran*) contains a supplication to the city signed by Johann Ernst Hoffmann, Peter Schwartz and Andreas Hart.¹ They had travelled and performed with Blümel, and would work with him again later. The High German comedians spent the autumn and winter season of 1656–7 at Heidelberg Castle, so it is unsurprising that they attached the title 'Heidlbörgische' to their troupe (Rudin,

¹ A digital reproduction is available through the Bavarian State Library: <https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb11206615.html>.

‘Textbibliothek’, 81–2). The pamphlet contains a prologue, and choruses for Acts 2, 3, 4 and 5, all of which appear to be free verse translations of their equivalents in Vos’ *Aran en Titus*.

The popularity of Vos’ *Aran en Titus* in Germany is further evidenced by Hieronymus Thomasius’ adaptation, entitled *Titus und Tomyris Oder Traur-Spiel, beygenahmt Die rachbegierige Eyfersucht* (*Titus and Tomyris, or a Tragedy called the Vengeful Jealousy*, Giessen, 1661; reissued 1662). This version retains the alexandrines and classical style of its source, but the choruses are omitted, and there are many local embellishments and additions to the dialogue. There is no evidence that this play was performed.

There are many performances of Titus plays in the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1667, at Nürnberg, Carl Andreas Paulsen’s troupe acted *Die Comoedie von Tito Andronico und dem Mohren Aron* (*The Comedy of Tito Andronico and Aron the Moor*),¹ while Johannes Velten’s troupe performed *Der Berühmte Römische General Titus Andronicus vnd grausamer Tyrann Aran Gottischer Mohren General* (*The Famous Roman General Titus Andronicus and the Cruel Tyrant Aran, the Goth Moor General*) at Bevern Castle in 1680 (Junkers, 169; Gstach, 617, 679–80, 686). In 1685 there are several accounts and ledger references to a Titus play performed in Český Krumlov (south Bohemia) by the Eggenberg comedians (Záloha, ‘Divadelní’, 71; Hejnic and Záloha, 51–2). The text that was probably used for this performance is extant in a collection of manuscript *Wanderbühne* plays held at the Vienna Rathaus Library (call number Ia 38589). The undated play is

¹ This performance is documented by Birken; he notes that ‘the Emperor Saturninus falls for the captive Goth Queen, who had an affair with the Moor’ (‘Key[ser] Saturninus hängt sich an die gefangene Gothische Königin, die mit dem Mohren buhlte’, 300). Birken mentions seeing a revival of this production the following year: ‘I saw the comedy of the sold and returned Andronico’ (‘Die Comoedie vom verk[auften] und wiederbeck[ommenen] Andronico gesehen’, 397). See also Gstach, 617.

entitled *Titus und Aran* (*Titus and Aran*) and appears to be a free prose translation of Vos' *Aran en Titus*. The choruses are omitted but the names agree with Vos, except for Titus' daughter, who is called Lavinia instead of Rozelyna. Rudin ('Textbibliothek', 78–81) has convincingly demonstrated the likelihood that Blümel's troupe, who had performed Vos' play in Germany, were responsible for this manuscript version, given that various members of their company formed the Eggenberg troupe, including Hoffman, Schwartz and Blümel himself,¹ whose signature and hand are found in other of the plays in the Vienna Rathaus Library collection.² Other plays in the collection can be traced to Český Krumlov by their watermarks or by the fact that their titles are also found in the castle's household records.³

There is an extant plot summary of a 1699 performance by the High German comedians in Linz, entitled *Tragoedia genannt Raache gegen Raache. Oder Der Streitbare Römer Titus Andronicus* (*The Tragedy called Revenge against Revenge, or: The Brave Roman, Titus Andronicus*) (Cohn, 'Breslau'). Rudin ('Textbibliothek', 81) argues that the Eggenberg version of the play was performed in this instance. There is another mention of a Titus play in the 'Weimar Index' of plays (Dutchess Anna Amalia Library, call number Fol 421/32), which lists *Der mörderische gothische Mohr sampt Dessen Fall und End* (*The Murderous Goth Moor and His Demise and End*). Here, as in many of the other titles mentioned above, the reference to a

¹ On the beginnings of the Eggenberg comedians, see Zálóha, 'Eggenbergischen', 265–7.

² For a recent edition of *Aran und Titus*, see Hulfeld and Mansky (97–180). The sixth play contained in the Vienna Rathaus Library collection of *Wanderbühne* plays, *Comaedia von der glückseligen Eifersucht zwischen Rodrich und Delmira von Valenza* (*The Comedy of the Blissful Jealousy between Rodrich and Delmira of Valencia*), contains a title page bearing Blümel's name, and Český Krumlov castle records provide evidence of a payment for *Die Eifersucht* in the year 1677 (Zálóha, 'Divadelní', 70). Likewise, *Aurora und Stella* (*Aurora and Stella*), which is present in the collection, is also mentioned in the castle records for the year 1688 (see Zálóha, 'Divadelní', 71).

³ See Schindler.

Goth Moor means that this play was not based on *Tito*, where the Moor is not a Goth. These texts and traces of performance suggest that translations of Vos' *Aran en Titus* were more popular than the version that we find preserved in *Tito*, but, unlike *Tito*, they all date from the second half of the seventeenth century, not the first.¹

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

The Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien of 1620 and 1624

Tito Andronico appeared in 1620 in an octavo collection of plays entitled *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (VD17 39:120191N) (see Fig. 2). Translated into English, the title page reads:

English Comedies and Tragedies, that is, very pleasant, delightful and select spiritual and worldly comic and tragic plays, with Pickelhering, that on account of their agreeable inventions and entertaining and partly true stories have been performed and set forth by the English in Germany at royal, electoral and princely courts as well as in distinguished maritime and trading towns, and have never been previously printed. Now for all lovers of comedies and tragedies and to please others these are publicly printed in such a fashion that they can be easily prepared for performance and serve for the delight and recreation of the mind. Printed in the year 1620.²

¹ There are no known modern performances of *Tito Andronico*.

² 'Engelische Comedien vnd / Tragedien / Das ist: Sehr Schöne, / herrliche vnd äußerlesene, / geist- vnd weltliche Comedi vnd / Tragedi Spiel, / Sampt dem / Pickelhering, / Welche wegen jhrer artigen / *Inventionen*, kurtzweiligen auch theils / warhafftigen Geschicht halber, von den Engelländern / in Deutschland an Königlichen, Chur, vnd Fürst-/lichen Höfen, auch in vornehmen Reichs-See- vnd /

2 Title page of *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (Leipzig, 1620) (University Library, LMU Munich, shelfmark: W 8 P.germ. 46).

Handel Städten seynd agiert vnd gehalten / worden, vnd zuvor nie im Druck auß-
gangen. / An jetzo, / Allen der Comedi vnd Tragedi Lieb-/habern, vnd Andern zu
lieb vnd gefallen, der Gestalt / in offenen Druck gegeben, daß sie gar leicht darauß
/ Spielweß widerumb angerichtet, vnd zur Ergetzlichkeit vnd / Erquickung des
Gemüths gehalten wer-/den können. / Gedruckt im Jahr M.DC.XX.'

