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Abstract

In Shakespeare’s first tragedy, *Titus Andronicus*, the blank spaces are filled by necessary action and constant visual representations of limbless bodies on the stage, which are easily lost on the pages of the text. It is my contention that an edition must offer the best possibility to bridge this gap between the stage and the page, by presenting a text based on the early modern text that is most influenced by the theater. Based on my evaluation of the most recent scholarship, this text is the 1623 First Folio. This choice is a clear break from the editorial tradition of *Titus Andronicus*, which has been to use the First Quarto as copy text and to insert the stage directions and the “fly scene” from the First Folio. While the First Quarto may represent something closer to what Shakespeare first wrote, the long success of *Titus Andronicus* on the stage, the addition of the theatrically based directions, and the number of hands involved in the preparation of the text for the Folio offer a more tangible connection to the effects of performance on early modern texts. They offer something much more valuable for a play that depends so critically on the theater. In the following chapters, I establish the importance that performance plays in fully developing the arguments of the play. I am confident that this edition provides readers with a basis in the most theatrically influenced early modern version of the play, because the First Folio benefited from the work of men who set out to put together the best representation of Shakespeare’s theater that they could, instead of merely reprinting one of the earlier quartos. It only seems right that a play so dependent on theatrical performance be prepared using the unique copy that resulted from *Titus Andronicus*’s successful history in the early modern theater.
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Introduction

For the first time in three centuries, *Titus Andronicus* is enjoying a level of success that is equal to the reception that led to multiple editions of the play in its first thirty years of existence, and helped to establish Shakespeare as a leading dramatist of his time. This success and recent upsurge in popularity is due partly to the Julie Taymour’s highly popular film version *Titus* (1999), which brought *Titus Andronicus* to a much larger and more varied audience than anything had before; and partly to the number of different theatrical performances that have been produced by the Royal Shakespeare Company over the last ten years. More and more scholars and audiences have become interested in the play in the twenty-first century. It seems appropriate then that *Titus Andronicus* deserves a fresh reconsideration as a text.

*Titus Andronicus* received little regard from scholars as a literary text for centuries. Even though critical attention to the over the last sixty years has grown, the literary value of the play as a whole continues to be held in low esteem by many scholars today. The two sides are clear in reviews of a recent production that comment on this reception history. Dr. Peter Buckroyd, in a review of the Royal Shakespeare Company’s latest production of *Titus Andronicus* at the Swan in Stratford-upon-Avon on May seventeenth, 2013, wrote that “*Titus* is not very often produced and for good reason,” like the “technical challenges” and dealing with the level of what he describes as “gruesome bits” (Moss Cottage). Michael Billington’s review by contrast begins with the line, “No one any longer has to make a case for this once-despised play” (*The Guardian*, 24 May 2013). At first, it may seem odd that there are such different expectations for *Titus*. The latter is clearly reacting to the recent successes of the play in performance and the former
seems to be relying on its long reception as a poor literary text that does not deserve to be listed as Shakespeare’s. These disparate views present the greatest challenge for a modern editor charged with presenting the text of the play for a reading audience. How does one bring the recent success of *Titus Andronicus* on the stage to the pages of an edition? It is this challenge that I take up here.

The following dissertation argues that *Titus Andronicus*, far from being a poor example of Shakespeare’s literary abilities, offers readers the first glimpses into Shakespeare’s genius in formation and the beginnings of his talent for portraying humanity at its worst and lowest. I argue that *Titus Andronicus* is a complex response to the spectacular plays made popular by Marlowe and Kyd during the years before its creation. The language that for so long seemed at odds with the violent action of the play is in fact an integral partner with that action in getting its argument across. *Titus Andronicus*, with all of its poetry, is about the limitations of language and the true nature of these limitations is nowhere more evident than in its great moments of silence at the times when language is most powerless. The play requires that the audience or reader be involved in establishing its meaning through these moments that rely so little on what is said; this task is obviously more difficult for the reader of the text. The contention of this edition is that *Titus Andronicus* is a particularly interesting Shakespearean play, but because the play’s greatest arguments exist in between and beyond the lines on the page, the visible images and actions that are evident to a theater audience are not always clear in the language on the page. The often numerous possibilities in the stage action must be conveyed to the reader through stage directions and extended discussion in the commentary.
Titus Andronicus requires performance to achieve its full potential and therefore demands a text that bears the most influence from the early modern theater. I establish in the pages that follow that this text is printed in 1623 First Folio, which has not received a modern full critical edition. For these reasons I have chosen the Folio as the copy text for the current edition. But before entering into a further defense of this choice, I will introduce the several aspects of Titus Andronicus that I approach in the following chapters.

In the first chapter of this dissertation, my fresh analysis of the authorship of Titus Andronicus reconsiders the history of authorship studies over the past century. Beginning with the scholarship of J. M. Robertson and T. M. Parrot in the first quarter of the twentieth century, the majority of scholars have produced studies that show that George Peele’s hand is evident in at least the first act of the play. Even with this amount of evidence, mainstream scholars through the late twentieth century did not accept that Peele participated in the creation of Titus Andronicus; the majority of opinions supported the argument that Shakespeare wrote the entire thing.

In the twenty-first century, recent scholarship has emerged to propose answers to the question of the play’s authorship. Brian Vickers’ Shakespeare, Co-Author provides the most thorough study of Shakespearean collaboration to date. I analyze the data that he presents from his studies of the styles of Shakespeare and Peele in light of Lene Peterson’s more recent arguments against Vickers’s study. My conclusion is that while Peterson brings up interesting concerns about the amount of weight Vickers put on repetition as a style-marker, there is strong enough evidence in Vickers’s data to support his conclusions. Peterson seems to be reaching too far to negate Peele’s value. Peele did
have a tendency towards repetition and this is clear in his plays and his poetry. Along with other details provided by Vickers and earlier scholars, this realization indicates that George Peele participated in the creation of act one and likely three other scenes in *Titus*.

The attributes in *Titus Andronicus* that can be associated with Peele’s work connect to far more than repetition. This suggests that the likeliest possibility is that Peele began writing act one, and Shakespeare either began collaborating with Peele or took over the play during the creation of act two at some point before the first recorded production in January 1594. This suggestion is more probable than the conjecture that Shakespeare revised a much older version. It seems unlikely that Shakespeare would have taken on a revision and made no contributions or corrections to the first act of the play itself.

Discussions of when *Titus Andronicus* was actually created correspond with those concerning its authorship. Scholars showed little agreement from the earliest studies attempting to discover a date for *Titus*. In the next chapter of this dissertation, I reexamine the several factors that scholars have relied on to support different possibilities of a date for the text. What is clear is that there is little solid evidence. We know that some version of *Titus Andronicus* was written before the first recorded performance on January twenty-fourth in 1594. Theories differ concerning the meaning of the 1594 First Quarto’s title page, when it boasts of three different playing companies having performed *The most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus*. There is also little agreement about what Philip Henslowe intended when he wrote “ne” next to his entry of its first performance on January twenty-fourth, 1594. While it is very unlikely that we should take Ben Jonson seriously when he mentioned in the Induction to *Bartholomew*
Fair (1614) that Titus Andronicus and The Spanish Tragedy had been on stage for twenty-five to thirty years, there are still those drawn to a date in the mid-to-late 1580’s. Compared to other contemporary claims and allusions to Titus, these dates seem a little early.

Most scholars provide their own scenarios supporting dates ranging from 1586 through early 1594, and many resort to discussions of the signs of revision in the Quarto text. With little other proof apart from revision, a number of scholars have argued that Titus Andronicus existed in an older version that was newly revised for the early 1594 performances by Sussex’s Men. I reconsider these scenarios against what we now know about the many agents involved in the creation of plays and suggest that the most likely conjecture is that Titus Andronicus was written as collaboration sometime between late 1592 and late 1593. While Titus may have been written or revised for the performances by Sussex’s Men, it is just as possible that the play was newly revised for the next set of performances later that summer by the new company known as The Lord Chamberlain’s Men. We know texts were changed for performances and that some of the revisions in the Quarto show the possibility of theater influence. If it was written just before the first performance in January 1594, there is yet another possibility. The revisions to the text that we find evidence for in the Quarto could have been made in response to the play’s initial reception on stage and/or in order to better fit the abilities of the new company’s summer production and still made it into print that fall. This could also explain why the “fly scene,” a scene that only appears in the Folio but most likely dates to early 1594, was not included in the Quarto text. It is possible that Shakespeare wrote the extra scene for the second set of performances and such an addition constituted a major revision. It could
be that the scene was too much of a departure from the licensed text, and so it was only the minor revisions that made it into the printed quarto.

The following chapter in my study discusses what we know of the earliest performances and their success. Then it considers the stage history that followed. The first three performances of *Titus Andronicus* took place between January twenty-fourth and February eighth in 1594. In addition to records of several performances of the play later that year and in 1596, there were two further quartos of *Titus Andronicus* printed in 1600 (Q2) and 1611 (Q3). This evidence suggests that *Titus Andronicus* remained popular and had a long run on the Elizabethan and Jacobean stages. For unknown reasons the popularity fell off at some point, and there are no known performances of *Titus Andronicus* until Edward Ravenscroft’s adaptation of the Second Quarto text was staged in 1678 and printed in 1687 as *Titus Andronicus or the Rape of Lavinia*. Ravenscroft adapted the play for his audiences’ sensibilities as well as his own dramatic tastes, and this willingness to adapt began a tradition that would run through the early-to-mid twentieth century. Adaptations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries continued to add and sometimes remove entire scenes from *Titus Andronicus* with the same liberty, and each of the major performances met with great praise for the versions that ended up on the stage and the actors who performed in them.

It was not until the director Robert Atkins made the concerted effort to reinsert much of what Ravenscroft had removed from *Titus Andronicus* for his production at the Old Vic in 1923, that this trend of adapting *Titus* for particular tastes began to slow. In the nineteen fifties directors continued to avoid the levels of rewriting from the previous centuries, but they were still unwilling to base their performances on a complete version
of an early modern *Titus Andronicus* and took some liberties with the arrangement. Peter Brook set a trend in his 1955 production by cutting Marcus completely from act two, scene four when Lavinia stands alone on the stage raped and mutilated with crimson ribbons flowing from her stumps and mouth. This seemed to be a response to the reactions of most scholars who could not see how Marcus’s poetic language in the scene fit with Lavinia’s traumatized body in front of him. Later directors would reinsert Marcus, but it was not until Deborah Warner’s 1986 production that a performance of the full scene as it appears in both the quartos and the Folio saw the stage since the early-seventeenth century. What amazed critics the most was that it worked. The popularity of *Titus Andronicus* in performance has not waned since, and as is evidenced in the number of well-received productions on stage and on films since the mid-nineteen eighties.

The importance of the stage history of *Titus Andronicus* is that the amount of respect that it has garnered has been consistently at odds with the poor critical response to the play as a literary text. The powerful effects of *Titus* on various viewing audiences throughout its performance history indicate that it works well on the stage and this is one the major influences on my decision to choose the Folio as the copy text for this edition.

Even with the amount of success that *Titus Andronicus* has been able to achieve in productions, its reputation as a literary text did not follow suit. For years, literary scholars refused to believe the play to be Shakespeare’s or showed embarrassment for Shakespeare’s apparent failure with his first tragedy. Eugene Waith was the first to attempt to challenge the trend in 1957 and began with what seemed to trouble readers most: the language of the play.
The earliest focuses of serious scholarship on the language of *Titus Andronicus* and the clear Ovidian links throughout the play have proven to be the most intriguing and lasting. Scholars from Waith to Jonathan Bate have accounted for Shakespeare’s successful use of Ovidian metaphor and Greek and Roman mythology in creating his play, and Bate rightly praises Shakespeare’s ability to surpass the poetic language and violence of his sources. Other scholars focused on making sense of Shakespeare’s depictions of Rome and what it meant to be a Roman in *Titus Andronicus*. A few studies determined that the anachronisms in the play that bothered early scholars were actually in line with Elizabethan knowledge of Rome and trends in Elizabethan drama. Considering political, religious, and historical attributes in *Titus Andronicus*, scholars have argued that *Titus* is in fact a successful Roman play. These studies of Ovidian sources and Rome together shed light on some of the reasons the play is so popular for modern directors. It is the political uncertainty, the breakdown in differences between Romans and Goths, and the refusal to be pinned to any particular time in Roman history that has allowed directors to comment on and portray various societies and cultures to explore what happens when traditional barriers break down.

More recent scholarship of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries presents character studies of Lavinia and Aaron. These scholars argue that we must reconsider Shakespeare’s display of Lavinia and Aaron as the “Other” in Shakespeare’s Rome, and often find more power in their characters than had previously been considered. While each character initially exists in the margins of *Titus’s* Rome, each is able to subvert these boundaries in order to achieve levels of power beyond stereotypical expectations. Aaron is able to manipulate both Romans and Goths for his own benefit and amusement with a
vocal display of his eloquent wit. Lavinia’s position is harder to maneuver and her own words have no effect on her status or the actions of others. Her power to change her own circumstances depends on physical action and her visible body on the stage. I take up this topic at more length in the following chapter, which serves as a foundation for this edition’s choice of the Folio to present a theatrical text of the play.

One of the other long-standing questions is whether Titus Andronicus is actually a successful tragedy. In the scholarship considered, I find there is very little support for Titus Andronicus as a tragedy. However, recent criticism opens up this question to debate. Naomi Conn Liebler, for example, convincingly shapes our understanding of ritual’s role in tragedy in her book Shakespeare’s Festive Tragedy. Also, a reevaluation of John Russell Brown’s definition of tragedy in his book Shakespeare: The Tragedies, suggests his argument that Titus Andronicus is a good attempt, but ultimately not a successful tragedy is incorrect.

I take up the scholarly tradition established over the last sixty years in the chapter, “Designing and (Re)defining Lavinia in Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus.” I show that a reexamination of Lavinia’s character and the role of language in creating identity in Titus Andronicus can shed new light on our understanding of the play. The first section of the chapter focuses on Lavinia’s role as a woman and possession traded among the men with power—a power that is most evident in their ability to effect change and create identity with language. As the plot moves forward the power of language begins to crumble along with the fortunes of the Andronici; and this disintegration of power is fulfilled with Titus’s fall from grace, the deaths of two of Titus’s sons, the exile of his eldest, and most importantly with the rape and mutilation of Lavinia.
Ironically, it is this fall of language for the Andronici that brings Lavinia to her most powerful state. Titus and Marcus struggle repeatedly in attempts to identify what Lavinia has become and to determine what it is she means. They do this by attempting to label her or provide her with a new identity, but none will suffice. The struggles of the Andronici may sometimes be seen as ludicrous on the pages of the text of *Titus Andronicus*, yet in performance Lavinia’s image on stage becomes more powerful as a reminder of her ordeal and, most importantly for this study, as a shared experience with the audience who, unlike the Andronici, knows what she went through. The audience members, like the characters on the stage, must confront their own definitions of Lavinia as they struggle with the knowledge that the Andronici cannot seem to discover, as Titus and his family constantly turn to a language that has lost all power for answers only to find silence in return.

Through a combination of extreme moments of silence, visible horrors, and vivid but ineffective language filled with Ovidian poetry and lore, *Titus Andronicus* demands the entire theatrical experience of simultaneously “reading” the spoken text from the page and witnessing the text presented on the stage through Lavinia’s body. Once again, it is this clear importance of performance in establishing the potential power of *Titus Andronicus* that has led me to decide that the best text for an editor to use for a modern edition is the one with the closest relationship with the early modern stage.

The final chapter, “Empirical Editing and the Copies Behind the Printed Texts of *Titus Andronicus*” sets out to determine which of the multiple extant early modern texts of *Titus Andronicus* provides the best example of this relationship to the theater when put up against recent scholarship concerning early modern theatrical texts. The chapter
considers new evidence offered most recently by Paul Werstine that indicates that there are flaws not only in how scholars have been defining different early modern texts, but also in the expectations these definitions created. His work results in successfully destabilizing expectations associated with “foul papers” and “promptbooks”—two “texts” that never really existed as they have been defined.

The focus of this chapter is to reconsider the major texts of *Titus Andronicus* in this new light. I offer extended accounts of both the First Quarto and First Folio texts of the play, and discuss them in relation to what editorial tradition has generally thought about the two texts. The First Quarto fit neatly into Greg’s “foul papers” with its many examples of second thoughts, errors, and ambiguities. This led most scholars to consider it to be the closest text to Shakespeare’s “first thoughts” and began the editorial tradition of basing editions on this quarto. Now that we know more about bookkeeper involvement in theatrical manuscripts, we can no longer conclude that such traits indicate an authorial draft. In fact, reexamining the First Quarto indicates that often it cannot be determined whether specific traits are those of an author, bookkeeper, or scribe. This clearly destabilizes the foundations for those who are still trying to establish editions representative of Shakespeare’s “first thoughts.”

The First Folio text of *Titus Andronicus* has long been thought to show clear theatrical influence because of its many added stage directions and the important new of an entire scene known as “fly scene” which is not in any of the quartos. A study of the Folio against the new evidence of bookkeeper involvement and authorial revisions at first poses a potential problem with this belief. Based on what bookkeepers did and did not do, some of the traits such as added stage directions and tidying up that had been associated
with theatrical influence are now less concrete. What we can still rely on is that traits such as duplicate sound calls, the addition of act and scene numbers, an actor’s name in place of a character name and, I argue, the removal of oaths can still confidently be associated with theatrical influence. A survey of F1 Titus presents several examples of these traits and thus we can argue with some surety that the annotations that were made to the text of the Third Quarto being prepared for Jaggard’s printing house do show the traits of a text influenced by performance. While the Folio is not representative of any one performance, it is possibly the closest we can get with Titus Andronicus to seeing how years of successful performances shaped at least some parts of the text printed in 1623.

Titus is unique in that the text on the page requires something beyond the words of characters to achieve its full potential. The blank spaces are filled by necessary action and constant visual representations of limbless bodies on the stage, but are invisible on the page. Accordingly, the editor should follow the text most closely related to the theater. Based on my evaluation of the most recent scholarship, this text is the First Folio. This choice is a clear break from the editorial tradition of Titus Andronicus, which has been to use the First Quarto as copy text and to insert the stage directions and the “fly scene” from the First Folio. Editors since W. W. Greg and John Dover Wilson generally followed the 1594 First Quarto text of Titus Andronicus, because it represented for the New Bibliographers the closest they could get to Shakespeares “first thoughts.” As performance criticism grew in popularity, textual scholarship followed. The “Death of the Author” stood to threaten Q1’s supremacy, as most believed that the Folio clearly showed signs of the theater. But even as textual scholars moved away from first thoughts, they
turned to something else just as unachievable: “first performances.” This goal was behind the creation of the 1986 Oxford edition edited by Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, and John Jowett. They argued that Q1 was revised for the first recorded performance in 1594 and it offered for them a closer connection to the goal of establishing a text of *Titus Andronicus* that represented the “first performance.” I disagree. While the First Quarto may represent something closer to what Shakespeare first wrote, the long success of *Titus Andronicus* on the stage, the addition of the theatrically based directions, and the number of hands involved in the preparation of the text for the Folio offer a more tangible connection to the effects of performance on early modern texts. They offer something much more valuable for a play that depends so critically on the theater. Therefore, I break with editorial tradition and choose the Folio.

**The Choice of the Folio**

This dissertation presents only the second modern edition of *Titus Andronicus* based on the Folio text. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen edited the first edition using the Folio as the copy text for the Royal Shakespeare Company. They successfully argue that the 1623 Folio deserves more esteem and attention than it has been given, and their *Complete Works* does a fine job of representing Shakespeare’s texts as they were prepared for the printers of the First Folio. They choose to present the text that resulted from each of the editions leading up to the First Folio, rather than following a tradition that “post-dates” the First Quarto by adopting material from the later quartos and the Folio. I agree that this is one of their best arguments for the Folio. One decision that I disagree with was their choice not to give every play in the *Complete Works* equal footing in their individual editions. Whereas the majority of the plays are printed alone in
individual editions, *Titus Andronicus* is printed in combination with *Timon of Athens* because the two plays share interesting parallels in their reception histories, characters, settings, and structures. While the parallels between the two plays are interesting, there is a risk in their decision. Printing *Titus Andronicus* alongside another play has the negative potential of suggesting to readers that a Folio-based *Titus* does not deserve serious consideration or attention on its own—though I do not think this was the intent. It is my contention in this dissertation that the First Folio text of *Titus Andronicus* presents a work that deserves the same level of respect that received by the First Quarto; therefore, we need a stand-alone critical edition of the play based on the Folio.

My edition of *Titus Andronicus* builds on the RSC editors’ decision to utilize the First Folio. I am inspired by their confidence in the value of the Folio as a purposefully collected and prepared text, and so work to build on what they began and present the first complete stand-alone edition of *Titus Andronicus* with the full treatment of a scholarly edition. I offer a more extensive account of variants between the several early modern texts of the play and give due credit to scholars who have helped to shape the editorial tradition of *Titus Andronicus*. Even though the majority of these scholars were editing texts based on the First Quarto of *Titus*, their contributions to how we now read and understand the play and performance are invaluable, and readers should be made aware of who made them and when they were made. This edition also reconsiders the RSC editors’ choice to print a large number of suggested stage directions in their text; unfortunately, the commentary notes in their edition do not provide any specific thoughts supporting the suggested stage directions that they include. While I do not insert as many directions directly into the play text presented in this dissertation, I do provide more
extended commentary notes on the choices surrounding possible stage action; I consider this an integral part of a text that depends so highly on performance. This edition also offers a greater amount of commentary on specific decisions made in editing the text, more discussions of previous scholars’ conjectures and choices, and arguments for any departures from the Folio text when they are not obviously the result of common compositor errors.

This new edition of *Titus Andronicus* follows the same attention and fidelity to the value of the text printed in the First Folio, as Jonathan Bate and Eugene Waith brought to their Quarto-based Arden 3 and Oxford editions. The goal of this edition is to move in a different direction from these texts that support the prominence of the Quarto, by offering a reevaluation of the Folio as a theatrically-influenced text. I set out to defend a number of the variants found in the Folio text that have for far too long been brushed aside, often based on the poor reputation of Compositor E (the compositor frequently and sometimes deservedly, described as the lowliest of those working on the Folio). A text based on the Folio must reconsider what it is we understand about Compositor E, and so I take some time to do so here.

Compositor B was long thought to have set all of *Titus Andronicus*, but stints of inconsistency in accuracy forced scholars to look for other answers. Charlton Hinman first identified Compositor E in 1957. He argues in “The Prentice Hand” that Compositor E set the First Folio text of *Titus* from dd3⁵ through the end (7). The quality of the printed pages suggested to Hinman that Compositor E was an apprentice (20). As compositor attribution studies gained popularity among scholars, an avalanche of studies produced evidence supporting a number of theories.
Andrew S. Cairncross set out to improve on Hinman’s methods and moved hundreds of pages identified by Hinman as set by other compositors, mostly B, to Compositor E. Cairncross argues that in fact Compositor B was only responsible for the first and last pages in his article, “Compositors E and F of the Shakespeare First Folio.” T. Howard-Hill tested Cairncross’s methods and found a number of flaws. Howard-Hill notes “Cairncross had turned E into a compositor of no firm characteristics at all, the mere repository of inconsistencies throughout the Folio” (“New Light,” 157). Howard-Hill came up with his own, more stringent methods based on typographical and orthographical evidence. He agrees with Eric Partridge that spelling evidence is the least reliable of all forms and places more weight on spacing tendencies of the different compositors including what each compositor tended to do with commas, lines with contractions, turnovers, stage directions, and more (“New Light,” 163-69). Howard-Hill confirms a few of Cairncross’s findings, but returns several pages to Compositor B. The results of his tests show that Compositor E rarely set first or last pages of plays early on, and that most of his pages received proofreading (177). Howard-Hill argues that in *Titus Andronicus*, Compositor E was responsible for all but cc4 (the first page of the play), dd3 (the first page of the “fly scene”), and ee2 (the final page of the play)—Compositor B set these three pages (173). Though D. F. McKenzie successfully shows that comma spacing is far from consistent among the compositors of the Folio (“Stretching a Point,” 114), the majority of Howard-Hill’s techniques still prove useful for scholars today.

Editors often use the fact that Compositor E set the majority of the text in the Folio’s *Titus* to say that the Folio copy lacks reliability and is harder to work with. In his Arden 3 editions of *Titus*, Jonathan Bate describes the Folio’s *Titus* as “poor in quality
because it was mostly set by ‘Compositor E,’ the least accurate of the men working on Shakespeare’s *Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*” and suggests, as Hinman had, that E was “probably an apprentice” (Bate 115; Hinman, “Prentice Hand” 20). More recently, Bate and Rasmussen claim that the Folio “introduced many new errors of its own, because it was mostly typeset by ‘Compositor E,’ the one genuinely incompetent agent in the creation of the First Folio” (xxvii, *emphasis added*). The number of stop-press variants alone in the sections worked on by E, suggest to many scholars that he was the least trusted of the compositors and this could be true. However, E’s apparent lack of experience does give us something that we rarely get with more experienced compositors: namely a better chance to identify the texts lying behind the printed copy.

One of Howard-Hill’s most important findings is that Compositor E “followed printed copy with reassuring exactness” (“New Light,” 157). Gary Taylor locates the same conservative nature in E’s practices when setting *King Lear* (“Folio Compositors,” 18). What is reassuring about this is that while there are a number of errors that remain in the text of *Titus*, Compositor E was much less likely to set his own spelling and punctuation preferences than were any of the other compositors that worked on the Folio. Therefore, for the entire text, barring the three pages set by Compositor B, we might expect to get a better view of what E was working with than we would expect with the other compositors. This suggestion is important for our understanding of the theatrical influence that is evident in the annotations that were made to the printed copy of the Third Quarto and especially what we can determine about the copy that was used to print act three, scene two, the “fly scene,” for the first time in the First Folio text of *Titus Andronicus.*
Editors since Hinman’s work on the First Folio have noted that act three, scene two is especially challenging to work with, and for a while the majority considered the key reason that it is challenging is that it was set by Compositor E, whom Hinman had given the credit to for the scene. Bate argues that the numerous “errors made by Compositor E [in act three, scene two] show a misreading of a manuscript copy” (115). Bate suggests that because E apparently had trouble dealing with the manuscript, an editor is forced to reinstate missing words just as the Second Folio editors clearly did (118). However, the number of errors in the scene may not be entirely Compositor E’s fault. Howard-Hill’s study of Compositor E argues convincingly that E was not responsible for setting all of the “fly scene.” Remember, part of his reattribution of Compositor E’s pages, resulted in the finding that the first 38 lines of the scene were set on dd3\textsuperscript{v} by Compositor B (“Reassessment,” 8-9). Howard-Hill argues that this scene would have been Compositor E’s first time working with a manuscript, and based on the regular proofreading of E’s pages, it would be unlikely that this text especially “would be left unread and uncorrected” (“New Light,” 173). The first page of the “fly scene” shows no signs of proofreading, “as is suggested by misprints at ll. 1451, 1459 and 1464”— this is a good indicator that “the page was set by Compositor B” (“New Light,” 173). Compositor E is clearly responsible for setting the second half of the “fly scene” on dd4, which “quite properly, was proofread” (“New Light,” 173). Paul Werstine agrees that dd4 was set by E, though he cannot decide who set dd3\textsuperscript{v}, as evidence on the page goes against both Compositor B’s and Compositor E’s characteristics being used as identifiers in his study. The page numbered dd4 follows Compositor E’s pattern of containing stop-press variants. Fifty of the pages attributed to Compositor E contain 300 press variants, with
only one page containing a single variant; Compositor B’s 17 pages with stop-press variants only contain 39 in all (‘New Light,’’ 177).

If Compositor E did as poor a job with a manuscript as many scholars seem to think, it would seem logical to expect an even greater number of stop-press variants in his section of the “fly scene,” but this is not the case. The lines of the “fly scene” that fall on dd4 show five stop-press variants, and there are three others on the rest of the page. It is not rare to find eight stop-press variants on a page in Compositor E’s case; in Titus Andronicus, cc4v has nine and cc5 has ten. The similar distribution of corrections suggests that whoever proofread the page found no clear difference between the quality of E’s work with manuscript and his work from printed copy.

Once again, it has been established that Compositor E was consistently true to his printed copy text when it came to spellings and punctuation. It is arguable that Compositor E was just as true to his copy when working with a manuscript as he was with printed texts; therefore, it would be reasonable to expect a good representation of the manuscript text E had before him when he set the “fly scene.” The only problem with this theory is that Compositor E did not work with a manuscript again until he set Antony and Cleopatra. Howard-Hill argues that the gap might show that Compositor E “could not set from dramatic manuscripts well enough or fast enough to partner another” compositor (“New Light,” 173). This does not mean that E would have been less true to his copy or that his product is necessarily worse than what is found on the rest of his pages. Therefore, editors should not treat the text of act three, scene two set by Compositor E any differently than they do the rest of his pages, and should make decisions about apparent errors based on his traits.
Every compositor that worked on the Folio has specific tendencies found in their work that are used to identify them. We know that while Compositor E is generally found to follow the spellings in his copy, Compositor B followed his own preferred spellings quite regularly. One trait for error that Compositor E has is a tendency to add the letter “s” to the ends of words unnecessarily. As Werstine finds, “so habitual is this error in [Compositor E’s] work that he would occasionally add a final –s to an adverb..., a name..., or a noun already in the plural” (“Folio Editors,” 264). Compositor E makes this error twice in the “fly scene,” once at line 53 when he spells “Flys” instead of “fly” and again at line 72 where he spells “my selfes” instead of “myself.” The printers of the Second Folio caught and repaired the first error, and the second correction occurred during the original printing process and is in the “corrected state” of the page. Stop-press variants indicate that two other misspellings were repaired during production of the First Folio; “Ther’es” was corrected to “There’s” and “btought” to “brought” (3.2.74, 75).

Based on what we know of E’s tendency, these misspellings were most likely not caused by his copy text. A survey of E’s apparent misspellings throughout the Folio text of Titus Andronicus are linked to the addition of an “s” to the end of a word, the transposition of punctuation or a letter, or what could be foul-case error. These kinds of errors were common with all early modern compositors, and few cause any real trouble for an editor, as they rarely result in nonsense. Even though Compositor B was much more experienced, his work with the first thirty-eight lines of the “fly scene” clearly contains three misspellings of his own, most notably the erroneous “without ragious” instead of “with outrageous” in the thirteenth line of the scene.
Compositor E’s work with the “fly scene,” though not as clean as B’s, seems not to be as awful as many editors in the past have suggested. Bate finds the errors like E’s misspelling of “complainer” as “complaynet” at line thirty-nine this scene to be indicative of “misreading of the manuscript” (118), but this may not be the case at all. The letters “y” and “i” were interchangeable in early modern spellings and the second exchange of letters is more than likely attributable to “foul case error.” Gary Taylor has shown that in the early modern printing house, the letters “r” with “t” were “often and easily confused” (Taylor, “Textual Double Knots,” 173).

Based on the discussion above, it seems that we can no longer consider Compositor E’s work a sufficient reason for an editor not to use the First Folio text of Titus Andronicus as a copy text. In fact, what we might get is a closer look at the copy used to annotate Q3. Compositor E set out to print a copy of Q3 that had been annotated with material from a theatrical text. Jonathan Bate notes that the Folio was not as poorly edited as most people thought it was, and that a good amount of time was put into collecting and preparing texts that were representative of Shakespeare’s theater (“The Case for the Folio,” 45-47). I agree that the stop-press variants in Compositor E’s sections are most likely more abundant because he was the least experienced in the printing house, but very few of the errors that were corrected are substantive; those errors that remain uncorrected seem to be the kinds of errors most often made by all composers. It is also clear that Compositor E was more true to his copy than the more experienced composers in his company were. So now, not only can we be more certain of the Folio’s connection to the theater, but we can also approach the text with the awareness that it is not as poorly printed as previous editors thought.
I am therefore less willing than previous editors to emend apparent issues when they cannot be attributed to compositor error, though I offer discussions of the more difficult decisions in the commentary and a clear account of the choices of editorial tradition. My goal is to present an edition that respects the integrity of the Folio as a purposefully compiled text. While I agree that it would be foolish to blindly follow the Folio text and that emendations will be necessary, I feel that we must note and discuss any departure from the Folio when it is not an obvious correction of compositor error. Bate and Rasmussen are on the right track when they argue that the Folio represents a moment in the life of the play, and that it has been successfully argued that early modern playtexts were in fact quite “mobile.” We now know that the number of hands involved in the creation of text of the plays as we have received them is greater and even more indistinguishable than we understood in the past. It is clear that those involved made changes to the texts based on what they experienced in the theater. For these reasons I argue that we should respect each of those involved in the creation of the Folio text of *Titus Andronicus*, from its earliest text in the First Quarto, to the one put together by members of Shakespeare’s acting company to represent a playwright they set out to honor. In the Folio, we benefit from the choices made by the editors of *Titus Andronicus* who prepared the text for print; it is clear that one person doing nothing but running his finger down the side of the page to locate stage directions is not responsible for the resulting additions. I believe we should respect all of the influences that affected the text only emend what can be proven erroneous.

Therefore, this dissertation offers the first stand-alone critical edition of *Titus Andronicus* based on the 1623 First Folio text. In the following chapters, I will further
establish the importance that performance plays in fully developing the arguments of the play. I am confident that the edition that follows provides readers with a basis in the most theatrically influenced early modern version of the play. The First Folio provides the only early modern texts for eighteen of Shakespeare’s plays. While we are lucky to have several earlier quartos of *Titus Andronicus*, the text of the play printed in the Folio is a unique text, because it benefited from the work of men who set out to put together the best representation of Shakespeare’s theater that they could, instead of merely reprinting one of the earlier quartos. It only seems right that a play so dependent on theatrical performance be prepared using the unique copy that resulted from *Titus Andronicus’s* successful history in the early modern theater.
Authorship

Just over fifty years after *Titus Andronicus* was printed in the First Folio, people began to scrutinize the play for its apparent disconnect from the rest of Shakespeare’s canon. Edward Ravenscroft provides the first record of this growing concern. He printed the earliest known adaptation of *Titus Andronicus* in 1687, in which he claims, “I have been told by some ancienly conversant with the Stage, that it was not Originally his, but brought by a private Author to be Acted, and [Shakespeare] only gave some Master-touches to one or two Principal Parts or Characters,” in Ravenscroft’s “address ‘To the Readers’” (Bate, Arden3, 79). The validity of Ravenscroft’s claim is impossible to test, and most scholars give it little credit. Ravenscroft and others tried to find another explanation for the play’s authorship, because *Titus Andronicus* just did not correspond with what they believed to be Shakespeare’s talent. However, by the eighteenth century, a few proponents of Shakespeare’s authorship of the play began to fire back, and Edward Capell finally makes an argument that the play is in fact Shakespeare’s in the edition of *Titus* for his publication of Shakespeare’s, *Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies* (1767-1768).