The collection contains ten plays (including two Pickelhering plays) and five short interludes or jigs. The plays appear in the following order: 1) *The Comedy of Queen Esther and Haughty Haman* ('COMOEDIA. Von der Königin Esther vnd hoffertigen Haman', sigs A4r–G3v); 2) *The Comedy of the Prodigal Son in which Despair and Hope Are Agreeably Introduced* ('COMOEDIA. Von dem verlornen Sohn in welcher die Verzweiffelung vnd Hoffnung, gar artig introduciret werden', sigs G4r–L1v); 3) *The Comedy of Fortunato and his Purse and Little Wishing Hat* ('COMOEDIA. Von Fortunato vnd seinem Seckel vnd Wünschhütlein', sigs L2r–R6r); 4) *A Pleasant, Merry, Triumphant Comedy of a King's Son of England and a King's Daughter of Scotland* ('Eine schöne lustig triumphirende Comoedia von eines Königes Sohne auß Engellandt vnd des Königes Tochter auß Schottlandt', sigs R6v–Y3v); 5) *An Entertaining Merry Comedy of Sidonia and Theagene* ('Eine kurtzweilige lustige Comoedia von Sidonia vnd Theagene', sigs Y4r–2D3v); 6) *A Pleasant, Merry Comedy of Somebody and Nobody* ('Eine schöne lustige Comoedia, von Jemand vnd Niemandt', sigs 2D4r–2K7r); 7) *The Tragedy of Julio and Hyppolita* ('Tragaedia. Von Julio vnd Hyppolita', sigs 2K7v–2N4r); 8) *A Very Lamentable Tragedy of Tito Andonico and the Haughty Empress* ('Eine sehr klägliche Tragædia von Tito Andronico vnd der hoffertigen Käyserin', sigs 2N4v–2S4r). The two Pickelhering plays are called *A Merry Pickelherring Play of Fair Maria and the Old Adulterer* ('Ein lustig Pickelherings Spiel von der schönen Maria vnnd alter Hanrey', sigs 2S4v–2U8v) and *Another Merry Pickelherring Play in which he Makes Merry Jests with a Stone* ('Ein ander lustig Pickelherings Spiel, darinnen er mit einem Stein gar lustige Possen machet', sigs 2X1r–2Y5v).¹ The collection concludes with dramatic anecdotes in verse, or jigs (sigs 2Y6r–3B7v), with accompanying musical notation. They are preceded by the

¹ For the Pickelherring plays in the 1620 volume, see Hilton, 292–9.

advice, 'The following English excerpts may be acted between the comedies' ('Nachfolgende Englische Auffzüge können nach Beliebung zwischen die Comoedien agiret werden', sig. 2Y6r). Each jig focuses on Pickelhering or a clown figure.¹

The first two plays deal with popular biblical subjects: the Old Testament story of Queen Esther, and the Gospel narrative of the prodigal son.² The third play dramatizes the story of Fortunatus which originated in an early sixteenth-century German chapbook and was later dramatized by Hans Sachs in 1553 in Germany and in two English versions: the lost *First Part of Fortunatus* (mentioned by Henslowe in 1596; Foakes, *Diary*, 34–7) and Thomas Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, published in 1599. The *Comoedia von eines Königes Sohne auß Engellandt vnd des Königes Tochter auß Schottlandt* may well preserve the contents of a lost English play (see Wiggins, 4.21–2). *Sidonia vnd Theagene*, on the other hand, is clearly based on a German verse play, Gabriel Rollenhagen's *Amantes Amentes*, published in Magdeburg in 1609, although Rollenhagen may himself have been influenced by the plays of the English comedians (Seelmann; Haekel, 125–8). The final comedy in the collection, *Jemand vnd Niemandt*, is based on the anonymous English play *No-body and Some-body*, printed in 1606 but perhaps performed as early as the 1590s (Bosman, 570).³ The first tragedy in the collection, *Julio vnd Hyppolita*, bears some resemblance to Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona*,⁴ and is followed by *Tito Andronico*, the Pickelhering plays and the jigs. The order of the plays may

¹ For the jigs in the 1620 collection, see Cohn, cviii–cix; Braekman, 9.13; Hilton, 299–302; and Baskerville, 515–49. For early modern English jigs more generally, see Clegg and Sheaping, and Baskerville.

² The first play might be related to the lost 'heaster & asheweros' mentioned in Henslowe's diary on 3 June 1594 (Foakes, *Diary*, 21), although Haekel (205–12) considers it likely that it derives from German sources.

³ A German manuscript of 1608 with a different version of this play is also extant; see below, p. 77.

⁴ For *Julio vnd Hyppolita*, see Cohn, cxi, 113–56.

reflect a conscious decision to start with the biblical pieces, before progressing to less respectable matter and genres.¹

Between the title page and the plays, the volume contains a four-page, unsigned prefatory epistle (sigs A2r–A3v), which makes a case for the importance of drama by commenting upon the dignity of actors in ancient Rome. As Fredén has shown, almost the whole preface is copied or closely adapted from a passage in *La Piazza universale di tutte le professioni del mondo*, by Tommaso Garzoni, which had first been published in Venice in 1585 (Fredén, *Friedrich*, 9–15). In fact, Garzoni's encyclopedic work had appeared in a German translation, by Matthäus Merian, in Frankfurt in 1619: *Piazza Universale, das ist: Allgemeiner Schauwplatz* (VD17 12:109736B). The *Piazza universale*, a massive folio of over 700 pages, consists of 153 'discorsi', or 'Discurs' in Merian's translation, of which the 103rd is entitled 'Von Comicis, vnd Tragoedis, beydes denen, so sie beschreiben, vnd denen, so sie spielen' ('Of comedies and tragedies, both they who write and they who act them'; sig. 3B4v). It takes up four pages, and the preface is essentially derived from the first of them (sig. 3B4v).² Since the preface in the 1620 collection is unsigned, it is unclear who wrote it (but see below, p. 73). What seems clear, however, is that it must have been added not long before the collection was printed.

The 1620 volume is entirely anonymous: it mentions no author, translator, adapter, theatre company, publisher,

¹ For the plays in the 1620 volume, see also Schlueter, 'Across'; Haekel, 120–31, 165–80; Noe; and Cohn, cvii–cix.

² For an example of the close correspondence between the two texts, compare the following two excerpts: 'So ist hingegen gewiß vnd auß allen Historien bekandt, daß auch etlichen *particularen* beydes vmb ihrer Kunst vnd dann vmb ihrer Tugendt willen grosse Ehre, vnd solches auch öffentlich ist erzeiget worden' (*Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien*, sig. A2v); 'so ist doch gewiß vnnd auß allen Historien bekandt, daß auch etlichen *particularen* beydes vmb ihrer Kunst, vnnd dann vmb ihrer Tugendt willen grosse Ehre, vnd solches auch öffentlich ist erzeiget worden' (Garzoni, *Piazza Universale*, sig. 3B4v).

bookseller, printer or even place of publication. Yet quite a lot can be inferred about the genesis of the collection from other sources. In 1921, the Swedish scholar Johan Nordström published a handwritten list by the German-born academic Friedrich Menius (1593/4–1659) of works he had written (see below, pp. 58, 66–8), which includes ‘English Comedies, 2 parts. Altenburg, published by Gottfried Grosse, bookseller in Leipzig, 1620, in octavo’ (‘Englische Comoedien 2 Theil. Altenburg in Verlegung Gottfried Großen Buchhändlers zu Leipzig. a:o 1620. in 8:vo’.) (Nordström, ‘Friedrich’, 86–91, 87). The information in the Menius manuscript (Uppsala, University Library, MS Nordin 1997; see Fig. 3, number 2) is also in a printed list of publications appended to Menius’ *Syntagma de origine Livonorum* (Dorpat, 1632 (1635), sigs G2r–G3v), a book about the origins of the Livonians, who lived in what is now northern Latvia and southern Estonia.¹ Much of the information Menius provides about the title and size of the collection of plays is confirmed by the Leipzig book fair catalogue of spring 1620, *Catalogus Universalis* (VD17 1:066359V), published by Gottfried Grosse and Abraham Lamberg, which mentions ‘English Comedies and Tragedies together with the Pickelhering, Leipzig, at Gottfried Gross’, 8°, 1620’ (‘Engelische Comoedien vnd Tragoedien sampt den Pickelhaering, Leipzig bey Godfrid Großen, in 8’, sig. F3v). The same information appears in an entry in Georg Draud’s *Bibliotheca librorum germanicorum classica*, published in Frankfurt in 1625 (VD17 12:154632L), a massive 800-page bibliography of German books. In a list of ‘Comedies of various worldly stories, including virtues and vices’ (‘Comedien von

¹ ‘Catalogus Lucubrationum Friderici Menii’, in *Syntagma de Origine Livonor[vm]* (Dorpat: [Jacob Becker], 1632 (1635), sigs G2r–G8v). The information in the printed list is almost identical with that in the manuscript; it reads, ‘Engelische Comoedien 2. Theil. Altenburg in Verlegung Gottfried Großen Buchhändlers zu Leipzig. a:o 1620. in 8:vo’ (sig. G2r).

3 Friedrich Menius, 'Catalogus Lucubrationum Friderici Menij' (Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek, shelfmark: Nordin 1997).

allerhand Weltlichen Geschichten, auch Tugenden vnd Lastern', sig. 4A3r) is a reference to 'English Comedies and Tragedies together with the Pickelhering, Leipzig, at Gottfried Gross', 8°, 1620'.¹ The information provided by Menius about the publisher and the place of publication is thus confirmed by independent sources.

Gottfried Grosse (1591–1637) was a bookseller and a publisher, but he was not a printer, and Menius' list tells us that the book was printed in 'Altenburg', a town about thirty miles south of Leipzig.² A printer in Altenburg who is known to have produced books that were published in Leipzig is Johann Meuschke (also spelled 'Meuschken'). In 1618, for instance, Meuschke printed Adam Cramer's *Kurtzer Aber doch außführlicher Extract auß denen Böhemischen Stad-Rechten und Lands-Ordnung* (VD17 7:707597S) and three sermons (*Drey FestPredigten*) by Heinrich Eckhard (VD17 12:207509N), both published by Henning Grosse, the younger, Gottfried's brother, in Leipzig. In 1623, Meuschke printed another of Cramer's sermons, *Regenten Ehrenpreiss* (VD17 39:103550G), published by Caspar Kloseman in Leipzig. He has been identified as probably the first printer in Altenburg, active from at least 1610 to 1633 (Hauthal, 22). Other Altenburg printers, Johann Bernhard Bauernfinck, Johann Michael, Otto Michael, Gottfried Richter, Johann Ludwig Richter and George Konrad Rüger, are known to have been active later in the seventeenth century (Bürger, 150–1). It seems very likely, then, that Meuschke printed the 1620 *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien*.

Gottfried Grosse was from a family of Leipzig booksellers and publishers. His father, Henning Grosse (1553–1621), is known to have published at least 938 titles in the period from

¹ 'Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien sampt dem Pickelhäring, Leipzig bey Gottfried Gross 8 1620' (sig. 4A3r).

² Benzing (1149) notes that Grosse in fact owned a printing house but leased it to a fellow Leipzig stationer, Johann Albrecht Mintzel.

1580 to 1621; he played an important role in moving a significant part of the German book trade from Frankfurt to Leipzig (see Brauer). Gottfried became a partner in his father's business in 1618 and took it over from him after his death, publishing at least 549 titles in the period from 1618 to 1637. He became an alderman of the City of Leipzig in 1623. Gottfried's older brother Friedrich (1580–1602) had set up his own bookshop quite a bit earlier, which another brother, Henning the Younger (1582–1622), took over after his early death (Brauer).

Gottfried Grosse's publications, like his father's, were mostly theological and religious in nature, notably sermons (like Johannes Andreae's *Vier Geist- und Trostreiche Evangelische Predigten*, 1619, VD17 14:017557D, and Johann Meelführer's *Postilla Davidica*, 1619–20, VD17 14:666249W); theological tracts, in Latin, like the *Decas Quaestionum* (1621, VD17 14:028545Q), by Erhart Lauterbach and Tobias Schubart, and in German, like Balthasar Marschner's pamphlet against purgatory, *Päpstischer Irrwisch* (1630, VD17 23:649084E); prayer books like the *Andächtige Christliche Gebet* (1624, VD17 14:681366B); and Luther's hymns, entitled *Geistliche Lieder* (1621, VD17 7:684853N). Grosse also took over from his father the publication of the important Leipzig book fair catalogue, as well as the *Continuatio* (e.g., VD17 39:124315U), a precursor of the newspaper, which regularly appeared in time for the Leipzig book fair and contained political and military news that had accumulated since the previous fair. Grosse also occasionally published books of other kinds, like a Hebrew language manual by Wilhelm Schickard (*Der Hebraische Trichter*, 1629, VD17 23:293103G), or a Latin collection of orations, letters and religious poems by the French humanist Marc-Antoine Muret (1619–20, VD17 28:730179B). Grosse published few literary titles, and those he did seem to have been mostly in Latin, like Ovid's elegies (*P. Ovidii Nasonis De Ponto Libri IV*, 1627, VD17 1:060931C) and a collection of six comedies by Terence, *P. Terentii Afri Comoediae Sex superstites*

(1632, VD17 1:043285K). An exception to this rule was Zacharias Lund's collection of poems, *Allerhand artige Deutsche Gedichte* (1636, VD17 23:293764M). Apart from the *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (the 1620 and the 1630 volumes; see below, pp. 71–4), Grosse appears not to have been involved in the dissemination of plays in the vernacular.