The question moved into the early twentieth century with little agreement among scholars; some scholars still thought the text just did not seem Shakespearean and looked for other possible explanations such as collaboration, but New Bibliographers such as W. W. Greg and A. W. Pollard objected to collaboration as a possible explanation, preferring the “singular dramatic author” for a text (Egan, “Intentions,” 382). However, by 1971, G. E. Bentley “had concluded that collaborative writing and revision-for-revival were
normal practices in the theater,” although he did not “push home the implications for
editorial theory” (Egan 382). According to Gabriel Egan, Stephen Orgel was the first to
introduce the “post-structuralist ideas of Zeller and Peckham” to “mainstream
Shakespeare Studies in the 1980’s with ‘What is a Text?’” (382). As New Textualism
continued to establish itself, numerous studies providing solid evidence of regular
collaboration were produced as scholars such as Paul Werstine and Margreta de Grazia
focused on establishing the importance of all those involved in the production of early
modern texts and the value of each text produced. Little by little, what began as the
suggestions of a few scholars of the possibility of collaboration between Shakespeare and
another author in the creation of Titus Andronicus has grown into what many scholars
believe is actually what happened. As of today, there seems to be strong enough evidence
to point to George Peele’s involvement in four scenes of Titus Andronicus.

Considering the history of questions of authorship the possibility of Peele’s
involvement came quite early in the process. Between 1905 and 1924, long before the
rise of New Textualism and during the infancy of New Bibliography, J. M. Robertson
and T. M. Parrott first made the suggestion that there were in fact multiple hands
involved in the play. Parrot, using the same evidence of feminine endings that led J. M.
Robertson to conclude the play could not be Shakespeare’s at all, argues that the majority
of the play shows Shakespeare’s involvement. What they do agree on is that Peele is
involved (Waith, Oxford, 16; Robertson, Did Shakespeare and Canon; Parrott,
Shakespeare’s Revision). Parrott concludes that act one and two other scenes, 2.1 and 4.1,
show tendencies that he linked to Peele and suggests that Peele must have started the
play, and Shakespeare took it over to revise and complete it (Waith, Oxford, 16; Parrott,
“Shakespeare’s Revision” 26). P. W. Timberlake also studied feminine endings in 1931 and argues for the addition of act 2, scene 2 to the list of scenes written by Peele. By 2002, Vickers is able to argue that “over the last eighty years scholars have applied, by [his] count, twenty-one separate tests to the play, each of which has confirmed the presence of a co-author” (Shakespeare, Co-Author, 243). Throughout that time, Peele has been the one author most often suggested as the co-author in question, though arguments for Greene, Marlowe and others have also been made.

In John Dover Wilson’s 1948 Cambridge edition of Titus Andronicus, he reconsiders what some scholars find problematic about the evidence used so far to argue for Peele’s hand in the text of Titus Andronicus. Instead Wilson tests evidence of “rhetorical data,” “verbal echoes,” and “parallel passages” throughout Titus Andronicus and compares the findings with tendencies that he locates in plays known to be by either author. This new evidence leads Wilson to the same conclusions as Parrott and Timberlake; Peele was responsible for all of act 1 and three other scenes, and Shakespeare revised it. Wilson suggests the possibility that Titus Andronicus was created in two stages, first a shorter version for traveling companies and then revised for the 1594 performance (Cambridge, xxxvi). Two years later J. C. Maxwell focused on particular grammatical constructions. He agrees that Peele must be responsible for act 1, but does not argue for the inclusion of the three other scenes (Maxwell, “Peele and Shakespeare,” 557-61). Scholars continued to create tests and, though the majority pointed to Peele’s involvement, a few still argued that Peele was not involved in the play. Vickers lists ten more “scholarly authorship tests on Titus Andronicus” that were published between 1950 and 2001, nine of which at least find that Peele was responsible for act one. These textual
scholars tested traits including rhetoric, vocabulary, metrics, stage directions, function words, verbal formulae, common words, polysyllabic words, alliteration, and vocatives.

Most studies reconsidered previous data and introduced new tests and came up with stronger results to support Peele’s hand in the four scenes. MacDonald P. Jackson, for example, produced two separate studies introducing an array of vocabulary tests. In 1979, he studied rare word tests that considered the chronology and authorship of Shakespeare’s plays and agreed that Peele could have written act 1 and possibly the two scenes in act 2 (*Studies in Attribution*, 153). Jackson wrote three more articles in the 1996, 1997, and 1998 in which he added to his earlier work to counter claims that Peele was not responsible for any part of the play. In each article he provides evidence for his conclusion that Peele was responsible for “most of” act 1, 2.1, 2.2, and 4.1; in his 1998 “Indefinite Articles in *Titus Andronicus*, Peele, and Shakespeare,” Jackson argues that patterns of the indefinite articles “a” and “an” match his previous data concerning the “division of authorship between Shakespeare and Peele” (309-10).

Arguments in support of Peele’s hand in *Titus Andronicus* continued to gain support as scholars became more comfortable with the decentering of the author; however, others still could not bring themselves to agree. In his 1984 Oxford edition of *Titus Andronicus*, Eugene M. Waith turns back to several older studies and comes to another conclusion. Waith finds the reliance on “echoes” and “parallel passages” in the majority of studies to be suspect at best. He suggests that the links that scholars had made with Peele were present in all texts of the late sixteenth century and not just in Peele’s work; “no such proof has ever been offered” that no one else used the words being associated with Peele (15). Waith argues that parallels can as be found just as easily
between *Titus Andronicus*, *Venus and Adonis*, and *The Rape of Lucrece* as they can between *Titus Andronicus* and Peele’s works. Also considering stylometric tests by Maxwell and Metz along with Gary Taylor’s function word tests, Waith suggests that *Titus Andronicus* is in fact “entirely by Shakespeare” (20). Bate comes to the same conclusion in his 1995 Arden3 edition of the play. He argues that “the one thing we know for sure about [Shakespeare’s] early career was that he was notorious for making use of other writer’s fine phrases,” so “parallels with other dramatists” do not really show that other authors were involved (82). Bate turns to tests by Andrew Q. Morton who is cited by Metz as the most convincing proof that no other author was involved. According to Bate, “computer analysis of [linguistic fingerprints] suggests what literary judgment confirms: that the whole of *Titus* is by a single hand and at this level its linguistic habits are very different from Peele’s” (83). According to Bate, Morton’s evidence shows the “statistical probability of Peele’s involvement is less than one in ten thousand million” (Bate 83; Metz, “Disputed Shakespearean Texts,” 155). Clearly, by the end of the twentieth century, some scholars were still not satisfied with the authorship of *Titus Andronicus*.

In his 2002 book *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, Brian Vickers set out to satisfy the question and provided detailed studies of the five most problematic of Shakespeare’s “collaborative plays.” The most difficult of the five is *Titus Andronicus*. Vickers, like most other scholars, found the evidence that existed was still not strong enough. Though he agreed with the many scholars promoting Peele’s involvement, Vickers understood that he needed to establish solid evidence. In his chapter on *Titus*, Vickers creates three new tests for authorship based on style. First he compares *Titus Andronicus* with “one
play by Peele of comparable subject matter, *The Battle of Alcazar*, in terms of their use of polysyllabic words” and abstract nouns (219). His test shows Peele was more likely to use polysyllabic words, and Vickers notes that the frequency of polysyllabic words in the first act of *Titus*—“one every 2.8 lines”—matches Peele’s pattern in *The Battle of Alcazar* (219). Vickers also shows that Peele’s use of more “abstract nouns” can be traced to *Titus Andronicus* (220). Next, Vickers tests alliteration in the same two plays along with two others known to be by Peele, *Edward I* and *David and Bethsabe*. Again Vickers’s results for the scenes in question in *Titus* match Peele’s frequency of alliteration in Peele’s other works (220-226). Vickers’s third test looks back to John Dover Wilson’s test from 1948. Wilson first noted the high frequency of vocatives in act 1 of *Titus*. Vickers compares *Titus Andronicus* to Peele’s *Edward I*, and suggests that Peele’s use of vocatives in *Edward I* is as much as two times more frequent than Shakespeare is known to use. Vickers again argues that the traits of the different scenes in *Titus* match up with their authors; Peele’s scenes in *Titus* contain twice as many vocatives as Shakespeare’s (226-28). With all three studies, Vickers finds that Peele’s greatest tendency is repetition, “deploying the same verbal devices over and over,” a tendency that Shakespeare successfully avoids (228). For Vickers, the evidence overwhelmingly proves that Peele is the author of or involved in 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, and 4.1. The rest of his study is used to show that scholars such as Stefan Keller, who have tested “rhetorical figures,” have successfully mounted enough evidence to prove that Shakespeare, whose “use of rhetoric in *Titus* is ... precise, economical, witty,” was solely responsible for the rest of the play (241-43). That Vickers had not convinced everyone is evidenced by the
fact that six years later, he was back to defend his claims from 2002 with the essay, “Coauthors and Closed Minds” published in the 2008 volume of *Shakespeare Studies*.

Vickers’s essay is part of the volume’s forum entitled “The Return of the Author,” in which several scholars argue that the twenty-first century has brought the author back into the center of the equation where New Bibliography had first placed it. But this time the author looks a bit different. Lukas Erne argues Shakespeare is both “playwright and author interested in publication” (“Reconsidering,” 32). David Scott Kastan does not argue against Erne’s vision of Shakespeare; instead he points out that *Titus Andronicus* does not follow the “regular pattern of publication” and that none of the printers of the three quartos found it “necessary or sufficient” to include Shakespeare’s name on the title page, even though Shakespeare’s “name appeared regularly by 1598” (“To think the trifles something,” 42-3). In the same issue, Vickers’s “Co-Authors and Closed Minds” confidently claims we “know that George Peele wrote act one and three scenes of *Titus Andronicus*,” yet wonders how some scholars still have a hard time letting go of Shakespeare as a single author (103). Vickers considers Ralph Berry’s counter to *Shakespeare, Co-Author* in Berry’s review of the book. Berry questions Vickers’s findings concerning *Titus Andronicus*, and argues that Shakespeare is the one dramatist who could have planned the whole play” and “Shakespeare simply absorbed Peele into his own vision” (Vickers “Co-Authors,” 105-106). Berry’s complaint is that giving Peele too much credit for *Titus* raises Peele to an “unearned” status. Vickers suggests that Berry “never bothered to learn Peele,” because if he had, Berry would have realized that “Peele had far wider experience of theater than any other dramatist in London in 1593-4 and several elements in [*Titus Andronicus*'s] dramaturgy reveal his hand” (107).
In 2010, Lene B. Peterson published “Stylometry and Textual Multiplicity I: Contextual Stylistics and the Case of Titus Andronicus” in her book Shakespeare’s Errant Texts. In this chapter, Peterson provides a much more in-depth critique of Vickers’s 2002 study. Peterson notes two major problems with Vickers’s 2002 study. She successfully establishes that repetition is a sure sign of “oral-memorial transmission” in early modern plays. This finding is based on much earlier work by Harry R. Hoppe and Thomas Pettit’s more recent work with “traditionally transmitted material (ballads, tales and plays)” which “seems to confirm that simple verbal repetition and verbal formulae are essential formal components in transmitted playtexts of the Elizabethan period” (Peterson, 201n27). Peterson questions Vickers’s acceptance of “internal repetition” as a style marker for Peele; her strongest opposition is to the use of Peele’s “canon” to determine Peele’s traits. Vickers “does not critically assess the value of his sample purity and relies too highly on repetition” (Peterson 201). To prove her point, Peterson uses Vickers’s own tests to show that plays we know to be entirely by Shakespeare can be made to look like Peele’s because they also contain repetition (204). Peterson turns to Peele’s canon and finds that Peele’s works “consist of highly transmitted texts” in which the kinds of repetitions point to “oral” and/or “memorial” transmission from previous performances or texts, which can be linked to theatrical influence and is not indicative of authorial tendency (207). “When a control canon is as unstable as that of George Peele,” Peterson argues, “simple verbal repetition and repetitious formulae [the kind most relied on by Vickers] provide uneven evidence as authorial style-markers to prove Peele’s hand or indeed that of any other ‘transmitted’ playwright” (208); scholars should instead test “a wider selection of plays for correlating statistics of potentially orally derived features
such as transposition, telescoping, speech contraction, narrowing of narrative focus, omission, etc. with the linguistic statistics for a given authorial fingerprint” (209).

Peterson’s treatment of *Titus Andronicus* ends here. She admits that “the cases Vickers makes for co-authorship are far from unfeasible, and most likely indicative of who wrote which sections of a series of collaborative plays,” but since *Titus Andronicus* “virtually boasts of its exposure to stage transmission” she feels that Vickers’s tests, in this case, fall short of being convincing (208, 208n50). Peterson’s work is successful in lessening the value of repetition as a reliable stylistic marker of authorship, and suggesting that oral transmission is at least a possible explanation for certain repetitive features in early modern plays (though it cannot be definitively separated from authorial style—a shortcoming Peterson admits to).

Vickers’s 2002 claim that the “quantity of independent tests, mutually confirming each other, will [surely] now be enough to gain Peele recognition as co-author” of *Titus* was clearly a bit premature, but Vickers provides enough satisfactory evidence to link Peele to the play. Even Peterson does not make the direct claim that Peele was not involved. The acceptance of Peele’s hand has grown and can be seen, for example, in Bate and Eric Rasmussen’s 2011 RSC edition of *Titus Andronicus*. In his 1995 Arden3 edition, Bate had not been convinced of Peele’s involvement. But by his next edition of the play, he and Rasmussen take George Peele’s involvement to be an accepted fact, though they admit “we do not know whether the play was written as a purposeful collaboration or whether Shakespeare came in to do a rewrite or to complete an unfinished work” (xiii). Clearly satisfactory evidence has been found to indicate that not only did authors work together on plays, but also reworked previous plays. I agree that
Peele was involved in the creation of the first act and 2.1, 2.2, and 4.1. But I do think that Shakespeare was involved or made some changes to the scenes after the first act. For example, in act two, scene one, there is a direct echo of a speech in between Demetrius’s description of Lavinia and lines in Shakespeare’s 1 Henry VI (see 2.1.86-8n.). This and a number of other signs of Shakespeare stand in the way of some scholars from giving any scenes to Peele other than act one.

Egan argues that there are two types of collaboration. He distinguishes voluntary and involuntary collaboration in his *Struggle for Shakespeare’s Text*; at the risk of oversimplifying his point, the difference seems to come down to whether the collaboration occurred during Shakespeare’s lifetime or after his death (Egan 226). This of course would make the collaboration on *Titus Andronicus* voluntary as the text was produced by 1594 at the latest. The evidence in so many studies of clear distinctions between parts of the play suggests that those who argue that Peele only began the play and is not responsible for any of the structure, action, or sources brought into *Titus Andronicus* stand on shaky ground. Each author was clearly involved seriously with the text at some point in its creation. The most probable scenario is that Peele began writing act one and Shakespeare either began collaborating with Peele or took over the play during the creation of act two. Obviously we know that it must have occurred at some point before the First Quarto was printed in the Fall of 1594. Further discussion of the date follows below. This suggestion is more probable than the conjecture that Shakespeare revised a much older version, which some have proposed. This seems unlikely because the revision of a much older play would have required changes.
throughout the text. I find it hard to believe that Shakespeare would have revised an older play without touching the first act.

**Date of Composition**

One thing that makes it difficult to determine the play’s authorship is the lack of confidence surrounding the exact date that the text used to print the First Quarto of *Titus Andronicus* was created. Philip Henslowe recorded what is believed to be the first performance of *Titus Andronicus* on January 23rd, during the short season between plague closures at Philip Henslowe’s Rose Theater that ran from December 27, 1593 through February 6, 1594 and was performed by Sussex’s Men. Henslowe’s entered the note ‘ne’ in the margin before listing “titus & ondronicus the 23 of Jenewary.” John Danter entered it into the Stationers’ Register on February 6, 1594 and the First Quarto (Q1) of *Titus Andronicus* was printed later that year (Wells and Taylor, *Textual Companion*, 113). The exact date of the performance listed by Henslowe is thought to be an error because it is recording the fourth performance of the week and plays were not usually performed on Sundays; scholars generally correct the date to the 24th of January (Bate, Arden3, 69n1). The part of the note that has not been so easy to determine is what Henslowe means by ‘ne.’ Brian Vickers notes that ‘ne’ was for a long time “thought to be an abbreviation of new, newly revised, or newly licensed” (*Shakespeare, Co-Author*, 148-9), but in 1991 Winifred Frazer provided an alternative. Based on her studies of appearances of ‘ne’ in Henslowe’s Diary, she suggests that it may indicate “Newington Butts,” and Vickers argues that Frazer’s “convincing arguments remove any ground for concluding that *Titus Andronicus* was indeed a new play in January 1594, and leave the question wide open” (Frazer, “Henslowe’s ‘ne,’” 34-5 qtd. in Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-
Exactly when the play was written is a question that continues to defy a definitive answer. Was it originally written expressly for this short season at the Rose or was it already in existence before the theaters were closed in 1592 by the Privy Council and then simply revised for the short season the following winter?

W. W. Greg argues that there is evidence that during the plague years between 1592 and 1594, shorter plays were produced for traveling companies (Editorial Problem, 56). John Dover Wilson used this claim to defend his argument that *Titus Andronicus* may have been “specially written for a traveling company in 1593 and adapted afterwards for the London stage” (Cambridge, xxxvi and xl). Waith disagrees and suggests “there is good reason to think [*Titus Andronicus*] was on the stage before the performance by Sussex’s Men on 23 January 1594 recorded by Henslowe” (Oxford, 5). Waith suggests that the two other companies listed in addition to Sussex’s Men on the title page of Q1 is “the most important evidence” for an earlier date (Oxford, 5). The title page of Q1 *Titus Andronicus* reads, “The most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus: As it was Plaide by the Right Honourable the Earle of Darbie, Earle of Pembrooke, and Earle of Sussex their Seruants.” The claim that the play had already been put on by three separate companies has caused scholars to propose a number of theories.

Some critics believe that the play either went through the hands of all three companies and so must have existed before Pembroke’s Men were “apparently bankrupt by September 1593,” according to a letter written by Henslowe, or that the list of companies was simply an advertising ploy (Hughes, New Cambridge 3; Wilson, Cambridge, xl-xlviii). Scott McMillan presents evidence that actors from both Strange’s Men and Pembroke’s Men eventually passed through Sussex’s Men on their ways to the
Admiral’s Men and Chamberlain’s Men respectively (“Sussex’s Men,” 214-23). This evidence, first presented by David George, allows for the possibility that there may have been a combination of veteran actors forming Sussex’s men for at least parts of the 1593 and 1594 season at Henslowe’s Rose (“Shakespeare and Pembroke’s,” 305-27). McMillan suggests the scenario explains how Sussex’s Men put on The Jew of Malta and Titus Andronicus at the end of their first season; each play was brought into the company by the actors from Strange’s and Pembroke’s Men and then taken with them when they left the company (“Sussex’s Men,” 214-23). McMillan’s suggestion clearly points to a date before the fall of 1593. Wells and Taylor argue that the little information that we have for Pembroke’s Men makes it hard to know whether they were actually bankrupt by August of 1593 or when and if they ever had Titus Andronicus (Textual Companion, 113). In his 1994 edition of Titus, Alan Hughes suggests the scenario that “having established himself to Robert Greene’s dissatisfaction in 1592, [Shakespeare] revised [Titus] and offered it either to Strange’s or Pembroke’s men” (6). After the two companies either joined or fell apart, Hughes suggests that Titus was sold to Sussex’s Men. This theory offers another possible connection between the three companies mentioned on Q1’s title page, but Hughes admits that “new, reliable evidence” is needed to verify any of it (New Cambridge, 6).

Henslowe’s records for Strange’s Men in 1592 do not include Titus Andronicus as one of the plays they performed; most believe that the Titus mentioned in Henslowe’s note of three performances during the “season of 29 December to 1 February 1593” played by Strange’s Men “must almost certainly have been a revival of the Titus and Vespasian that was new on 11 April 1592” (Bate, Arden3, 74n1). Also, the records for
Pembroke’s Men are scant. We only know of “two performances at court in the 1592 Christmas season” and that the company traveled for a short time before and after those two performances, but there are no recorded performances of *Titus Andronicus* (Bate, Arden3, 74). Terence G. Schoone-Jongen suggests that Sussex’s Men’s “unbroken existence from 1584-85 to 1594” may very well have “earned [the company] prominence at the Rose based on its own merits, rather than the sudden influx of Strange’s Men and Pembroke’s Men” (*Shakespeare’s Companies*, 158), but this does not get us any closer to a solid answer. In the face of this lack of evidence for an earlier date of *Titus Andronicus*, scholars have turned to direct references and/or apparent allusions to *Titus* in other plays for clues.

Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*, first performed in 1614, directly mentions Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus*; in it Jonson mentions that the favor for plays like “*Jeronimo, or Andronicus* [...] has been] constant, and hath stood still, these five and twenty or thirty years” (6.16). Frederick S. Boas and other early scholars pointed to the mention as direct evidence that Shakespeare wrote the play between 1587 and 1588, “immediately after Shakespeare left Stratford” (137). We know *Jeronimo*, as *The Spanish Tragedy* was often called, was written in 1589 (Arden3, 71; Hughes, New Cambridge, 4). If we take Jonson seriously, *The Spanish Tragedy* was exactly twenty-five years old by 1614, and this leaves *Titus* to represent the older of the two plays in Jonson’s statement, at thirty years old, and places the date for *Titus Andronicus* sometime in 1584. E. A. Honigmann took the two dates and hedged his bets by suggesting that *Titus* was written in 1586. However, Bate argues, “exaggeration is the trope of Articles of Agreement” like the one in which Jonson’s statement is found and the numbers are “inflated” like the two
complaints about the “length of performance” and “ticket prices” in the same document (Arden3, 71-2). The suggestion that Jonson’s time periods were exaggerated seems the most likely to be true.

Another play that has been connected to Titus Andronicus is A Knack to Know a Knave, which was printed in 1594, but first performed in June 1592 as indicated in Henslowe’s diary. A few lines from the play have been linked to Shakespeare’s tragedy. The lines in question read,

as welcome shall you be ...

As Titus was unto the Roman senators,

When he had made a conquest on the Goths,

That in requital of his service done,

Did offer him the imperial diadem ...

(sig. F2v)

Waith finds the reference to be “remarkably exact” (5). Wells and Taylor offer two possible conclusions. They do not believe the line is an “advertisement” for Titus Andronicus, but that it either “must originate from memorial confusion in the 1594 text [of A Knack] or indicate that the story of Titus Andronicus was well known to London audiences in 1592” (Textual Companion, 113). The two possibilities coincide with their argument that Titus Andronicus “must have belonged to Strange’s Men either long before 1592 or not until after January of 1593,” since Strange’s Men (later The Earl of Derby’s Men) recorded no performances in the period between 1592 and early 1593, when other companies were traveling (Textual Companion, 113). Bate admits that all we know for sure based on this is that Titus Andronicus “existed when A Knack to Know a Knave was
newly set forth in early 1594” (Arden3, 73). Scholars have suggested that other data gives us stronger evidence of a date.

J. Q. Adams attempts to answer the question in a 1964 article; he argues for an earlier date, and suggests that Q1 is actually a “full-scale revision of an older play before the original production as a new play in January 23, 1594” (190). Adams takes Henslowe’s “ne” to mean “newly revised” and claims that the play was originally written for a two unit stage and then adapted for a stage with three units, and he points to a clear sign of this in act three which requires pits both on and off stage (190). Alan Hughes argues in Appendix 1 of his New Cambridge edition of *Titus Andronicus* that there is in fact no evidence for a for a three unit stage in Q1 (173); instead he presents evidence in sensational plays that link to *Titus Andronicus* and what Hughes calls the “stylistically uneven” writing throughout the play causes him to conjecture that there may well have been a version of the play written “as early as 1588” and then revised for a later performance (Hughes, New Cambridge, 6). Most who support an earlier date agree that the play must have been revised for the 1594 production, and several scholars have argued successfully for signs of revision in the Q1 text (for a discussion of theories surrounding the text of Q1, see “Empirical Editing and the Copies Behind the Printed Texts of *Titus Andronicus*”). Alternatively, connections between *Titus* and other plays by Shakespeare and his contemporaries suggest for other scholars that *Titus Andronicus* was written just before the first known performance in 1594.

In 1984 and again in 2002, J. J. M. Tobin offers evidence of a connection with Nashe’s *Christ’s Tears over Jerusalem*, which was “entered into the Stationers’ Register September 8, 1593 and composed during the summer months of that year”
Nomenclature,” 186). Tobin argues that in addition to some apparent “instances of common diction,” Nashe’s work provided Shakespeare with the names ‘Titus’s and ‘Saturninus’s in a context of the choice of a reluctant emperor and the killing and eating of a child by its mother” (“Nomenclature,” 186). Tobin’s point is that Titus Andronicus “derives in part” from Nashe’s play, so this means that Shakespeare’s play should be dated “in the latter part of 1593” (186-7). In 2002, Tobin provides further evidence that Christ’s Tears had influenced Shakespeare, but this time he points to the Epistle in the second edition, which was published in 1594. He notes that Shakespeare’s first two uses of the word “tyrannize” occur in Titus, and Nashe defended his use of the word in the Epistle (“More Evidence,” 222). This and other connections that only occur in these two works, in Tobin’s opinion, provide evidence that “Titus Andronicus was composed after Nashe had written the Epistle to the second edition of his pamphlet sometime early in 1594” (224). Jonathan Bate argues there is also evidence that Shakespeare was influenced by another Nashe work in addition to Christ’s Tears.

When Chiron and Demetrius boast they will use Bassianus’s dead body as a pillow for their rape of Lavinia (2.3.130-31), there seems to be a link to a similar image in Nashe’s Unfortunate Traveler, which was written in June 1593 (Bate, Arden3, 77). Bate also finds two more examples that connect the text to Peele. First the “rare word ‘palliament’ appears to have been coined by George Peele in his The Honour of the Garter, written for a ceremony in June 1593 ... [and] the word is used by Marcus [in Titus] at 1.1.185” (Bate, Arden3, 77). Of course, since Bate did not accept Peele’s involvement in Titus at the time he was preparing his 1995 edition, he argues that the connection to Peele must be an example of Shakespeare being influenced by Peele’s
work; however, for those who believe that Peele is responsible for parts of *Titus*, the easiest explanation is that Peele is directly responsible for the word’s appearance in the text himself. Finally, Bate suggests there is a possible connection between the Clown’s odd mention of a delayed hanging in 4.3 and an actual example of “two puritans” who had been spared their fate, only to hang one week later in March of 1593 (Arden3, 77). As with Tobin, these connections offer evidence of influence on Shakespeare for Bate and so must have been available or occurred before he wrote the play. His conclusion is that *Titus Andronicus* was “written in late 1593 and first performed in January 1594” and that it was “completely new,” though he admits another version may have existed before (78). However, as with all arguments concerning parallels and/or “influence,” determining who influenced whom is always open to debate when the dates are unclear.

To suggest that the more experienced writers influenced Shakespeare because they were more seasoned or established is to ignore a trait that Shakespeare showed a talent for early on—the ability to expand and challenge his own vocabulary with each play. But of course, arguments that follow this path are just as tenuous. Unless the works in question are separated by a significant amount of time, we can only guess at the direction of influence, and evidence that relies on such conjecture, educated as it may be, can hardly serve as a definitive base for our conclusions about the date when the text was first created.

In the absence of any further solid evidence, the only thing that we can say for sure is that some version of *Titus Andronicus* was written before its performance on January 24, 1594. It seems likely that the connections to Peele suggest that he began writing the play in between 1592 and 1593, and sometime early in the process.
Shakespeare began collaborating with Peele directly or took the play over. It appears that there are signs of revision that occurred after the play was initially finished. If one agrees that there are signs of revision in the Q1 text printed later that year, we cannot say when those revisions occurred. The play went through at least two more performances in the Summer of 1594 by Chamberlain’s Men and was not entered into the Stationers’ Register until September sixth and there are no further performances recorded between these two events. We know that plays in performance show signs of changes by several hands (see “Empirical Editing and the Copies Behind the Printed Texts of Titus Andronicus”). It is possible that Peele began working on the play revisions to Titus were made after the first run in early 1594, for the newly established company sometime before their first summer season that began at Newington Butts in 1594.

**Stage History**

The first three companies connected with Titus Andronicus—Derby’s Men, Pembroke’s Men, and Sussex’s Men—are directly listed on the title page of the 1594, First Quarto. Debates exist over whether the each of the three companies individually or some combination of the three actually performed the play by. Henslowe lists the first performances of Titus Andronicus, as performed by Sussex’s Men, in his diary on January 23 and 28 and February 6 in 1594. Two more performances put on by Cambridge’s Men followed during the next summer season at Newington Butts on June 5 and 12 (Bate and Rasmussen, 104). The number of performances evidences the play’s popularity in its first two short runs.

Another early performance of the play was discovered and reported in 1961 by Gustav Ungerer. “One of the London companies, presumably Shakespeare’s
Chamberlain’s Men in the household of Sir John Harington at Burley-on-the-Hill in Rutland” put on the play on January 1, 1596 (Bate, Arden3, 43; Ungerer, “Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance,” 102). This performance provided a rare opportunity to read a contemporary reaction. Jacques Petit, a French Tutor in the Harington household, was most intrigued by “la monstre” or “the spectacle” of the performance (Ungerer, “Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance,” 102; Waith, Oxford, 3; Bate Arden3, 43).

Two other early modern sources are sometimes linked to performances of *Titus Andronicus*. The first is manuscript drawing known as “The Peacham drawing” of several characters on the stage that are obviously those from the opening scene in *Titus Andronicus*, but there are details that do not fit exactly with the play. It has a date in Latin that Bate finds indicates a date between 1604 and 1615 (Arden3, 41). The writing below the drawing present lines directly from different parts of *Titus*, but some of them seem to be from another sources. This suggested to early scholars that the drawing must have been of a moment in the performance, but this theory is no longer considered a probability. Richard Levin argues convincingly that the drawing could be a reading of the play as a whole (325-30), and disagrees with an earlier article by June Schlueter that argues the drawing is not of *Titus Andronicus*, but of a scene from the a play written in German that resembles much of the action of *Titus Andronicus* (323-4). I thin that each of the articles is problematic and that for now the most useful thing that we can take from the drawing is that it is representative of the kinds of costumes that were worn on the early modern stage.

The German play that Schlueter attempted to connect the to the Peacham drawing is part of a collection of English plays that had been translated into German in 1620. The
title translates as “A most lamentable tragedy of Titus Andronicus and the haughty empress, wherein are found memorable events.” Questions have stirred on whether the text of the play may help us to determine the date of origin for Titus Andronicus. We have records of English actors playing in Germany from the 1590’s on. But production of English plays in German did not take place until after 1600 (Bate, Arden3, 45). While Titus Andronicus may have been performed in English in the 1590’s, it is highly unlikely that it would have been translated for production in German before the playing companies were performing in that language. Arguments that this version of the play is based on an earlier version of Titus Andronicus than what was printed in the First Quarto are not convincing.

What we can say more firmly about the history of the play during the early seventeenth century is that the continued printing of the play marked its increasing popularity; two more publications occurred during Shakespeare’s lifetime in 1600 (Q2) and in 1611 (Q3), each of which boasts that Titus has been played “sundry times.” Jonson’s mention in Bartholomew Fair demonstrates plays such as Titus remained popular 25 to 30 years after initially hitting the stage. While Jonson was most likely been exaggerating the amount of time, the indication that the play still regularly ran and remained popular in 1614 exhibits the play’s success over at least two decades. No records of any performances of the play in London appear again until the Restoration.

Shakespeare’s plays found a new audience several years after the reopening of theaters in 1660. Edward Ravenscroft’s 1687 adaptation of the play as Titus Andronicus or the Rape of Lavinia includes several changes to the Second Quarto of Shakespeare’s script (Bate and Massai 135). As the subtitle suggests, Lavinia’s “violent rape is
highlighted as a special attraction” (Reilly 139). Kara Reilly argues Lavinia’s rape transforms from a gruesome spectacle of Elizabethan violence into a Restoration vehicle for exposing actresses’ bodies on stage” (139). Ravenscroft’s stage direction for Lavinia’s entrance makes an important addition. All earlier texts of Titus Andronicus describe Lavinia as entering with her tongue and hands cut off and describe her as “ravisht” (2.4.0 SD). Ravenscroft, in a fashion typical in his stage direction, more explicitly describes Lavinia’s entrance, “her hands cut off and her tongue cut out, Loose hair and her garments disorder’d as ravish’d” (26). Reilly believes this is evidence the audience “took pleasure in viewing the sight of the disheveled and exposed Lavinia,” forcing the crowd to “be both simultaneously horrified and aroused by the spectacle of rape” (142). It is unclear exactly how this scene was originally performed by Shakespeare’s acting company, but the addition of the female actress to the stage and the evidence of the popularity of staging raped women in Restoration drama create a new set of possibilities with characterization in Ravenscroft’s adaptation.

Another character heightened by Ravenscroft’s edition is Aaron. Virginia Mason Vaughan argues Aaron remains “black and loathsome” in Ravenscroft’s addition, but less devilish and providing a greater possibility of a “noble Moor” (135). The character of the Moor now enters the action of the play in the first act, whereas in act one of Shakespeare’s play, he does not speak and silently stands aside. According to Bate, this change, “heightens the conspiratorial relationship between Tamora and Aaron” while the adaptation also “introduces the motif of race” with Aaron’s second speech. When Ravenscroft has Saturninus comment on his new servant Aaron as “Dark is the Case, but thro’t a noble light / There Shines” (1.2), Aaron responds: “If Blushes could be seen thro’
“this black Vayle,” the others who are present would see he was embarrassed by their praises (Bate, “Staging,” 98-100). Aaron later praises blackness for its ability to hide the truth from others in both Shakespeare’s original and Ravenscroft’s adaptation.

Ravenscroft again presents the possibility that Aaron is a moral being by having him chastise Quintus and Martius for being driven by “Amorous expectation” (3.1) and, according to Bate, having him offer to eat his own child to stop Tamora from killing their son, demonstrates “Aaron has a truly consuming love for his baby” (Bate, “Staging,” 100-101).

Along with several other local changes, Ravenscroft alters the ending of Titus Andronicus. For some, “Ravenscroft’s banquet scene actually surpasses Shakespeare’s in bloody, violent gore” (Reilly 147). Additional action shows that Titus stabs Lavinia and reveals the body parts of Chiron and Demetrius, the dying Tamora learns she has eaten their hearts and tongues, Marcus pretends he will kill the child, and Aaron is revealed on a rack and then set on fire to quiet his cursing tongue (Reilly 147). While Ravenscroft’s adaptation is clearly not the same play as Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus, as Bate notes, Ravenscroft’s stage directions in particular have influenced editors and performances of Titus since its first publication. So well received after a brief run in 1704-5, Ravenscroft’s adaptation was revived for James Quin in 1720 and Aaron was one of his “favorite roles” (Bate and Rasmussen 105). Waith notes that between 1717 and 1724 it was “performed ten more times, usually with Quin as Aaron” (Oxford, 45). The popularity of the play subsequently ebbed, and was not seen again until the mid-nineteenth century after it was picked up and changed again by another great actor.
Ira Aldridge, already an established African American actor with performances as Othello, Oroonoko, and Zanga in England, saw something in Aaron’s character. Aldridge “commissioned C. A. Somerset, a popular dramatist, to produce for him an Aaron centred Titus which would not offend Victorian sensibilities” (Bate, “Staging,” 103). A very different play emerged out of Somerset’s adaptation. Much of the violence, even Lavinia’s rape and mutilation, was excised from the play, along with the “gross language,” acts praised in one review of the play (Bate 103-104). The Bowdlerization of the play coincided with several similar revisions to Shakespeare’s plays in the nineteenth century; such acts as rape became unstageable and even unspeakable on the Victorian stage. In its place evolved a more prominent and complex Moor. Aldridge even instructed Somerset to insert an entire scene “from a play that had been written for [Aldridge] in Dublin with the splendid title Zaraffa, the Slave King,” to strengthen the focus on “the Moor’s blackness” (Bate 102-103). Waith argues, “Aaron (however transformed) took over the play,” and according to a review in “The Era (26 April, 1857), ‘Aaron is elevated into a noble and lofty character’” (Waith, Oxford, 48). No further performance of the play occurred again in England until 1923.