A second edition of the *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien*, also in octavo, appeared in 1624. The title page replicates that of the first, save for an additional line that announces that the collection is a corrected reprint ('Zum Andern mal gedruckt vnd *corrigirt*').¹ Although some of the printer's errors in the first edition were indeed corrected, new ones were introduced. The second edition was clearly set from the first, but type shortage seems to have led to the use of a mixture of differently sized typefaces, including in the portion that contains *Tito* (see Figs 4 and 5).² The frequent changes in font size, which give the volume an unusual, unprofessional appearance, suggest that Grosse was not involved in its publication. Indeed, there is no trace of it in the relevant Leipzig book fair catalogues where one would have expected it to be mentioned, that is, those of autumn 1623, spring 1624 and autumn 1624.³

¹ One copy of the second edition has survived with a title page of the first edition, and another copy with a facsimile title page of the first edition (see below, p. 80), which has led to scholarly confusion. Creizenach's comments about the collection, for instance, clearly indicate that he mistook the second edition for the first (lxxiv), and Brennecke based his translation on a copy of the second edition (17).

² The replacement of the first edition's roman type by fraktur (a German black-letter typeface) in many gatherings may imply that a Latin text was concurrently printed, which led to a shortage of roman type.

³ In 1670, the Frankfurt publisher Johann Georg Schiele issued three octavo volumes entitled *Schau-Bühnen Englischer und Frantzösischer Comödianten* (*Theatre of English and French Comedians*) of which the second (VD17 35:725477W) contains three plays previously published in the 1620 collection (*Fortunato*, *Sidonia* and *Theagene*, and *Another Merry Pickelherring Play*) and the third (VD17 35:725483X) two such plays (*Queen Esther* and *Haughty Haman* and *Prodigal Son*). See Noe, 3. The third volume also contains three plays of the 1630 collection (Noe, 51). *Tito Andronico* was not reprinted until the nineteenth century.

Dienet nim ihn alß bald von hinnen / vnd vber-
antworte dem Hencker / daß er ihn von Stun-
den an weg henge.

Vote.

Enädiger Herr Käyser / ich hoffe nicht / daß
mir hie wird Gewalt widerfahren / vnd den
Hencker vberantwortet werden / dann solches
were wider allen Kriegsgebruch / ich habe ja
nichts mehr gethan / sondern die Vorseh-
meines Herrn also außgerichtet / wie er sie mir
befohlen hat.

Keyser.

Es hilffet nichts dazu / dein Leben muß dir
genommen werden / hörstu nicht Dienet nim
ihn alßfort für meinen Augen weg. etc.

ACTUS SEXTUS.

Zetzt kömpther auß die weise Muth-
me / hat ein junges schwarzes Kinde im Arm /
welches der Morian mit der Käyserin
nen. gezeuget.

Weise Mutter.

Ich suche jetzt allenthalben den Morian /
welchem ich dieses Kinde sol vberantworten /

Q v

daß

4 Sample page of *Tito Andronico*, in *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (Leipzig, 1620), sig. Qq5r (University Library, LMU Munich, shelfmark: W 8 P.germ. 46).

5 Sample page of *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (n.p., 1624), sig. Qq5r (Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, shelfmark: R 17 Come 1).

Friedrich Menius and the 1620 Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien

Before we investigate Menius' involvement in the 1620 *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien*, including *Tito Andronico*, it will be useful to clarify who he was and what is known about him. He was born in 1593 or 1594 in the small town of Woldegk in Mecklenburg of which his father, Franz Meyn, was the mayor. He went to school in the neighbouring Friedland, after which he studied at the University of Rostock, probably from 1609 to 1615, and the University of Greifswald, from 1615 to 1617. In 1617, he married and settled in Wolgast as a public notary, referring to himself as 'juratus & immatriculatus Notarius Caesareus' (Fredén, *Friedrich*, 25). Menius moved to Poland in 1621, leaving behind his wife, Sophie, for reasons that are unknown. In 1625, he committed bigamy by marrying the sister of Georg Mancelius, a former colleague at the University in Rostock. Around the same time, he started collecting documents relating to the history of Livonia. In the late 1620s, Menius became acquainted with a number of Swedish dignitaries, including the nobleman Gustav Horn, a member of the Royal Council, who was appointed as a field marshal in 1628. It was through Horn's intercession that Menius was appointed field chaplain for the Swedish troops in Livonia, and when Horn was called to Germany to participate in Gustavus Adolphus's intervention in the Thirty Years' War, he entrusted the management of his estate in Livonia to Menius.

In or around 1630, Menius seems to have briefly served as a pastor near Riga before being offered a post as a history teacher at the gymnasium (grammar school) at Dorpat (now Tartu). When Gustavus Adolphus, in 1632, upgraded the gymnasium to a university, Menius became its first professor of history and antiquities at the newly founded Academia Gustaviana. His quiet, scholarly life in Dorpat seems to have ended in 1637 when a dispute led to the discovery of his bigamy (although his

first wife had died in the meantime). He escaped arrest by leaving in a hurry and was outlawed from Dorpat. In the following year we meet him in Ösel (Saaremaa), today an Estonian island but in Menius' time in Danish possession, where he alienated the local governor and other dignitaries. Having moved on to Sweden, he appears to have secured a position as a supervisor in a copper mine in Småland, perhaps through the intercession of his brother, Dietrich Meyn, who was a cook at the royal court in Stockholm. Menius later moved to Stockholm where, in 1644, he published a mystical-occultist work, *Consensus Hermetico-Mosaicus*, which claims to explain the origins of all things visible and invisible. Menius published the book under a pseudonym, Salomon Majus, but this did not prevent him from getting into trouble with the Lutheran authorities. He was arrested, prosecuted and condemned for heresy. Queen Christina seems to have asked for his execution, but he was pardoned after spending a year in prison and making a public recantation. He tried to secure a position as the queen's historiographer, but that understandably came to nothing. His career as a scholar was over, and little more is known about him until his death in 1659.¹

It is worth noting in the present context that during his time at the University of Dorpat, Menius seems to have been assigned the title of poet laureate. In January 1633, he contributed to a booklet congratulating Petrus Goetschenius on becoming a licentiate in theology, signing as 'Frid: Menius P.L.C. Hist: & Antiq. Prof. Publ.', 'P.L.C.' standing for 'Poeta Laureatus Caesareus' (Flood, 1312–13). This need not imply, however, that Menius was a poet of extraordinary merit, for the title seems to have been an academic honorific.² That he wrote some poetry in Latin is known from the title of the now lost

¹ This biographical sketch draws on Fredén, *Friedrich*, 17–81; Fredén, 'L'auteur'; Donecker, *Origines*, 125–31; Beyer and Penman; and Åkerman, 87–91.

² For laureation in the Holy Roman Empire, see Flood, xlvii–cclv.

collection published in 1620 (see below, pp. 66–7), yet the fact that not a single copy of the collection has survived and that it does not seem to have received any further editions suggests that he remained little known as a poet. What German poetry of his that we have come across is of mediocre quality.¹ The fairly undistinguished and repetitive prose of *Tito* is by no means incompatible with his involvement in the play.

Menius' claim to involvement in the collection of 1620 depends upon the list of his own publications extant in manuscript and printed in 1635. Does the list provide reliable information? The reason why the question is worth asking is that the list of his published books is followed by that of his allegedly forthcoming publications, and the latter raises doubts about Menius' reliability. It consists of forty-six books and is divided into three groups according to format: twenty-one octavos, thirteen quartos and twelve folios. Not only has he decided on format, but he also informs the reader that many of his publications will appear with copperplates and will be in more than one language, typically Latin and German but occasionally also other languages. A history of Scandinavia, for instance, is planned for publication in four folio volumes, in Latin, German and Swedish (*Syntagma*, sigs G7r–v). As it turns out, not a single one of the forty-six books has come down to us, suggesting that most of his planned publications were little more than wishful thinking.²

What then of Menius' list of published books? The first three items are all said to have been published in Leipzig in 1620 by

¹ An excerpt from an elegy written on the occasion of the death of Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden, in 1632, is quoted in Gadebusch (2.251): 'Der, der, der, der ist gestorben, / Der, der, der, der ist verdorben; / Ja die Frommen han verloren / Einen Vater auserkoren; / Ja die Bösen seyn entworden / Den, der ihn'n mit scharfen corden / War zur *disciplin* bereit'. A twelve-line German elegy of his, in alexandrines, is no better (see Klöcker, 313).

² For Menius' allegedly planned books, see Donecker, 'Arbeiten'.

Gottfried Grosse. The first is a collection of Latin poems, *Poemata artificiosa varij generis*; the second are the *Engelische Comoedien*; and the third is a comparison of funeral rites in different cultures and periods, entitled *Syntagma Historico-Politico-Juridicum de ritibus funebribus omnium gentium*. Of these, only the *Engelische Comoedien* are extant, whereas the other two titles seem to have perished and are not even mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogues of 1620 (or 1619).¹ The six other items were all published between 1630 and 1635, one in Riga in 1630 and five in Dorpat between 1632 and 1635. Of the six, four are prolegomena for his major planned work, which never reached print, a chronicle of Livonia ranging from the ancient past to the present: *Intrada und Vortrab der grossen Universal Lieffländischen Historischer Geschichten Beschreibung* (Riga: Gerhard Schröder, 1630) is an announcement and sketch of the great chronicle; *Historischer Prodromus des Lieff-ländischen Rechtes und Regiments von Anfang der Provintz, Erfindunge, als auf I: K: M: von Schweden Gustavi M: Todt* (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1633) is about the history of Livonian law; *Diatriba Critica de Maris Balthici nominibus et osijs* (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1634) examines various names used to designate the Baltic Sea since ancient times (Donecker, ‘Arbeiten’, 39); and *Syntagma de origine Livonorum Dorpati* (Dorpat: n.p., 1635) presents materials related to the origins of the Livonians. The other two titles are an account of the opening ceremony of the University of Dorpat, *Relatio von Inauguration der Universität zu Dörpat* (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1632), and a tract which counters an interpretation of a recently published sermon by Johannes Döling, according to which the Apocalypse was imminent, *Proba der Letzten Zeit von der großen Verfolgung, Restaurirung*

¹ This may suggest that the two lost titles received a small print run, perhaps subsidized by Menius himself.

des Wahren Gottes-dienstes, Vntergang des Pabstuhms, und Zukunfft des Jüngsten Tages (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1633). These six titles have all survived.¹ In sum, then, seven of the nine titles in Menius' list have come down to us, and the bibliographic information for all of them squares with that provided by Menius. Whereas the list of Menius' forthcoming publications should hardly be trusted, that of his published books seems entirely reliable. We thus have reason to believe that Menius' information about the *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* of 1620 is trustworthy, and that he must indeed have made a significant contribution to the 1620 collection.

Menius included the 1620 volume of 'Englische Comoedien' in the list of his works, but the list as well as the octavo collection do not explain in what way exactly the volume is his. In the absence of clear evidence, scholars have arrived at different conclusions. Fredén ends his long study arguing that Menius deserves to be considered the author ('Verfasser') of the 1620 collection (*Friedrich*, 491). Haekel seems to endorse

¹ Of *Intrada*, a copy is preserved at the University of Tartu Library (shelfmark F 7,s.97). Of *Historischer Prodromus*, two editions are in fact extant, of which one is dated 1633 (VD 17 14:079927K) and the other, also published by Becker according to the imprint, is undated (VD17 39:123077C). (Referring to the end of the preface, VD17 claims that the latter edition is also of 1633, but the date in question, 20 October 1633, dates the original preface, not the edition's year of publication.) We know about only one copy of the first edition, at the Latvian National Library in Riga, whereas quite a number of copies are extant of the second edition, including one at the British Library (shelfmark G.R.C. 1436.b.46). See also Jaanson, items 35 and 36. Of *Syntagma*, at least three copies are extant: at the Latvian National Library in Riga, the Russian National Library in St Petersburg and at the Stiftsbiblioteket in Linköping, Sweden (Donecker, *Origines*, 124; Jaanson, item 89). *Relatio* is extant in various libraries (Jaanson, item 5); of *Proba*, at least two copies have survived: at the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen and at the University Library of Uppsala (Jaanson, item 37); and of *Diatriba*, two copies are known: at the Tallinn University Academic Library and at the Russian National Library in St Petersburg (Jaanson, item 70). For the contents of these six titles, see also Donecker, 'Arbeiten', 37–43.

Fredén's conclusion (117–18), as does Katritzky, who writes that 'Gustaf Fredén's author attribution is generally accepted' ('Paintings', 213). Braekman (9.22–5) and Bate (Ard³ TA, 43) suggest that Menius 'reported' the plays,¹ and John Alexander writes that Menius 'in all likelihood wrote down the texts from notes and memory' (463). Schlueter, by contrast, contends that 'despite earlier scholars' speculations that these texts were reconstructed from memory, it would appear that the notary, perhaps in his official capacity, had the resident company's playbooks in hand' ('Across', 232–3); accordingly, she holds that the volume was 'Compiled by Menius' ('*Fortunati*', 120). Marti similarly refers to Menius as the volume's 'Herausgeber' (360), i.e. editor.² Others have considered Menius as the plays' translator (Williams, 197) or even made of him the first translator of Shakespeare into German ('erster Übersetzer Shakespeares ins Deutsche'; Klöcker, 312). While Menius' involvement in the 1620 *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* is generally accepted, there is thus considerable disagreement over the exact form that involvement took.

By far the most sustained analysis has been undertaken by Fredén. He makes a detailed case for the presence of a recognizable hand in much of the volume whose characteristics are compatible with the assumption that it is Menius': a considerable number of Latinisms, usually with correct declensions, and Low-German vocabulary and syntax (*Friedrich*, 119–53); narrative, literary stage directions which often provide information that is also available from the dialogue text, often in the same words (*Friedrich*, 159–70); and stage directions which conceptualize entrances as a coming out ('heraus') and exits as a going in ('hinein'), in contradistinction to the English 'enter'

¹ Bate later refers to a stage direction in *Tito* as 'Menius' (Ard³ TA, 46).

² According to the 'King of England's Son' entry in the *Lost Plays Database*, the 'octavo volume [was] edited by Friedrich Menius'.

and ‘exit’ (*Friedrich*, 170–89).¹ These features are hard to reconcile with the assumption that Menius simply assembled theatrical manuscripts from a touring company and had them published more or less unchanged. That does not mean that Menius necessarily reported plays he had seen in performance. It is equally possible that he had access to theatrical manuscripts but revised them with a view to publication. In particular, he may have expanded and added stage directions.² The title page of the 1620 collection, we recall, insists that the plays are ‘printed in such wise that they can be easily prepared for performance and serve for the delight and recreation of the mind’, a comment that may reflect the particular attention Menius paid to stage directions in preparing the dramatic texts.