Robert Atkins brought the play to the Old Vic theater in 1923, and performances there received mixed reviews. Atkins’ production marked a concerted effort to return the early modern text to the play, and “in the staging, as in the text, this production exemplified the renewed concern for authenticity characteristic of the period” (Waith, Oxford, 49). While some critics, such as Gordon Crosse praised the acting, the play faced criticism as well: for example, “the deaths in the final scene produced unwelcome laughter” (Bate and Rasmussen 105; Waith, Oxford, 150). The following spring, a group
of Yale students led by John M. Berdan and E. M. Woolley brought *Titus* to America with a production emphasizing its horrors (Waith, Oxford, 51). Nearly thirty years passed before *Titus Andronicus* returned to the stage.

In 1951, Kenneth Tynan and Peter Myer created and directed a 30-minute version of *Titus Andronicus* for “an Evening of Grand Guignol.” Critically acclaimed, it led to calls for a new full performance (Hughes, New Cambridge, 30). Waith writes, “Tamora’s ferocity was applauded by reviewers, and Harold Hobson (Sunday Times, 11 November 1951) found ‘practically the whole company waving gory stumps and eating cannibal pies ... really splendid’” (Waith, Oxford, 51). Peter Brook organized the first widely popular full-scale production in 1955 in Stratford-upon-Avon, with Laurence Olivier as Titus and Vivien Leigh as Lavinia. Lavinia’s entrance after her brutal attack was the most celebrated moment in the performance. Richard David elegantly describes Tamora’s entrance “to ‘the slow plucking of harp-strings, like drops of blood falling into a pool,’ she entered with ‘scarlet streamers’” flowing from her “wrists and mouth” as blood, in his review in *Shakespeare Survey* in 1957 (Bate, “Staging,” 104). The stylized entrance influenced performances of *Titus* for thirty years (Bate, 104). The scene’s total focus on Lavinia served as an impetus to the production’s success. Brook cut Marcus and his poetic lines entirely out of the scene and focused the attention on Lavinia alone on the stage. While “Brook did not alter the text in the manner of Ravenscroft or Aldridge, he cut over 650 lines, combined the third act ‘banquet’ [or fly scene] with the first scene of act four, and rearranged the sequence of later scenes in that act” (Waith, Oxford, 54).

However much Vivien Leigh elevated the character of Lavinia through beauty and grace amidst the horrors, Olivier as Titus received the greatest share of praise. Anthony Quayle
was able “to take command in the later acts” as Aaron (Hughes, New Cambridge, 39). The cuts and the stylized staging of the originally gory scenes worked, the acting was strong, and critics viewed *Titus Andronicus* as a legitimately good Shakespearean play in performance. While most productions following Brook’s returned Marcus to the scene, his lines were heavily cut following Brook’s decision.

Trevor Nunn’s major production for the RSC in 1972 also exhibited an especially high number of cuts. As Bate points out, the “promptbook of the ... production reveals that twenty-nine out of forty-seven lines were cut (including all the ‘poetic’ ones)” in Marcus’s response (Arden3, 60). Nunn, and later Buzz Goodbody, followed suit in cutting the lines, but their decision to bring back “realistic and bloody” violence represents the 1970’s “massive cinematic revival of revenge drama” and “horror films” (Bate and Rasmussen, 110).

Fifteen years later, Deborah Warner’s production of *Titus Andronicus* set a new precedent for staging the play. Warner, for the first time since Ravenscroft adapted a text of *Titus Andronicus*, strictly followed an early modern text, not cutting a single line from the play in her 1987 production of *Titus*. The only adaptation she made to the language of the play was the translation of the Latin phrase “*Terras Astraea reliquit*” to English (4.3.4), a sign of what Bate terms “the erosion from our culture of the network of classical—and indeed biblical—allusion which to Shakespeare was second nature” (“Staging,” 107). The most daring choice was including all of Marcus’s lines in the post-rape scene. For Alan Dessen, “the spectators both see Lavinia directly and see her through [Marcus’s] eyes” (Dessen, 60). Bate, who quotes Dessen’s description also gives his own experience of watching the scene unfold; seeing the interplay between Marcus’s
poetry and Lavinia’s body on stage “taught [Bate] more about that strange theatrical experience we call ‘tragedy’ than any theory has done” (“Staging,” 106). Whatever trouble readers experienced with the lines of the play on the page, in performance Marcus’s lines can work brilliantly.

The next test for Titus on the stage was apparently unintentionally a politically charged production. Gregory Doran’s production of Titus Andronicus with Antony Sher as Titus in South Africa, before touring England and Spain, set the play’s “action in an African context, and presented it, according to Michael Billington [in his Guardian review (14 July 1995), ‘as a mirror of modern South Africa’” (Hughes, New Cambridge, 49). Gregory Doran denied his play contained “any overt political intent” (Bate and Rasmussen, 108), but in an interview for the publication of the RSC Titus Andronicus, Doran describes the Rome he saw in the play: “It is a Rome that has been through war, Titus has come back from ten years of fighting the Goths, and it is a racist society. All those things had a particular application to South Africa” (Bate and Rasmussen 130). The production was very effective. Doran recalls, “we did not have a single drop of blood in our production” and yet when Lavinia enters after the rape, “Somebody in our audience projectile vomited over the four rows in front” (Bate and Rasmussen 128, 134). Such a reaction speaks to the primary difference between reading the play as literature and viewing it on stage. The trials of the Andronicus require the visual experience and the dialogue of the play-text to reach their the audience most effectively.

The end of the twentieth century saw the most acclaimed film production of the play: Julie Taymor’s Titus. While not first film production, Taymor’s rendition of Titus Andronicus emerged as the strongest for several reasons. Jane Howell directed Titus
Andronicus for the BBC in 1985, and it was “widely regarded as one of the most successful of the series, praised for its lack of sensationalism and noted for reimagining the play through the eyes of the Young Lucius” (Bate and Rasmussen 109). Henry Fenwick writes “scenes which on the page had seemed innocuous suddenly in the studio, at the sight of the delicate and gentle Miss Calder Marshall [Lavinia] reduced to such straights, took on a horror and pathos all the more wrenching for being unexpected” (22). In looking at the modern print editions, Lavinia’s character—beyond the occasional stage direction to enter or kneel, the rare line, and actions implicit in the dialog—is barely noticeable even before she is ravaged. So easily turned into a statue, many critics have fallen for this disappearing act and reduced her to little more than Titus’s description as a “mirror of woe.”

Since Warner’s production, film versions of the play have taken a new direction. Samuel Crowl counts three “low-budget movie versions of the play” that focused on its potential as “the archetypal slasher film...: Lorne Richey’s Titus Andronicus: The Movie (1997), Christopher Dunne’s Titus Andronicus (1999), and Richard Griffin’s William Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus (2000)” (Crowl 94). Taymor resists this tendency of the 1990’s, and “takes Titus Andronicus seriously and sees in it a parable about family, state and power that speaks about the link between empire and violence from classical Rome to contemporary America” (Crowl 94-5). Taymor’s Titus builds on Deborah Warner’s focus on Young Lucius, and uses his character as “a framing device and as an innocent witness to the family horrors that multiply as the play’s narrative unfolds” (Crowl 95). Crowl adds that the film is a success in keeping with the “narrative tradition of Shakespeare on film” with the performances of “Harry Lennix’s Aaron and Anthony
Hopkins’s Titus” (95). Courtney Lehmann views the play a little differently. She finds a connection to horror films, because Titus “uses the ontological foundation of horror—the spectacle of the female body subject to rape, mutilation, and murder—as a starting point for a ‘look’ all its own, one that employs abjection, paradoxically, as a means of going through and beyond victimization” (225). Taymor’s film pushes the limits of some scenes. The violence is as realistic as it gets, and Taymor utilizes the obvious metaphors of the play; Marcus’s poetic response replaces Lavinia’s “lopped” hands (2.3.16-17). But, she moves beyond the text by creating a nightmare-like sequence complete with visions of the ravenous and beastly Chiron and Demetrius stripping and taunting the evermore bloodied and ravaged body of Lavinia, just as the scene focuses on the barren landscape surrounding Lavinia alone on a stump. For Cynthia Marshal, Lavinia’s “post-rape appearance is perversely pornographic” (109). While Anthony Hopkins’ performance as Titus is masterful, the visions of Lavinia reverberate, elevating Taymor’s Titus as one of the most effective adaptations of a Shakespearean play on film.

*Titus Andronicus* entered the twenty-first century at the height of its popularity in the modern era and maintains its momentum today. The Royal Shakespeare Company housed three separate productions of *Titus Andronicus* on stage in the last ten years. Bill Alexander directed the play for the RSC in 2003. In his production, “Titus’s family were made real to the audience by punctuating the horror with small details of everyday humor” (Bate and Rasmussen 124). Yukio Ninagawa brought his production in 2006 as part of the RSC Complete Works Festival. Bate and Rasmussen argue:

Ninagawa, like Shakespeare, created out of the revenge formula an astounding piece of theater in which the stylized acting techniques of the
Japanese-speaking actors, coming from their traditions of theater reliant on formal physical movement, seemed completely in tune with Shakespeare’s intention. (111)

Ninagawa “turned violence into a dark visual poetry. His completely stylized depiction of violence, rather than lessening the impact, made it deeply affecting” (Bate and Rasmussen 116). Hitoko Manaka as Lavinia successfully brings the ribbons of Brook’s staging back, but this time there is nothing beautiful about the “blood.” Red ribbons flowed in strings from Lavinia’s mouth and stumps as she writhed in pain on the stage. The play was well received and seen as a success.

Most recently, on May 16, 2013, Titus returned to the stage directed by Michael Fentiman as his first production for the RSC, with Stephen Boxer as Titus and Rose Reynolds as Lavinia. Michael Billington notes a few good points in the production, though he finds it not to be “a model of intellectual coherence” and notes, “Fentiman’s pick’n’mix approach to place and his juxtaposition of high tragedy and low comedy only becomes clear towards the climax” (The Guardian, 24 May 2013). The play and the actors, in Billington’s opinion, improve as the play goes. He writes Boxer is “excellent in the later scenes of vengeful irony” and praises Katy Stephens’ “dangerously voluptuous Tamora.” Billington was also impressed when Rose Reynolds as Lavinia “ingeniously spells out the names of her abusers with the aid of a salt-cellar.” Dr. Peter Reynolds praises Rose Reynolds for her “lovely dumb show work once Lavinia’s tongue has been cut out and once her face has been wiped up from the blood” but describes the final banquet scene as “a kind of Keystone cops horror event” (Moss Cottage review, 17 May 2003).
In his introduction to *The New Cambridge “Titus Andronicus,”* Alan Hughes writes “the evidence of successful productions suggests that readers dissatisfied with the quality of *Titus Andronicus* as literature should remember that it was written for the theatre” (45). In nearly sixty years of productions, *Titus Andronicus* has taken on many forms, some of which proved highly effective and brought a new level of respect to the play that Ravenscroft thought could not have been Shakespeare’s because it was so bad. Part of what has helped shape the recent history of the play is that directors have taken Peter Brook’s approach. In “An Open Letter to William Shakespeare,” Brook comments on the clear surprise of critics that were amazed at how well the play worked in production, and “apologizes” to the Bard because “it had not occurred to any of us in rehearsal that the play was so bad” (Brook 72 qtd in Bate, Arden3, 1). This is the key to *Titus;* when staged, the play is effective. Once again, the reception of the text leads to my point that a printed edition of *Titus Andronicus* should be interested in performance and should be based on the early modern text that bears the most evidence of influence from the theater. This again, is why the following edition is based on the First Folio.

**Critical Reception**

While the text of *Titus Andronicus* has received more interest of late as a valuable play on the stage, its reception as a literary text has not caught up. The history of critical reception of Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* is one that until fairly recently, showed little variation; scholars disliked the play and few took it seriously as a literary text. Harold C. Goddard’s feelings are representative of the majority of opinions held before the later 1950’s. Goddard writes,
All lovers of Shakespeare would be glad to relieve the poet of responsibility for that concentrated brew of blood and horror, *Titus Andronicus*. Though it is ostensibly a Senecan tragedy of revenge, it is not tragedy at all in any proper sense, and even if it is Shakespeare’s, it would be good if commenters were to cease referring to it as his first Tragedy.

(*The Meaning*, 33)

It is not news to Shakespeareans that Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* is a play that has had a long history of negative responses since the Restoration. Ravenscroft believed that the play shows little signs of Shakespeare; in the eighteenth century, the critical perception of the play was negative “because it was thought to be in bad taste” (Bate, Arden3, 1); in the first half of the twentieth century, T. S. Eliot thought *Titus Andronicus* was “one of the stupidest and most uninspired plays ever written” (82 qtd. in Bate, Arden3, 34). A. C. Bradley published *Shakespeare’s Tragedies: Lectures in “Hamlet,” “Othello,” “King Lear,” and “Macbeth*” in 1904 and, as was common at the time, *Titus Andronicus* receives only a few oblique references. W. H. Auden also lectured widely on Shakespeare, covering all of Shakespeare’s plays except *Titus Andronicus* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*. On one of the few occasions where he mentions the play, it is in a negative vein. In the opening to a lecture on *Julius Caesar* given on January 15, 1947, he states, “Shakespeare’s two significant tragedies preceding *Julius Caesar*—we can forget *Titus Andronicus*—are *Richard III* and *Romeo and Juliet*” (125). Throughout the early to mid-twentieth century, this was the sentiment; scholars disliked the play so much they refused to give it any consideration. But, towards the middle of the twentieth century, a slow trickle of serious considerations of the play’s merits began to fall and has now
become a full-flowing stream of regular scholarship concerning the literary value of Titus Andronicus.

Several of the earliest contributions to serious scholarship on Titus Andronicus focus on the language of the play that had for so long been seen in a negative light because it did not seem to be appropriate when set beside the violent action of the play. The first contribution was that of Eugene Waith in his essay “The Metamorphosis of Violence in Titus Andronicus” in Shakespeare Survey (1957). The essay provided the first in-depth study of the relationship between Ovid’s Metamorphoses and Titus. Waith argues that Ovid’s treatment of violence and its meaning can help us to better understand the relationship between language and action in Titus Andronicus. He shows that in book six of Ovid’s Metamorphoses, themes of metamorphosis are both physical and psychic. The most important examples of extreme emotion are those leading to transformations from the individual self and from humanity altogether, and Shakespeare’s use of Ovid’s style reinforces the actions of metamorphosis. Waith argues that emotion is the most important feature in Titus and Shakespeare, like Ovid, develops “personified emotion” through violence—the kind that leads to Ovidian metamorphoses at the psychic level at least. Clearly Lavinia cannot morph into a bird and regain her voice.

Language, action, style, and structure make up the focus of another important work. D. J. Palmer’s essay, “The unspeakable in pursuit of the uneatable: language and action in Titus Andronicus” was published in Critical Quarterly in 1972. The connections between language, action, and style create a greater reality. In the second part of his essay he moves on to show how Titus is not historical, but instead is constantly “re-shaping the narrative material [that] … Shakespeare … [found] analogous in Roman literature and
mythology” by referring to and using themes associated with works such as Ovid’s “Tereus and Philomela,” and Seneca’s banquet of Thyestes and more, to “evoke the Roman world of the play” (320-21). Palmer finds the shift from Roman civilization to Gothic barbarism, the contradictions in Titus’s behavior, and the movement between the court and the forest to be the most important issues in the play. In Titus, language is assimilated into ritual and game through both speech and action. Palmer shows that Titus is an “elaborately designed work,” and suggests that the play may even be seen as Shakespeare’s “thesis on tragedy.”

In 1974, Albert H. Tricomi returned to a discussion the use of metaphor in Titus Andronicus, both in the language and the actions on the stage. He published “The Aesthetics of Mutilation in Titus Andronicus” in Shakespeare Survey. In studying the figurative language of the play, he finds a strange connection between such language and the events that follow. In order to “render the events of the tragedy more real and painful,” the horrific metaphors of Titus often foreshadow the events of mutilation and dismemberment that later occur in the “real events” of the play (13). He finds that the “metaphoric impact of the tragedy can only be realized by forcing the metaphors to take on [this] dramatic life” (14). By making the horrors related in the metaphors of the characters come alive on stage, Shakespeare is attempting to “reach the ultimate verge of realizable horror.” Tricomi finds that by utilizing the “living stage,” Shakespeare has attempted to surpass his sources in Seneca and Ovid, and he suggests that the attempt is interesting and witty, if not entirely successful.