One question raised by Menius’ involvement in the 1620 collection is how it can be reconciled with the volume’s publication in Leipzig. Wolgast, where Menius resided, is on the Baltic Coast, almost 300 miles from Leipzig. So how did the manuscript get from Wolgast, where Menius may have seen plays performed by English players, to Leipzig, where Gottfried Grosse was involved in the book’s dissemination? The answer is difficult to recover, although it is just possible that it is bound up with contemporary politics: as the political crisis resulting

¹ Dahlberg has endorsed Fredén’s conclusion that the plays are likely to reflect Menius’ involvement, but he suggests that one play, *Sidonia und Theagene*, is of different origins and adopts different conventions (including Latin stage directions) from the others. The differences between *Sidonia und Theagene* and the other plays in the 1620 volume are more likely to be the result of the play’s close relationship to Rollenhagen’s *Amantes Amentes* (see above, p. 55), of which Dahlberg seems unaware, than of its derivation from the group of plays published in the 1630 collection *Liebeskampff*, for which he argues.

² Dahlberg claims to have identified a linguistic oddity in the 1620 volume that appears in both dialogue text and stage directions, namely the recurrent use of ‘hefftig’ (severe, intense) as an intensifier (‘hefftig gut’, ‘hefftig gross’, etc.), which he takes as evidence that the same writer was responsible for the dialogue text and the stage directions (329). Further analysis of the linguistic make-up of the plays in the 1620 volume might help to strengthen or invalidate Dahlberg’s argument.

from the beginnings of the Thirty Years' War was deepening, John George I, Elector of Saxony, convened a Kreistag in Leipzig to take place on 30 January 1620, to which Philip Julius sent delegates from Wolgast and Stettin (see Nicklas, 201–4; Thiede, 2.89). It is not impossible that Menius, as a public notary, was among the delegates, and that he took advantage of his stay in Leipzig to find a publisher for his manuscripts (not only the *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* but also the Latin poems and the tract on funeral rites). Even if Menius did not personally travel to Leipzig, it is possible that he entrusted his manuscripts to someone else who did and who had them published on his behalf.

Menius' list of his own works appended to his *Syntagma de origine Livonorum* mentions 'Englische Comoedien 2. Theil' (sig. G2r), which has understandably puzzled scholars (e.g., Fredén, *Friedrich*, 490–1; Dahlberg). According to today's typographic conventions, '2. Theil' would mean *second part*, but conventions were looser in the seventeenth century than they are today, and, in any case, the manuscript in fact reads '2 Theil' which suggests that Menius meant *two parts*. If so, it may be tempting – but we think mistaken – to believe that the other part Menius had in mind is the collection published ten years after the first, in 1630, with the title 'Love's Fight, or the Other Part of the English Comedies and Tragedies, in which very pleasant, choice Comedies and Tragedies are to be found, never previously printed' ('Liebeskampff Oder Ander Theil Der Engelischen Comoedien vnd Tragoedien, In welchen sehr schöne, außerlesene Comoedien vnd Tragoedien zu befinden, vnd zuvor nie in Druck außgegangen'; VD17 23:285896G). Like the 1620 collection, that of 1630 mentions the year of publication on the title page but no printer, publisher or bookseller. Yet the catalogue of the Leipzig book fair of autumn 1629, *Catalogus Universalis*, published by Gottfried Grosse and Abraham Lamberg (VD17 1:069589P), mentions in a list of 'German books in sundry arts' ('Teutsche Bücher in allerhand

Künsten'), 'English Comedies, the other part, published by the author, Leipzig, to be found at Gottfried Grossen's, 8°' ('Englischer Comaedien Ander theil, in Verlegung des *authoris*, Leipzig bey Gottfried Grossen zu finden. 8.', sig. D4r). The book fair catalogue of the following spring, again co-published by Grosse (VD17 1:069587Y), mentions the collection under its main title, 'Love's Fight, or the other part of the English Comedies and Tragedies, Leipzig, at Gotfriede Grossen's, in 8°' ('Liebes Kampf, oder Ander Theil der Englischen Comoedien vnd Tragoedien. Leipzig bey Gotfriede Grossen, in 8' (sig. E4v). Not only the title, 'Engelischen Comoedien vnd Tragoedien', and the designation of 1630 as 'the other part' ('Ander Theil') connect the 1620 and the 1630 volume. Much of the text on the two title pages is in fact identical (see Brauneck and Noe, 1.vii, 2.3). It should also be noted that the preface to the 1620 volume announces a follow-up volume with further plays if the first one is well received: 'Should it be the case that you enjoy [the plays] and find them pleasant, more of the same kind will follow soon' ('da man nun vermercken wird / daß sie ihnen lieb und angenemb / sollen derselben bald mehr darauff folgen', sig. A3v). Moreover, as has been shown by Richter (9–11), the Preface to the 1630 volume, like that of the 1620, is mostly copied from printed sources, notably chapter 34 of the second part (*Ander Theil. Der guldenen Sendtschreiben*) of Aegidius Albertinus' translation of Antonio de Guevara's *Epistolas familiares* (Munich, 1603, VD17 3:605728D; and reprinted in 1607, 1615, 1618 and 1625), and from a preface to the German translation of the Amadis chivalric romances, which had first appeared in 1569 (*Neue Historia vom Amadis auß Franckreich*, VD16 A 2113) and was frequently reprinted in the early seventeenth century (e.g. in 1617, *Das erste Buch der Historyen vom Amadis auß Franckreich*; VD17 1:631962N).

Given all these connections between the collections of 1620 and 1630, one might be forgiven for relating Menius' reference

to '2 Theile' to them. However, Menius unambiguously dates the whole publication 1620, and mentions no additional volume in 1630. Just as importantly, the plays in the 1630 volume are of a very different kind. Unlike the plays that make up the 1620 volume, those in *Liebeskampf* mostly have French and Italian dramatic sources rather than English. The conventions governing their presentation, such as their classical stage directions, are entirely different from those in the 1620 volume. As Price has written, 'Despite its secondary title, the *Liebeskampf* was published quite independently of its predecessor, though it was no doubt suggested by it and though it probably followed its example in some respects . . . The title and the style are Italian rather than English and the author was of Thuringian origin' (22), which is clearly not the case for the 1620 volume. What that means is that Menius' '2 Theile' must somehow relate to the material published in 1620. Perhaps he thought of the full-length prose plays as one part and the jigs, in verse, with accompanying musical notation, as the other. One cannot be sure about the meaning of Menius' '2 Theile', but it makes sense to assume, in keeping with Menius' bibliographic entry, that it refers solely to the 1620 publication, not to the two publications of 1620 and 1630.