Nearly twenty years later, in 1993, Jonathan Bate wrote Shakespeare and Ovid in which he makes several arguments concerning Titus Andronicus. After considering
Renaissance views on Ovid and Shakespeare’s *Rape of Lucrece*, he turns his focus onto Lavinia. For Bate, Marcus’s speech in response to finding Lavinia mutilated, is “rife with Ovidian poetic ore” (82). Bate finds structural models for the play in Ovid’s stories of Philomel, Tereus and Procne. Noting that Shakespeare’s grammar school education would have stressed *imitatio*, Bate finds examples of *imitatio* in the play, and is impressed by the Shakespearean variations. Bate argues the key difference between *Titus* and his structural source is that in Ovid, “extremity of grief leads to metamorphoses,” while in *Titus Andronicus*, such extremes simply “make men mad” (181).

Even with the clearly developed interest in the language of the play, *Titus Andronicus* was not taken seriously as one of Shakespeare’s Roman plays. In 1983, G. K. Hunter and Robert S. Miola set out to challenge this position. In his essay, “Sources and meanings in *Titus Andronicus*,” Hunter accounts for some of the apparent anachronisms in Shakespeare’s setting and argues that Shakespeare was toying with two time periods in Rome, those associated with Livy and Herod (185-87). Miola published *Shakespeare’s Rome* and committed one chapter to the argument that *Titus Andronicus* is a Roman play. He argues that Shakespeare’s “language reveals a conscious attempt to create a Roman style” (43). Titus embodies what the early modern English would consider *romanitas*, or Roman virtue. Miola shows how the rapes of Philomela, Lucrece, and Troy “combine to suggest civil and moral dimensions of Lavinia’s rape and the barbarism of the invading Goths” (74).

Scholars such as Clifford Ronan have combined the two major subjects of scholarship on *Titus Andronicus*. Ronan published “*Antike Roman*”: Power, Symbology and the Roman Play in Early Modern England, 1585-1635 in 1995 in which he presents a
study of Shakespeare’s use of Ovidian texts, in addition to a closer look into other available texts that provided the Elizabethans with knowledge of Roman history. Ronan establishes that anachronism in early modern Roman plays was often intentional and usually anachronism is found in representations of political, literary and theological history. He argues that *Titus Andronicus* is a summary of the full scale of Roman political history, and that the anachronisms in the play are to be expected. Ronan finds Shakespeare’s representation of *romanitas* in Titus’s character to be an accurate portrayal of what early modern people associated with what it meant to be Roman. This study helps us to make sense of *Titus Andronicus*’s apparent disconnects with what we now know of Roman history. I find the study interesting especially in light of Titus’s inability to see the importance of his family early on, and how slow he is to finally open his eyes to the fact that they are all he has left.

Rome also remains a center of focus in Coppélia Kahn’s, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* in 1997. Her third chapter “The Daughter’s seduction in *Titus Andronicus*, or, writing is the best revenge,” provides a feminist reading of the relationship between mother, father, and daughter in *Titus Andronicus*. Kahn sees *Titus* as a “critique of Roman ideology, institutions and mores” (47). The divides between Romans and Goths are only set up to be torn down, and Rome provides a perfect example for the examination of the daughter as emblem and finally as revenger. For Kahn, the number of sources beyond Philomel in the play suggests “the complexity of women’s relations to textuality in patriarchal culture” (62). Several studies have continued to arise in Kahn’s vain, using Rome and Ovid to approach the character of Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*. One example is the 2006 collection of essays entitled *Identity, Otherness,*
and Empire in “Titus Andronicus” edited by Maria Del Sapio Garbero, which includes essays by Garbero, Barbara Antonucci and Gilberta Golinelli that provide studies on Titus Andronicus, Lavinia and representations of Rome. One point that has connected all scholarship on Rome is that Shakespeare’s refusal to pin down any particular Roman trait or period creates limitless potential for the play in performance. As is clear above, the number of settings alone in different staged plays, directors have exploited the open questions of politics and culture in the face of barriers that are quickly fragmented and constantly being set up just to be broken down.

While Titus Andronicus’s Rome has garnered the attention of numerous critics, others began to look at the extreme violence in the play. Katherine A. Rowe presents this focus in “Dismembering and Forgetting in Titus Andronicus” (1994). Rowe argues, the dismembered body parts in Titus Andronicus should be understood “as part of the world of the stage properties or of character” (280). In this essay, she focuses on the dismemberment of hands as political agency, and how an understanding of a “manual semiotics” based on Galen’s On the Usefulness of Body Parts and other early modern medical knowledge can help to find a better reading of dismemberment violence in the play. Rowe shows how severed hands/arms with objects in hand were used with emblem and imprese books to create “icons of power,” often political in nature, which are introduced in the play and then disrupted through dismemberment. Rowe correctly established that associations between hands as icons of political power combined with an apparent fetishism in the play’s constant verbal references to hands are central to our understanding of the play.
Another focus that remained on the margins of literary criticism in *Titus Andronicus* was that of Aaron the Moor as a valuable character. Though the characterization gained actors praise from the eighteenth century on (see “Stage History”), Aaron’s character received little more than a mention as a precursor to Shakespeare’s later villains in literary criticism. Virginia Mason Vaughan’s book shows a change in this pattern; in *Performing Blackness on the Elizabethan Stage, 1500-1800* (2005), she argues “Aaron’s characterization seems to cross the line from color coding to the murky territory that George Frederickson terms ‘proto-racism’” (47-8). Vaughan considers the expectations that Elizabethan audiences had when faced with black characters on the stage and determines that they “saw Aaron’s blackness as causative factor”; Aaron is “not black because evil but evil because black” (48). Vaughan provides a number of reasons for these expectations based on early modern conceptions of pigmentation through the stories of travelers that fueled the aura of the Africans’ overt sexuality. But Vaughan notes that Shakespeare does step beyond his audience’s expectations by having Aaron defend his child; doing so, “humanizes [Aaron], complicating and thickening blackness’s significance” (49).

Emily C. Bartels’ book also provides an interesting discussion of Aaron. Bartels’ *Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello* (2011) includes a chapter focusing on *Titus Andronicus* and the Moor as the Other. Bartels argues that it is hard to determine just who the barbarian is in *Titus Andronicus*. As others have noticed, the differences set up between the Goths and the Romans quickly break down. But where does Aaron fit? Bartels argues that to see Aaron for what he is, we must first see Rome for what it is: “a place where crossing of cultures is the rule” (70). Bartels notes that at first both the Goths
and the Romans actually trust Aaron. He “can move easily between the forest and the court” as well as between cultures (87). She goes against the expectations of the Elizabethan audience that were suggested by Virginia Vaughan, and argues that black skin does not cause the characters in the play suspect that Aaron is evil. Bartels suggests that Aaron’s blackness only becomes a negative when Tamora births a black son; the color of the child’s skin is negative because it is evidence of adultery, not because he is black. The overtly derogatory references to Aaron throughout the play are merely evidence that such discrimination is already present in Roman “lore and language” (88). While Aaron’s final sentencing displays that Lucius despises him, by now Aaron’s evil is well known, and Aaron has become the epitome of stereotyped blackness that one might expect existed in early modern England by the end of the play.

The most difficult task for scholars of Titus Andronicus has been in determining whether or not it actually should be considered a tragedy. For years, scholars held Auden’s opinion when discussing Shakespeare’s tragedies, most often opting to “forget about Titus.” However, in 1995, Naomi Conn Liebler’s Shakespeare’s Festive Tragedy: The Ritual Foundations of Genre devotes a chapter to this exact dilemma. Liebler sets out to determine whether the basic requirements of tragedy—the death of the body, spirit, and polity—are fulfilled by the text of Titus Andronicus. It is pretty obvious that the play provides the dead bodies required, so Liebler focuses on the death of Rome in the play. She identifies sources in Herodian and Seneca in addition to Ovid for Shakespeare’s Rome. Throughout the essay, Liebler illustrates how Titus Andronicus portrays the dismemberment of Rome, beginning with its head, which is never truly replaced, and notes the tragedy in the fact that “the reconstruction of the body politic is doubtful after
such dismemberment” (140). As for the spirit, Liebler finds that Shakespeare “aborts the ritual intention of _sparagmos_ and _omophagia_” which constitute an expectation of a “completion of a cycle and a new beginning” (139). Liebler determines that the culture of Rome is destroyed through “confusion or neglect of cultural markers” in _Titus Andronicus_, so that in the end we have a complete history of the fall of Rome, and Lucius offers little hope in the face of such tragedy (147). The fragmentation complete, _Titus Andronicus_ has fulfilled the requirements of tragedy. Through the breakdown of ritual and cultural definitions, Rome has fallen.

With Liebler’s findings, one might think that _Titus_ would have stood on solid ground as a successful Shakespearean tragedy, but this ground has proven less sturdy that one might think. John Russell Brown’s _Shakespeare: The Tragedies_ (2001) offers a discussion of the structure of _Titus Andronicus_ and the demands that structure places on the audience, while ultimately he questions _Titus’s_ value as a tragedy. Brown’s concern is that the play seems to focus more energy on ensuring how the actions are perceived rather than on a clear structure in the creation of the tragic hero. This finding goes directly against Bertrand Evan’s 1979 article in which he claimed that _Titus Andronicus_ was a structural failure as a tragedy (Evans 19). While Brown considers that there are complications created by the play, and that the confusion is caused by the requirements of the audience to witness the characters in pain and attempt to follow the development of “the tragic hero’s mind” (16). Brown argues that the play is not just a youthful attempt to show off or an experiment by a young playwright; instead, _Titus Andronicus_ is a “concerted attempt to write a tragedy that probes horrendous suffering and displays inhuman actions, as later tragedies will continue to do” (25). In the end, he does not find
the attempt very successful, but I disagree. Shakespeare successfully fulfills not only the structure of tragedy that is set up in act one, but also presents the epitome of tragedy in Lavinia’s body and in Titus’s fall from grace. When the play ends, we have the requisite bodies on the stage and the future for Rome in Lucius’s care is less certain than those presented in any of Shakespeare’s most lauded tragedies. Liebler’s earlier findings seem to be more in line with how tragedy works in the play and is made successful.
Designing and (Re)defining Lavinia in Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus*

*Enter the Empress’ sons with Lavinia her hands cut off and her tongue cut out, and ravished.* (2.4.0 SD)

Lavinia enters onto the stage, mutilated, raped, and silenced in the opening stage direction of the final scene of the second act in *Titus Andronicus*. This powerful direction creates one of the central problems of Shakespeare’s first tragedy: who will Lavinia be to the other characters in the play and more importantly, to the audience? The various approaches directors have chosen over the years suggest the many possibilities available in the play. The ultra-stylized 1955 staging by Peter Brook begins with ribbons flowing from Lavinia’s mouth and arms to represent blood flowing from her wounds. Others have used more realistic portrayals of Lavinia with bloody wrists and blood dripping from her mouth.

Probably the most disturbingly realistic representation of Lavinia’s entrance occurred in Xavier Leret’s production for the 2001-2002 season at the Kaos Theatre. Pascale Aebischer describes Jane Hartley’s Lavinia as “very much a present-day woman;” Leret’s production avoids any ambiguity in Lavinia’s character by promoting her strength and subversiveness in act one. Even after her rape and mutilation, Lavinia’s presence continues to “refuse to ‘poeticize’” the gruesome details of her experience:

Lavinia returned onto the white-tiled stage [. . .] with her clothes bloodied and torn and her back to the audience. She dragged herself along the backstage wall, her mouth leaving a long smear of blood on the gleaming tiles. When she turned around, the spectators were confronted with the sight of bare arms hacked off below the elbow [. . .] and, most harrowing,
of her skirt ripped open to reveal her naked crotch from which blood was still dripping down along the legs. [. . .] When Chiron, in bloody underwear, and the nude Demetrius, with blood dripping from his genitals and smeared over his chest and hands, followed Lavinia on-stage to taunt her, their mockery was sickening. (Aebischer 51)

Simply the reading of this description of the grotesque image of Lavinia accompanied by the grizzly, taunting boys creates a visceral reaction. Leret’s choice was clear: rape and mutilation were presented as painful and disturbing. This ploy worked by leaving the audience with a “feeling of intractable disgust arising from the deep moral seriousness” demanded by the “reality” of the image thrust before them on the stage (Aebischer 52).

As Marcus and then the rest of the Andronici find, there are simply no appropriate words for such a reality. Lavinia acts initially as an indecipherable symbol and then transforms into a catalyst for the actions of the Andronici. Simultaneously, she shares a constant silent connection with the audience surrounding the brutal truth of her experience, of which only Lavinia and the audience are aware.

Lavinia’s mutilated body on the stage demands the audience’s attention. The play exploits the voyeuristic sense to enhance the uneasiness of the situation. In Julie Taymor’s 1999 production, Kim Solga suggests the “‘music video’ like sequence [following the rape, displays a woman] with a hint of coy vixen about her” as Lavinia stands for all to see (71). Whether or not Taymor intended this reaction, what is important is that it requires the scene to be witnessed. Without seeing this in film or on stage, few readers would describe Lavinia as even remotely sexual or provocative. The adroit reader may, as Brown did, picture a Lavinia “in great pain, unable to speak and scarcely able to
move” (19), however, going further beyond this description would be difficult. More importantly, “pictures” of any kind become more blurred for the reader as the play moves on.

The audience at this point is key. To see Lavinia is the only way to begin to understand her. Her character, so easily overshadowed in the pages of the text, is allowed to become the intricate and interesting woman Shakespeare created only when she is under the lights of the stage. Unlike the other main characters of the play, she has little opportunity in her dialogue to make an impression on the reader. Once she does, it is overshadowed by the cruelty of her attackers as she begs for their mercy in act two scene two between lines 118 and 184. However, her “silence,” from her first abduction to her death, is broken on stage by her distinctive choice of movement, expression, or noise. John Russell Brown observes, “with feelings of ever-greater intensity, both silence and physical actions carry an increasing proportion of the load” in *Titus* (23), which is reflected in the intensity of Lavinia’s actions and the inability of others to identify the cause of her pain.

In order to understand how Lavinia’s picture and silence affect the characters on the stage and audience, it is necessary to see who Lavinia was before this disturbing scene. Studying the other characters’ actions toward Lavinia to the point where she is so brutally attacked, creates a more thorough understanding of just how the “visual impact” of Lavinia, silent on the stage, can “contest” and, at times, out-shine Titus’s “verbal supremacy” (Aebischer 31). This is apparent under the realization that Shakespeare created her character within a society where speaking eloquently was paramount. Thomas Wilson’s *Rules of Reason* (1551) provides the following as an example of a true
propoition: “A man is a living creature endowed with reason, having aptness by nature to speake” (Danson 45). If the natural ability and desire to speak sets man apart from beasts, what value is there in silence? What happens when, for example, *Titus Andronicus* presents us with a play in which spoken language becomes ineffectual, in which body and action work to create the most powerful responses in the play, and in which understanding can only be gained by turning to the written words of the classical masters of literature?

1. Lavinia in the Mouths of Men

Paul Hammond recently suggested that one of tragedy’s defining aspects is that it creates a world where “human language has no signifié transcendental [to recall Derrida], no ultimately fixed point, no ground [. . . and] rigorous coherence and full intelligibility are indeed a mirage” (8). At its best, tragedy damages and dislocates “the concepts which define us as human—God, Nature, Reason, Truth” (Hammond 9). Positioning itself as a proper tragedy, everything that is established as true at the beginning of *Titus Andronicus* is almost immediately broken down. The men around Lavinia first attempt to claim her and, ultimately, define her through both language and action.

It is no surprise that in a play that begins with two instances of representative politics—when Saturninus and Bassianus argue for the crown, and further when Marcus and Titus speak with the people’s voices — language and voice are only useful to and possessed by the men in power. With that power, the males around Lavinia establish and reestablish her with words, and, in each case, she does nothing to dissuade or stop them in response, even though she is still “physically” able to fashion her own identity early on (though admittedly her position as a woman in Rome creates barriers of its own). To stop
the turmoil over the crown, Marcus speaks with the voice of the people, and Oliver Arnold finds the actual absence of the Roman people and their silence “extraordinarily palpable” (10). But Marcus quickly passes his power to Titus, who asks the “People of Rome and noble tribunes” (though none are on the stage) for their “voices” and “suffrages” in granting him the authority to select the next emperor himself (Arnold 9-11; 1.1.219). As each of the elder Andronici speak “with” the voice of the people, which we must assume was given to them, they possess the political power not only to name Saturninus emperor, but also to determine or name the identities of others in Rome, including Lavinia. Once Saturninus is named emperor by Titus and given ultimate power over the people of Rome, his voice is all that can “legally” create. All that speak against him speak against Rome, and, in effect, these antagonistic tongues establish the characters of those who are apparently willing to defy Rome and its ruler, or those who simply have no say regardless of personal leanings.

**From “Rome’s rich ornament” to a “changing piece”**

After the two brothers, Saturninus and Bassianus, are asked by Marcus Andronicus to disband their supporters, Bassianus promptly agrees. In his response to Marcus, Bassianus describes the family of the Andronici, whom Bassianus loves and trusts to the point he is willing to put his purpose into Marcus’s hands. Bassianus is specific when he describes Titus’s daughter, “to whom [his] thoughts are humbled all, / Gracious Lavinia, Rome’s rich ornament” (1.1.52). Before Lavinia is even introduced on stage, we have her original designation. She is Rome’s and, more importantly, she is a beautifying and empowering object for the males that can claim her (Harris 391). After the burial of Titus’s sons and the controversial sacrifice of Alarbus, we finally meet
Lavinia when she walks onto the stage to kneel at her victorious father’s feet to be blessed. Titus’s response further describes Lavinia. He thanks Rome because it has “lovingly reserved / The cordial of [his] age to glad [his] heart,” and prays that Lavinia will “outlive [her] father’s days / And fame’s eternal date, for virtue praise” (1.1.166-69). For Titus, Lavinia is a comfort and a representative of virtue. But as act one develops, Titus shows that he values Lavinia in terms of her potential “exchange value as a virgin daughter” (Kahn 49) and also, as P. K. Joplin notices, her value as a “sign of her father’s or husband’s political power” (Joplin 53, qtd. in Kahn 49). No clear value is placed on Lavinia’s own thoughts or feelings. The next character to “name” Lavinia is Saturninus. Ostensibly to thank Titus for choosing him to be emperor, Saturninus announces that he will “advance” the Andronici by taking Lavinia for his wife; he describes her in yet another manner as “Rome’s royal mistress” (1.1.240, 243). This pleases Titus so much, that he adds a dowry of his sword, his chariot, and finally his prisoners for Saturninus. Clearly, Titus rates his daughter as a possession that is his to give, an object of exchange no different than the spoils of his victory over the Goths. This “value” is further solidified when Bassianus claims his own “right” to Lavinia.

Just as Saturninus prepares to leave the stage with his new treasures, Bassianus “seiz[es] Lavinia” and announces, “Lord Titus, by your leave, this maid is mine” (1.1.275 SD, 275). When Titus objects, Marcus chimes in to defend Bassianus’s actions, “‘Suum cuique’ is our Roman justice: / This prince in justice seizeth but his own” (1.1.282-83). Lavinia is valued only as something to be possessed. When the dust settles from the fray and murder that follow, Saturninus enters the stage with Tamora and her entourage and announces that he does not need Lavinia or any of the Andronici, and tells Titus that he
can give his daughter, whom Saturninus now calls a “changing piece” to Bassianus (1.1.314). This fourth descriptor of Lavinia reinforces her perceived value as something merely exchanged between men. In Shakespeare’s England, a woman’s physical being and her chastity were valued as property. This sense is evident in laws concerning rape at the time. Carolyn Sale turns to T. E.’s *The Lawes Resolutions*, a history of English laws written around the mid-seventeenth century. According to Sale, T. E.’s history “suggests that legally speaking, both Lavinia and the women whom *The Lawes Resolutions* addresses are nothing more than a *loqui* at which property interests converge and clash”; T. E. “is particularly concerned with what he construes as the ‘mitigation’ … of the laws against rape” that is caused, “he suggests, because statutory law increasingly focuses not on the offense against the woman’s person but the offense against the man or men for whom she constitutes a valuable commodity” (5). The root of the problem that T. E. finds is with the

“antique law of King Adelstand,” [which] … allows for a woman’s exercise of her consent *after* the rape; the raped woman could elect to save the alleged rapist from punishment by claiming that she now consented, after the fact, to what had been done to her. She would signify her consent by agreeing to marry the alleged rapist. (5)

The problems with the sixteenth-century laws are displayed, according to Sale, by “Sir Henry Hobart’s report on the Star Chamber case of *Bruton v. Morris*” (8). His report indicates that “the ravishment of John Bruton’s twelve-year-old daughter cannot be construed as a felony because the ‘daughter was neither heir apparent to her father, nor had lands or goods’” (Sale 8). In other words, women were seen as property no different
than livestock in the eyes of the law in early modern England, and valued in relation to their possessions or future inheritance.

Sale’s description of the apparent value of women in the eyes of early modern English laws seems appropriate for an understanding of how the men value Lavinia. Bernice Harris comments that the exchanges of women that occur in the first act—Titus giving Lavinia to Saturninus, Bassianus’s subsequent seizure of her, Titus’s presentation of Tamora to Saturninus, and, finally, Saturninus choosing Tamora as Queen—“serve as markers of [Titus’s and other men’s] prowess and authority,” markers both political and familial (Harris 387). Furthermore, as a “changing piece [. . .] Lavinia is silent [and] appears to have no voice” (388). Lavinia’s silence in the face of each exchange within the first act is the earliest and least powerful impact of her silences, particularly since she continues to have the ability to speak, but intentionally remains wordless.

When asked if she disapproves of Saturninus’s welcome of Tamora as a person of Rome to be used in a “princely” manner and not scorned, Lavinia responds, “Not I, my lord, sith true nobility / Warrants these words in princely courtesy” (1.1.273-74). Barbara Antonucci suggests that Lavinia’s moment of voice in the acceptance of Saturninus’s praising of Tamora is an assertive response which “true nobility warrants” that “unveil[s] in a phrase his baseness and her acumen” (126). It is Lavinia’s verbal acceptance of what she hears that shows the respect of nobility, but Antonucci’s mistake is in assuming that Saturninus’s comment on Tamora’s “lascivious beauty [. . .] of the hue / That [he] would choose, were [he] to choose anew” (1.1.263-4) is spoken within the hearing of the characters on the stage. Edward Capell and the many editors that follow him, offer a more plausible suggestion that this couplet is likely meant to be an “aside.” Saturninus
has nothing to gain by saying these first two lines out loud, and the remainder of his speech does represent the “princely courtesy” that Lavinia rightly understands. This, along with her silence and disappearance from much of the rest of the scene, suggests that the intentional lack of dialog in the text exhibits a timorous nature of her character consistent with that of a silent acceptor of fate, over which she seems to have little control. Whether controlled by her father, Saturninus, or Bassianus, Lavinia never seems to be in control of herself or her fate. Each man possesses some level of power initially, and Lavinia silently submits to each man in an effort to determine her identity.

When Saturninus becomes aware of Bassianus’s intervention and claiming of Lavinia, he provides yet another significant description of exchange. Saturninus accuses his brother of “rape”—though for Saturninus the victim of this figurative rape is not the female or the body, but rather himself as the rightful owner of the “property” that Lavinia represents to him. Oliver Arnold agrees, stating that though rape is described as both the “illegal seizure of property (OED 1)” and “sexual rape (OED 2)” (114) in Titus Andronicus, the first mention of rape in act one deals entirely with the former definition. The difference in victimhood between the two very distinct descriptions requires some attention. Logically, with sexual violation it seems clear that the body or person is the victim, however, with illegal seizure of property it is only the “owner” of “property” that can be considered the victim. This alternative view of the apparent victim causes no issue when the property is gold, for example, which would never be considered harmed itself. The distinction between the two begins to break down when the “property” stolen is a human being, whose value nullifies any consideration of that person as the victim of the rape. This is apparent since the property has lost nothing in the exchange.
Taking into consideration the laws of 1590’s England, the difference between the two meanings of “rape” becomes even more blurred. Emily Detmer-Goebel suggests that “by calling Lavinia’s abduction ‘rape,’ the play illustrates women’s customary lack of authority to define rape in the medieval form of the law,” in which the word ‘rape’ embodied both “abduction” and “sexual violation” (79). Note that in each legal sense of the word rape in the text, the only victim that is legally identified is the man in “possession” of the woman, whether abducted or sexually assaulted. Recalling T. E.’s findings in the mid-sixteenth century, the laws considered a woman as a valuable commodity of man and not as an individual worthy of distinct protection. Sale sees Lavinia’s silence throughout these exchanges as highlighting women’s “legally troubling agency” (3). In this scene Lavinia is never once considered as a victim by any character on the stage, and she clearly has no legal right as a victim. This is especially true relating to the laws concerning abduction, which leads to the question, who is the victim of rape in this scene? Bassianus claims he was previously betrothed to Lavinia, and so it was Saturninus who committed the rape here in claiming her for himself. This explains Bassianus’s reaction at the accusation: “Rape call you it, to seize my own” (1.1.411). Bassianus clearly believes he is taking back what is rightfully his to possess; he seems to see himself as the victim of the initial loss and not Lavinia.

Returning to the moment when Titus freely gives Lavinia to Saturninus, Coppélia Kahn, though noticing Lavinia’s value as an object, also seems surprised that Titus does not react at any point of the exchange as a responsible father concerned for the well-being of his daughter: “Titus seems curiously negligent in supervising her betrothal—the cruel transmission of his treasure to another male guardian” (51). Rather than considering
Lavinia’s “right” to be with Bassianus, whether he was aware of the betrothal or not, Titus speaks up only in defense of Saturninus’s “right” to her. The key is not Titus’s apparent negligence, but more importantly that he considers his daughter an object to be possessed and exchanged. Titus’s response to the initial rape of the play reinforces Lavinia as an object. His concern is not for his daughter’s well-being as much as it is for his own standing in the court of Rome he had helped to establish. Titus’s accusations of his sons as “traitors” (1.1.285), shows that Titus is more of a Roman warrior than he is a family man; Robert S. Miola points out that in Titus, “as in his Rape of Lucrece Romans live and die in a restricted ethical universe, one dominated by a military conception of honor and by a desire for fame” (Miola 44). Titus’s ideals are those of Rome and what he perceives to be the values of a Roman emperor to whom all must show deference regardless of actual worthiness. As Miola shows, “Roman heroic traditions act [. . .] as a source of strength and nobility; yet they also force Romans to lead lives increasingly at odds with human instincts and needs,” and though much about Rome was esteemed by Shakespeare and his contemporaries in early modern England, Shakespeare would have definitely been aware of the negatives as well (44). Here Titus’s display of romanitas disallows any fatherly concern of his own family’s private well-being, and instead supports the state of Rome and his reputation.

What determines Lavinia’s value in the initial scene is not what happens to her, but what the men in power name her. Lavinia’s constant silent acceptance of each man has garnered considerable attention. Bernice Harris argues Lavinia holds power in her lack of response:
Lavinia’s silence [.] is useful to her [at this point in the play . . .] she may or may not be complicit [in Bassianus’s claim]. Her silence is potentially her own tool or weapon. The only way to truly disarm her is to take away her ability to choose silence. (390)

The key word here is “choice.” However, it does not appear that Lavinia displays any ability to choose in this first scene. The few words she speaks are not words of one with true agency to determine her own outcomes, but words required of a dutiful woman in response to direct questions from men. Significantly, she seems to have little control of her own identity as it is molded and remolded throughout the scene. Moving from Harris’ argument, Caterina Romeo does not see Lavinia’s actions in this scene as necessarily powerful, though Romeo does give Lavinia some level of agency in this silence. She writes, “Lavinia’s silence in the abduction scene is eloquent not because it is actively used as a weapon, but rather because it symbolizes the silence of women who [.] have not been admitted into the realm of language. Confronted by a system that does not require her opinion, Lavinia prefers to remain silent” (87). Again, Romeo relies on Lavinia having a choice, but it is unclear that any options are available to Lavinia at any of the points of exchange. Is it Lavinia’s preference of silence, or her lack of status as a subject and daughter that influences this silence? Reasonably in this historical setting, the signs of Lavinia’s “power” to “choose” do not begin to develop until she is a wife, and no longer a virgin the day after her wedding.

Critical scholars see a complication in her silent responses. Is Lavinia’s silence chosen or simply a sign of the obedience required of a woman in her position? While the action of choosing allows for Lavinia to possess at least some degree of agency, her
inability to determine her own fate regardless of choice does not. Alexander Leggatt sees Lavinia’s chosen silence in response to Saturninus’s claim to her as Lavinia’s consent and obedience to the wishes of Titus, who voiced his approval of the marriage. However, Leggatt argues that Lavinia’s silence when she is “seized” by Bassianus can be seen as Lavinia being “defiant of her father,” because it is clear that Titus does not approve of their actions (Shakespeare’s Tragedies, 11). Leggatt’s logic seems to make sense but, upon further consideration, it becomes clear that Lavinia’s reasoning cannot be known by the reader, and therefore cannot be labeled as displaying a choice between consent and defiance. If Lavinia showed any signs of choice in this first scene, then her actions could be considered in tune with the “abduction” as disobedient, however, she has not chosen anything concerning her identity. As Mary Laughlin Fawcett suggests, “without Lavinia’s vocal choice between suitors or any appeal to her father, this dispute is deeply ambiguous; we cannot tell about her intentions, or even whether she has any” (266). The power that men have in act one is the ability to name or fashion Lavinia’s character. Lavinia cannot speak in a manner that would threaten her identity or, furthermore, counter her character created by the men who possess her.

Each theory has its salience, and each would require a different physical reaction on the stage. Regardless, when reading the play on the page, this silence may not even garner the attention of the reader. This is especially true when we consider that not one of the most recent editions from Arden, Cambridge, or Oxford even suggests a possibility of reaction on Lavinia’s part. Instead the lines continue without any level of discussion in the notes of these texts. The value on the page is given to the dialogue between Saturninus and Titus, while Lavinia comes off as a mute character of little importance—
as nothing more than an emotionless mannequin being pulled into the hands of Saturninus.

Lavinia’s status, whether as “Rome’s rich ornament” or a mere “changing piece,” erases her ability to be considered a victim of a crime and denies any option to show agency or choice in this initial scene. Lavinia is established from the outset through the defining capabilities of men of power and their words. Her value as a human being is, at most, a secondary product of the few references to her as daughter, betrothed, or sister, and these serve to keep her a secondary citizen. In either case, Lavinia’s lack of response should not come across as a surprise, but instead should further help us understand Shakespeare’s intention for Lavinia, who becomes one of Shakespeare’s most vocal and powerful female characters. Once she appears to have lost all possible chance of agency, her power becomes evident in her rare ability to outshine the speaking characters with which she interacts, especially after she has been rendered silent and handless after being raped. But, before experiencing these defining moments of Lavinia’s power, her initial position and the silence it affords in act one proves a tentative but vital element of the play and exemplifies her later acquired power. Next, Aaron and the sons of Tamora toy with the power of naming and defining Lavinia.

In the Name of Lust

Act two, scene one begins with Aaron’s own display of the power to name “reality” in placing both Tamora and himself above all of Rome—a position no doubt beyond Saturninus’s intentions or understanding. But after this brief soliloquy, it is Chiron and Demetrius who next attempt to play this powerful “game.” However, having not yet attained the true ability to create through naming, Chiron and Demetrius must
submit to Aaron’s greater power to find where, when, and how they will next define Lavinia.

Their naiveté is clear from the moment they enter the scene, quibbling over who will gain “Lavinia’s love” (2.1.36). In attempting to create this new definition of Lavinia as a willing “mistress,” Chiron and Demetrius underestimate not only Lavinia’s chastity, but also Bassianus’s right to her. In her most recent level of status provided by Bassianus, she has moved from a “changing piece” to a “wife.” Lavinia remains secondary to men of power, though the rise in status has humanized her and given her a level of agency above that which Chiron and Demetrius suppose. Lavinia now has the power to speak her mind, even if only by following the lead of Bassianus. Because neither Chiron nor Demetrius understands her new position, it is Aaron who spells it out. Aaron describes Lavinia as “a prince’s right” and reminds them of her chaste reputation (2.1.64-65). The problem, as Aaron understands it, is that if they each pursue Lavinia’s “love,” it will only lead to their death in a place like Rome. “Love” cannot be their main objective, since it requires the agreement of all parties involved—an exchange that Lavinia is unlikely and unable to accept as readily as Chiron and Demetrius hope.

Further questioning clarifies what the boys truly wish to “achieve.” Demetrius provides us with his vision of a woman: “She is a woman, therefore may be wooed; / She is a woman, therefore may be won; / She is Lavinia, therefore must be loved” (2.1.82-84). Each line defines a woman as an object merely to be acted upon and toward. Next Demetrius turns to the narrative of the hunted doe that may be poached from under the “keeper’s nose” (2.1.93). This will become the most common description of Lavinia even beyond her mutilation, and will finally allow her to be considered a true victim. At last,
Aaron realizes Chiron’s and Demetrius’ true intentions and that “some certain snatch or so / Would serve [their] turns” (2.1.96). Since the boys do not genuinely care to receive Lavinia’s love, they must instead realize what truly drives them. Because Lavinia is “Bassianus’s love,” and no less likely to commit any fault by choice than Lucrece, they must turn to “rape and villainy” in the perfect place for such things—the forest (2.1.115-16, 123).

In this first reference to Lucrece, Shakespeare begins a continuous set of comparisons to his sources, and Chiron and Demetrius follow Aaron’s lead. Their only hope is to “single [. . .] thither this dainty doe, / And strike her home by force, if not by words” (2.1.118-18). The clear goal is “Lavinia’s treasury” (2.1.131). No longer is Lavinia’s love the goal; it is now the female body that, like the doe, is free to be poached and taken. Finally, the naming ends with the men’s realization that the only way to attain Lavinia, is to take away her value as a chaste wife. The only avenue to success is to force her back into the status of an object of exchange.

In this short scene, Lavinia takes on many names, described independently as “a prince’s right,” “woman,” “doe,” “Lucrece,” and “Bassianus’s love.” Chiron and Demetrius come to realize they both want Lavinia not only as an object but, more importantly, in her flesh. As Antonucci points out, Demetrius in the final lines of the scene, “even evokes Seneca to put forward his explanation for the ‘inevitability’ of the violence which is going to be enacted” on Lavinia (124). Demetrius turns to Seneca’s word and exclaims: “Sit fas aut nefus, till I find the streams / To cool this heat, a charm to calm their fits, / Per Stygia, per manes vehor” (2.1.140-42). The violence is inevitable, but Lavinia, is no longer the “ornament” or “piece” of act one. The transformation of her
status from the muted object to Bassianus’s wife and then finally to a chaste widow, gradually provides Lavinia with a voice that she did not, and could not, possess at the onset of the play. The Andronici learn one-by-one through the next several scenes that their language has lost its power to name or to create reality in Rome. The fate of the Andronici is now in the hands of the Goths and Tamora’s puppet emperor, who are now ruling the forests of Rome. Titus and his family no longer have the ability to determine their own status; instead it is the Goths who begin to recreate the Andronici through physical actions.