A corollary of this argument is that the connections between the paratext of the 1620 and the 1630 collections originate with the publisher, not with Menius. Menius' name is notably absent from the 1620 collection, and this despite the fact that his bibliographic ego was by no means small, as suggested by his long list of his own past and future publications. What this may suggest is that Menius, or someone who acted on Menius' behalf, sold his manuscripts to Grosse, but that Grosse decided on the wording of the title page (with its absence of Menius' name) and contributed the (unsigned) preface. If so, it was Grosse, not Menius, who announced in the preface that another volume of plays would be published if the first one met with

approval – an announcement of a commercial spin-off that it makes sense a publisher would make.¹

The 1620 Englische Comedien vnd Tragedien and their theatrical origins

It has been assumed that Menius probably attended performances of English players at the court of Philip Julius, Duke of Pomerania (1584–1625), in Wolgast (Braekman, 9.9; see also Schlueter, ‘Rereading’, 179).² That may have been the case, although it should be pointed out that the documentary record is too scant to allow for clear conclusions. Evidence about the presence of English players at Julius’ court was brought to light by C. F. Meyer, who did extensive research in the royal state archives in Stettin in which the ducal archives of Wolgast were preserved. Meyer shows that Julius hosted English players in 1606, when one Joachim von Wedel complained about the duke’s lavish spending: ‘recently, many and twenty of the English, musicians, acrobats, dancers and the clown, exercised the *artes voluptarias* [sensual arts], serving no purpose other than guzzling, indulgence and the furthering of disorder and wastefulness’.³ Later in the same year, the ‘Comedianten’ performed in nearby Loitz, where the prince’s mother had her residence, to which the ducal household seems to have been invited (Meyer, 200). The players set up their stage in the Castle

¹ An added complication is that the entry in the 1629 book fair catalogue mentions that the 1630 collection was published by the author (‘in Verlegung des *authoris*’). Who this author was and why the collection was published by him and only sold by Grosse now seems impossible to recover. For self-publication in the early modern German book trade, see Meurer.

² Nordström speculated that Menius ‘was a member of some English troupe of players’ (‘Editor’, 8) but observed that there is no evidence for it.

³ ‘[N]eulich etliche und zwanzig Engländer, musicanten, springer, tändler und der pussenreisser, so die *artes voluptarias* üben und anders nirgends zu nützen, als daß sie fraß, schwalg und ander unordnung und verschwenden befördern’ (Meyer, 199).

Church, much to the outrage of the court chaplain, Gregorius Hagijs, who vociferously complained in a series of letters to the duke and his mother. In one of his letters, he specifically objects that the plays were written and performed in an ‘unknown language’ (‘Ire Comedien in vnbekannter sprach geschrieben sindt und agirt werden’, Meyer, 203), no doubt in English.¹ According to Meyer, we next hear of English players (referred to as ‘Musikanten’, musicians) at the Wolgast court seventeen years later, in 1623. In a petition to the duke, dated 30 August 1623, prefaced ‘Der Musicanten Supplication’ and signed by ‘Richard Jones’, ‘Johan Kostreßen’ and ‘Robert Dulandt’, they ask for permission to return to England after a year’s employment at the ducal court.² A second, unrelated petition, dated 28 May 1624 and signed by ‘Musicant Richard Farnaby’, mentions an unspecified number of other ‘Musicanten’ (Meyer, 209) who were also at the Wolgast Court.³ The third and last petition, dated 10 July 1624, is by Richard Jones (signed ‘Richardt Jones / Engelder undt Musikant’; Meyer, 210), who is back in Wolgast and asking for employment after his projects in England had come to nothing (Meyer, 209–10).⁴

¹ Julius’ interest in English theatre is also documented from the time of his extensive travels in 1602 which led him not only through various parts of Germany, Switzerland, Italy and France, but also to England, where several visits to London theatres are mentioned in the travel account by his secretary and interpreter, Friedrich Gerschow (see von Blow and Powell).

² ‘Robert Dulandt’ is better known as Robert Dowland (c. 1591–1641), son of the lutenist and composer John Dowland (1563?–1626). See Greer, and Fredén, *Friedrich*, 111–12.

³ Richard Farnaby (c. 1593–1623), of whom a few musical compositions appear to be extant, is the son of Giles Farnaby (c. 1563–1640), the composer and virginalist (see Marlow). See also Fredén, *Friedrich*, 112–16.

⁴ For Jones, see Fredén, *Friedrich*, 110–11; and Schrickx, “‘Pickleherring’”. Meyer (207–8) also found a petition by students from the University of Greifswald who asked the duke for financial and logistical support in their staging of a tragedy at the University (whose patron the duke was). The date of this document is corrected by Fredén from 1619, as given by Meyer, to 1614 (‘L’auteur’, 423–4; *Friedrich*, 95).

The patchy documentary record brought to light by Meyer is thus confined to two periods: 1606 and 1623–24. Fredén seems to have come across additional relevant documents, but, frustratingly, he does not reference them. In 1607, Fredén claims, the duke ordered a small troupe of English ‘Musikanten’, based in Hamburg, to his court (Fredén, *Friedrich*, 104–6). Four years later, a group of English comedians asked for employment at the duke’s court,¹ and in the reply they received, they were asked to accept a previously made offer, or to depart (Fredén, *Friedrich*, 106). Fredén adds that bills dating from 1613 and the following years suggest that considerable amounts were spent on ‘Musikanten’ (*Friedrich*, 107), although it does not emerge whether these were English or German. All in all, then, what is known about the documentary record does not exclude the possibility that English players were present at the Wolgast court during the years (1617–20) when Menius might have witnessed them, and perhaps received, recorded or adapted their theatrical texts. Nor, however, should theatrical activity at the Wolgast court during the years in question be taken for granted.

More circumstantial evidence may be gathered about the origins of the plays by asking in what company’s repertory they may have been. The prominence of the name of ‘Pickelherring’ on the title page may provide a hint. The name soon became widespread and generic, but it was still recent in 1620 and had previously been associated with the actor George Vincent. In an account book of the court of Wolfenbüttel in Lower Saxony, an entry that can be dated to May 1615 records a payment to ‘Georg Vincint alias Pickelhering’ (Schrickx, “Pickleherring”, 139), one of a number of English players at that court, including John Green (Schrickx, “Pickleherring”, 141). It emerges from other records that Vincent and Richard Jones who, as explained above,

¹ Fredén points out that in this (unidentified) document, the word ‘Komödiant’ is used as a synonym for ‘Musikant’ (*Friedrich*, 106).

was at the Wolgast court in 1622 and 1623, were members of the company headed by Green. After their time at the court of Wolfenbüttel, for instance, they seem to have travelled east with other members of the troupe and can be found in Danzig in August 1615 (Schrickx, “‘Pickleherring’”, 141). Green had started his theatrical career on the Continent around 1603, initially as a member of a company led by Robert Browne, although he seems to have been in charge of his own troupe by summer 1607 (Schrickx, “‘Pickleherring’”, 137; *Foreign*, 203–7). We know about the repertory of the company led by Green thanks to a letter (commonly known as the ‘Theaterbrief’) by the Archduchess Maria Magdalena to her brother, the later Emperor Ferdinand II. The letter mentions ten plays performed in Graz from 6 to 19 February 1608, of which three are in the collection published in 1620: ‘die Comedi von dem verlorenen sohn’ (*The Prodigal Son*), ‘fortnatus peitl und Wünschhietel’ (*Fortunatus and his Purse and Wishing-cap*) and ‘Niemandts und iemandt’ (*Nobody and Somebody*) (Schrickx, *Foreign*, 332–3).¹ Of the last of these plays, a manuscript dated 1608 is extant with a dedication by Green to the Archduke Maximilian Ernest of Austria.² *Fortunatus*, as pointed out above, is based on Dekker’s *Old Fortunatus*, but the version in the 1620 collection has added the character of Pickelhering, which strengthens the connection between Green, Vincent (‘alias Pickelhering’) and the *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien*.

The centre of activity of Green and his fellow players seems to have moved further north by the end of the second decade of the seventeenth century, when they are known to have spent three winters at the Warsaw court (1616–20) and at least part of a summer in Danzig (1619) (Schrickx, “‘Pickleherring’”, 144–

¹ For an English translation of the ‘Theaterbrief’, see Schrickx, *Foreign*, 208–12.

² For the 1608 manuscript and its relationship to the play printed in 1620, see Chambers, *Elizabethan*, 2.281–2; Flemming; Hay; Brauneck and Noe, 6.28–32; and Bosman.

5). Documents from the Acts of the Privy Council show that Vincent was intermittently back in England in 1617 and 1618, making provision ‘of certeyne necessities for the use of the Prince his master and for the King and Queene of Poland’ (Schrickx, “‘Pickleherring’”, 140) but probably also drafting further players for the troupe led by Green. Vincent, as Schrickx has pointed out, ‘was an important intermediary in providing entertainers for the troupe headed by Green’ (“‘Pickleherring’”, 141). In the summer of 1617, Jones was back in England with Vincent, but in the following summer, Jones stayed on the Continent and Vincent returned from England to the Continent with his wife and children as well as with Jones’ wife.¹ We know that by 1622, Jones at least was at the Wolgast court, and he and fellow players may of course have been there before. There is thus considerable circumstantial evidence that associates the plays in the 1620 collection with Green, Vincent, Jones and their fellow players.

Given their presence in Danzig on the Baltic coast in 1619, it may be added that Wolgast, also on the Baltic coast and home to a ducal court, may have been an obvious destination for Green and his fellow players. Commenting on the travels of London playing companies, Andrew Gurr has stressed the comparative ease of ‘coastal shipping for their travels’: ‘The sea gave them quick and simple transport to many towns easy of access. Given the loads of expensive costumes and properties they had to carry with them for their plays, carriage by water was probably more secure than by cart or coach and horseback’ (63). What is true for travelling around Britain may also apply to travelling on the Continent. Although no records survive that demonstrate the presence of Green’s troupe in Wolgast during Menius’ presence there (1617–20), it would be compatible with what is known about their whereabouts.

¹ Two letters by Jones and one by his wife, all addressed to Edward Alleyn, have survived (see Greg, *Papers*, 33, 94–5; Schrickx, “‘Pickleherring’”, 144).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the textual and theatrical origins of *Tito Andronico* are bound up with the plays with which it was published in the collection of 1620, and while some things can be recovered with some confidence about those origins, others remain uncertain. The collection, although published anonymously and without imprint, can be shown to have been published in Leipzig by Gottfried Grosse and printed in Altenburg, probably by Johann Meuschke. Thanks to the survival of a list of his publications, Friedrich Menius, a public notary in Wolgast from 1617 to 1621, is known to have been involved in preparing the plays for publication. Menius may have witnessed the performance of the plays at the Wolgast Court of Philip Julius, Duke of Pomerania, perhaps by the company led by John Green. It is likewise possible that Menius had access to the theatrical manuscripts and revised them with a view to publication. Just how different Menius' play texts are from those that were performed is now impossible to recover. It seems likely that many of the stage directions are essentially his, and it is possible that his contribution to the play texts, including to *Tito*, was substantial.

The 1620/1624 Englische Comedien vnd Tragedien: extant copies

Copies of the 1620 edition are extant in various libraries: the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Unter den Linden (two copies: call numbers Yp 5801 and Libri impr. rari oct. 255); the Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek in Erfurt/Gotha (call number Poes 8° 01527/02); the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (call number A: 105 Eth. (1)); the Universitätsbibliothek LMU in Munich (call number 0014/W 8 P.germ. 46); the Universitätsbibliothek in Leipzig (call number 94-8-4775); the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek in Hannover (call

number Lh 3308); the University of Chicago Library (Special Collections, call number PT1264.E57); and the University of Pennsylvania Library (call number V49.163 En3 1620).¹ The copies at the British Library (call number C.95.b.36) and the Folger Shakespeare Library (call number PR1246.G5 E59 Cage) belong in fact to the second edition (1624), although a 1620 title page (or, in the case of the Folger copy, a facsimile title page) has been added to them. Other extant copies of the second edition are at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (call number A: 100.1 Eth. (2)); the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen (call number 8PDRAM III, 30); the Württembergische Landesbibliothek in Stuttgart (call number R 17 Come 1); the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (call number B4/DWB); the University of Pennsylvania Library (call number V49.163 En3 1624); and the Beinecke Library, Yale University (call number Zg17 A13 624). A fragmentary copy of the second edition is at the Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek in Weimar (call number Scha BS 4 A 02749).

Editorial history

The first modern edition of the German text was published in Ludwig Tieck's *Deutsches Theater* in 1817. Some decades later, Albert Cohn included the German text alongside an English translation by Moritz Lippner in *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Account of English Actors in Germany and the Netherlands*

¹ Our edition of the German text (see above, p. xvii) has been prepared from the Munich copy. Four copies are imperfect and lack certain leaves: the first one at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Yp 5801) lacks A2, A7, A8, C3 and C6; the one at the Universitätsbibliothek in Leipzig lacks A1–B3; the copy at the University of Pennsylvania Library breaks off at leaf Y5 and lacks the five interludes placed towards the end of the volume; and the title page of the Chicago copy is a photostat facsimile.

and of the Plays Performed by them during the Same Period (1865). The German text was next published in Wilhelm Creizenach's *Die Schauspiele der englischen Kömodianten* in 1889, and, more recently, in Manfred Brauneck and Alfred Noe's *Spieltexte der Wanderbühne* (1970), which conservatively reproduces all the plays contained in *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (1620) and *Liebeskampff* (1630). These editions contain no or little annotation. The most recent German edition of *Tito*, with a slightly fuller apparatus, appears in an appendix to Markus Marti's German translation of the English play (2008).

There have been two translations of *Tito* into English. Lippner's translation in Cohn's *Shakespeare in Germany* and Ernst Brennecke's in *Shakespeare in Germany 1590–1700* (1964). Brennecke's was unintentionally based on a copy of the second edition (1624): he used the copy at the Folger Shakespeare Library, to which a facsimile of the 1620 title page had been added. Lippner's text is entirely unannotated, and Cohn devotes no more than a page and a half to the play in the introduction (112–13). Brennecke's introduction, at four and a half pages, is longer, but not by much, and his annotation consists of merely three short footnotes. Despite the existence of two retranslations, little has thus been done before the present edition to mediate *Tito Andronico* to an English-speaking readership.