Chaste Wife to Pleading Widow

The Lavinia presented briefly in the second scene of act two and then fully developed in the next scene is a changed woman. Now married and with her husband sturdily beside her, the once silent maid seems emboldened. It is as if her new status as a wife gave her a previously unavailable right to speak. Upon entering the scene and noticing Aaron and Tamora alone in the forest, Bassianus and Lavinia approach Tamora as Aaron leaves the stage. Knowing nothing of their impending doom, they speak to Tamora with abandon. Bassianus compares Tamora to Diana, the goddess of “horning” who turned her lover into a stag to be torn apart by his own hounds—following the Early Modern tendency to associate this “horning” with cuckolding. At this time, Tamora furiously strikes back with the same reference and Lavinia jumps into the verbal fray and adds a direct accusation of adultery: “’Tis thought you have a goodly gift of horning, / And to be doubted that your Moor and you / Are singled forth to try experiments” (2.3.67-69). Continuing to echo the theme that Tamora has just tried to turn on Bassianus, Lavinia puts the reference back on Tamora: “Jove shield your husband from his hounds
today— / 'Tis pity they should take him for a stag” (2.3.70-71). And before Tamora can
insert a reply to her, Lavinia and Bassianus take turns offering further commentary on
Tamora’s clear betrayal, each vowing to inform the cuckolded emperor, Saturninus.

Recently, these sudden moments of voice from Lavinia drew the attention of
Philippa Berry. She finds a sign of rhetorical value in Lavinia’s words. In the lines just
quoted, Berry points out the echoing on horning that takes place. For Berry, Lavinia (and
at the same time Tamora) participates in a “feminine rhetorical performance that is
explicitly figured as echoic with both female sexuality and the violence of physical
extinction graphically staged” (51). In Lavinia’s speeches in this scene, Berry notes a trait
that was invisible and unexpected from the Lavinia in act one. In her accusation of
Tamora, Lavinia’s echo of the subject, already provided by Tamora and Bassianus with a
“play on ‘horning’ [. . .] shows knowing wit.” Berry admits this “wit” could also be cause
for Lavinia’s demise, though for Berry this is only clear after the “terrible ensuing events,
which result in the death of Bassianus and her own complete silencing by rape and
mutilation” (52-53).

Coppélia Kahn adds to this discussion, expressing that not only do Lavinia’s
words show a rhetorical wit, but Lavinia also “supplies a precipitating cause for the rape”
(53). According to Kahn, by insulting Tamora, Lavinia “implies her own unspotted
chastity” (Kahn 53). This implication is complicated for those who see Lavinia’s words
as far from proper for a lady. For example, Lavinia attacks Tamora “with fierce assertions
[. . .] that a ‘properly’ chaste woman would not have pronounced if not blushingly”
(Antonucci 126). Lavinia’s chastity is implied in her accusations, which come back to
haunt her, however, these words cannot be construed as responsible for her fate. Chiron
and Demetrius, as the audience is well aware, have already planned Lavinia’s impending doom. In the beginning of the scene, Aaron reminds us of this fact by saying to Tamora that Bassianus’s “Philomel must lose her tongue today, / Thy sons make pillage of her chastity” (2.3.43-44). Even before Lavinia’s rhetorical attacks on Tamora—whether identified as witty, ill advised, or both—the audience is aware of the danger lurking nearby in the forest.

Jessica Lugo notes that Philomela “does nothing to deserve her mutilation,” and because of this suggests, “Shakespeare takes care to remedy this quickly in his adaptation by giving her [Lavinia] a character that tempts fate and defies the boundaries of reasonable defiance” (409). Until Chiron quiets her, Lavinia “is a fiery, perhaps even nasty girl quick to point out the flaws of others,” and unlike a heroine, “she has no concept of decorum in her speech, and remains unable to keep from flaunting her sharp tongue” (Lugo 409). Apparently for Lugo, Lavinia’s actions somehow lead to her mutilation. Several scholars take issue with Lavinia’s voice in this scene considering it as following a continuous pattern throughout the entire scene. For example, Aebischer claims that Lavinia’s “brutal silencing is the consequence of her vocal and sexual assertiveness” (44). These claims have two major flaws.

The first error is the expectation of a certain level of “propriety” at a time in Titus Andronicus when anything approaching what is proper has already broken down. Most scholars agree that Lavinia’s words are not necessarily choice, but can they actually be considered Lavinia’s own words in the first place? Lavinia in the first speech is merely, though effectively, joining in the echoing of the theme that Bassianus initiated. And far from any attempt at decorum herself, Tamora quickly echoes Bassianus. It is only after
both characters have offered their thoughts that Lavinia joins in. The set tenor and the theme provide Lavinia with the prompts she needs, and she simply takes them forward—though notably with at least as much wit and force as the initial speakers that supplied them. Being a wife and with her husband at her side, Lavinia was given the “right” to speak up. Where previously Lavinia was merely an object of beauty to be looked upon and then traded as a “changing piece,” Shakespeare has now provided her with a new freedom, albeit one that requires a man’s accompaniment. The “improper” subject of their accusations is set by the situation that Lavinia and Bassianus walked up on, by Bassianus’s first words and Tamora’s nasty response; Lavinia has no other choice but to continue in the manner already established.

This leads to a second issue with the main theories regarding Lavinia’s words in this scene. Lugo, like other scholars, considers Lavinia’s language to be comparable throughout the exchange. What this line of thinking fails to consider is that the Lavinia died the instant that Bassianus was killed. From a wife, whose aggressive echoing is clearly supported and validated by Bassianus’s presence, Lavinia goes through yet another change in identity. Not only is Lavinia now a widow, but also she now sees the true danger she is in, and this time there is no husband with which to bravely stand. Left to her own devices, Lavinia turns from echoing, to pleading for some level of mercy. In doing this, she takes on the part of the useless pleader once played by Tamora, clearly revised and accomplished by Lavinia.

Some find power in Lavinia’s lines that follow Bassianus’s murder, as Lavinia searches for some sign of hope. Lavinia’s knee-jerk reaction when Bassianus is killed right before her eyes continues the previous concern with Tamora’s fidelity, but shifts
quickly to Tamora’s barbarity. Lavinia cries, “Aye, come, Semiramis, nay, barbarous Tamora, / For no name fits thy nature but thy own” (2.3.118-119). This outburst may fit the “fiery” language of the previous accusations, but the reaction is clearly understandable. Through Lavinia’s eyes, Tamora has just incited her sons to murder Bassianus. Tamora almost kills Lavinia instantly, but the sons intervene and remind Tamora of their plans for Lavinia. Demetrius attacks Lavinia’s virtues (interestingly the opposite of Bassianus’s and Lavinia’s attack on Tamora):

This minion stood upon her chastity,
Upon her nuptial vow, her loyalty,
And with that painted hope braves your mightiness.
And shall she carry this unto her grave? (2.3.124-27)

These words are enough to convince Tamora to let Lavinia live for the moment. A few lines later, as if it was not already clear, Chiron notifies Lavinia, that “now perforce we will enjoy / That nice-preservèd honesty of yours” (2.3.134-35).

Lavinia’s voice takes on a new tone as she attempts to plead not for her life, but for death and the preservation of her chastity. In these lines of pleading and attempting to persuade unreasonable creatures, the character of Lavinia is truly revealed. Her cleverness is evidenced in her ability to rely on her own mind to attempt to influence her enemies. One by one, Lavinia turns from the mother, Tamora, to her sons, Chiron and Demetrius, to find some level of decency. After failing to appeal to Tamora’s womanhood, Lavinia turns to Chiron and Demetrius—“Sweet lords, entreat her hear me but a word” (2.3.138). After hearing Chiron’s plan and Tamora’s approval for him and his brother to take “the honey [they] desire” to sate their lust (2.3.131), Lavinia is forced
to beg. In her attempts to detect a speck of mercy, Lavinia struggles in and out of hope in pleading with the two boys; the hopeful “O, do not learn her wrath” quickly becomes despair when she realizes that “Even at thy teat thou hadst thy tyranny,” before returning to hope yet again (2.3.143, 145). Showing some optimism, she says, “Yet every mother breeds not sons alike,” turns to Chiron and pleads “Do thou entreat her show a woman pity” (2.3.146-47). But these words have no effect, and Lavinia shows her wit by trying another tactic.

Lavinia next turns to lore in an attempt to reason with her enemies. While she finds little hope that Tamora could have born children any different than herself, she remembers the story of “The lion, moved with pity, [that] did endure / To have his princely paws pared all away” (2.3.152-53), and then of ravens who will help “forlorn children,” rather than their own offspring (2.3.152-55). Though she stands in utter despair when her words have little chance of swaying the Goths to kindness, she begs that they will at least show her some pity. But, Tamora will have none of it and she reminds Lavinia of Titus’s refusal to show any mercy to Alarbus as Tamora knelt begging for his life. Lavinia attempts to clarify that having “died” when Bassianus was killed, she is not asking for her life to be spared; Lavinia cries, “’Tis present death I beg, and one thing more / That womanhood denies my tongue to tell” (2.3.174-75). Though she hopes to save herself from rape and her body from being exposed, she is no longer Lugo’s “fiery [. . .] nasty girl” that began this scene. Having been widowed, it seems there is now a limit to how far her voice will go. She asks simply that they kill her and hide her body from man’s view. But regardless of this new tone, Tamora does not budge and coldly states,
“let them satisfy their lust on thee,” showing that her cruelty is in tune with Aaron, who devised this plan in the first place (2.3.181).

As if surprised by Tamora’s lack of sympathy, Lavinia begins, “No grace? No womanhood?” (2.3.183), but these questions are rhetorical, and Lavinia simultaneously realizes that her fate is sealed. Only now does she return to insults that are just as true as her words were when alongside Bassianus: “Ah, beastly creature, / The blot and enemy to our general name,” and finally turns to curse Tamora beginning “Confusion fall” (2.3.183-85). It is at this moment that Chiron “stop[s her] mouth” (2.3.186). Ironically this curse—Lavinia’s final words—does not affect Tamora, Chiron, and Demetrius, but descends on the Andronici instead. As Lavinia is dragged off to her doom, Tamora reminds the boys to “see that [they] make her sure” and announces this is only the beginning of her vengeance as she vows again that she will not be satisfied until “all the Andronici be made away” (2.3.189, 191). Leaving the stage, as if to excuse her sons’ actions, Tamora returns to the concept of Lavinia as a whore in calling her a “trull” despite admitting that the boys will “deflower” Lavinia (2.3.193).

The exchange as Lavinia pleads for her life results in mixed reviews from scholars. Antonucci praises Lavinia for “verbally defend[ing] herself,” mistakenly claiming that she “does not succumb until her tongue is cut out” (127)—which of course does not happen on stage when she is silenced here. Though Lavinia is forced to succumb when her mouth is stopped by Chiron, there is overwhelming appreciation for the young widow’s ability to speak up on her own behalf—an ability she did not have the power to use throughout act one. Unfortunately for Lavinia, the violence and the atrocities of the Goths are exposed to the audience, which is aware that Aaron’s plan will be carried
through, and Lavinia “will lose her tongue” just as Philomela did. For some, Lavinia’s ability to show ingenuity in speech creates further motive for this to be the end; “where the removal of Philomela’s tongue serves a purely utilitarian purpose, [. . .] Lavinia’s potential cleverness is a threat which simply must be silenced” (Lugo 490). Lugo’s point is interesting, but not quite convincing. Lavinia’s “potential cleverness,” at least to this point, is in her rhetorical skill. In essence Lugo’s claim is Lavinia’s spoken words could prove dangerous to the Goths. However, though witty and resourceful, Lavinia’s pleas, like every other spoken plea in Titus Andronicus, have no effect upon the intended hearers. Carducci notes, “As we move away from the orderly Roman civilization into the anarchy of the wilderness, [. . .] old Roman oratory [has become] useless” (2). I would narrow this claim some and suggest that it is only true for the Andronici in this play. Realization of the loss of language comes to each of the Andronici as they find their own words are of no use, while others still seem to wield the power of voice. This will be evident continuing through the next two acts.

For Lavinia, from this point on, silence is all there is—spoken language is lost, but it does not matter in a world where the spoken words of the Andronici no longer have the power to name on their own or even to comfort one another. In a world where pleading leads to nothing and language proves completely ineffectual, something else must take its place. While Harris praises Lavinia’s silence in the first act and argues that “the only way to truly disarm [Lavinia] is to take away her ability to choose silence” (390), the forced silence of the rest of this play suggests Harris may be placing too much emphasis on Lavinia’s actual ability to choose. Leggatt points out, “In silencing [Lavinia, Chiron and Demetrius] have inadvertently made her the most powerful character in the
play” (*Shakespeare’s Tragedies*, 8). When silence pervades, physical presence becomes inescapably powerful and the only words to trust will be those that are written and/or read by the Andronici. Understanding Lavinia’s many labels and names leads to an appreciation of just how effective and powerful she becomes as she reenters the play. She is no longer solely defined by the words of others, but by the ability of the Goths to physically transform her through action. As Lavinia struggles to find her voice, she must do so in silence. As others attempt to name her, she slowly gains power. The difficulty for the reader of *Titus* is that Lavinia’s power is silent; it is only by witnessing her physical presence on the stage in performance that Lavinia’s strength can be fully realized.

### 2. Lavinia’s Silent Ascent

The significance of act two, scene four in *Titus Andronicus* is that the scene introduces the audience to a central problem of the play. Now that Lavinia is not an ornament, an item of exchange, a chaste bride, or a pleading widow, how is she to be understood and labeled? What is Lavinia’s potential value for the men, if she can no longer adorn them? Throughout the rest of the play, the characters and the audience are forced time and again to find the answers to these questions. As the scene begins, Chiron and Demetrius attempt to name Lavinia’s new identity.

Recall the image presented at the beginning of this essay of Chiron and Demetrius entering the stage at the start of 2.4, bloody and beaming with accomplishment, following the all too gruesome figure of what was once the image and standard of chastity and beauty. This image defies any attempt to soften the utter brutality of the moment more than any other representation of Lavinia’s entrance. And while Lavinia remains silent, it
is the Tamora’s sons who break the silence with words as deplorable as the violence they commit. The value of these words is given little significance beyond being despicable. However, it is boys’ unsuccessful attempts to continue to re-create Lavinia with words, which leads to the realization that Lavinia can no longer be named or fashioned by the words of others.

Chiron and Demetrius begin the scene with ten lines attempting to define Lavinia by all that she cannot do and by what they have so brutally taken from her. They completely underestimate her potential for meaning. Thinking that they followed Tamora’s command to “make [Lavinia] sure” (2.3.189), the boys forget their mother’s initial directive: “Let not this wasp outlive us both to sting” (2.3.132). Demetrius begins, “So, now go tell, an if thy tongue can speak, / Who ’twas that cut thy tongue and ravished thee” (2.4.1-2). Like Philomela, Lavinia’s tongue has been removed to quiet the victim. Chiron mockingly points out that Lavinia does not have Philomela’s option to identify her attackers either. Chiron and Demetrius believe they removed her ability to “play the scribe” by taking her hands (2.4.4). Their plan is to “leave her to her silent walks” (2.4.8), assuming that if she could, she would play the part of the traditional “violated woman” of revenge tragedies and “kill herself for the sake of ‘honour’” (Wynne-Davies 215). Lavinia must be able to name her rapists before she can go through this “final step” in the tradition of revenge tragedies, and Chiron and Demetrius are convinced this cannot happen. Lavinia remains instead, between life and death, between rape and suicide. The Goths’ mistake is not realizing that tradition will prevail. In going beyond their own source in Ovid, by cutting off Lavinia’s hands, in addition to her tongue, they have unwittingly created the same possibility for Lavinia to outgrow her precursor. Their
belief that they broke the cycle of tradition is an underestimation of the power tradition holds.

Chiron and Demetrius make their exit with a false sense of security. Lavinia cannot speak and cannot kill herself; therefore, to Tamora’s sons (and possibly the audience) “her function as a meaningful entity appears to end” (Wynne-Davies 215). Those who meet Lavinia in this state verify this conclusion. One by one, the remaining Andronici cannot seem to understand or define a meaning in Lavinia. Berry attempts to explain the inability to translate the state of Lavinia’s mutilated body, one which is apparently dead, but also living; “as an oxymoronic spectacle of lively death, the mutilated, dying or dead female body defies any simplicity of visual response or ‘discovery’ on the part of the human observer towards the sphere of matter” (81). When there is no thinkable response, the Andronici, as Tamora’s sons have just done, attempt to name Lavinia time and again, only to realize that she has escaped the realm of something or someone who is to be named. As Liz Oakley-Brown states, “raped and dismembered, Lavinia has been violently fashioned into a problematic sign [. . .] and this [becomes] a matter for debate for the male characters who surround her” (27). By physically breaking down Lavinia, Chiron and Demetrius create a symbol that is beyond the capabilities of language. The purpose of a sign is to be read and understood as portraying and providing meaning of some other larger concept. Lavinia serves as such a sign. As the play moves forward, the Andronici and the audience watching the play are forced by the presence of Lavinia’s body on the stage to continually reinterpret their understanding of her meaning.

A few scholars attempt to pin down some level of an identity or value in Lavinia’s character at this point. Cynthia Marshall, for example, suggests that Lavinia, from the
moment she returns to the stage ravished and mutilated serves as the “emblem” of her rape because the “violence itself is not [and cannot be] shown on stage” (127). This may be so for the audience, the problem for the Andronici is that they are unaware of whether she has been raped or not, and cannot find the appropriate response. Though Marcus initially guesses that she has been raped, he just as soon forgets this thought. The truth that she has been raped will not be revealed until Lavinia turns to the pages in Ovid and inscribes the names of her rapists in the sand. At this point she will finally be able to establish herself as the impetus for revenge.

Katherine A. Rowe suggests that Lavinia is incapable of her own meaning and “undergoes a [. . .] radical loss of the signs and instruments of agency. In losing her hands, Lavinia [. . .] loses the ability to do for herself [. . .] Loss of these means represents a contingent loss of self-representation, of the capacity to ‘bewray’ her own meaning” (295). Not only does Lavinia eventually defy this logic by “bewraying” the identities of her attackers, her body on the stage consistently acts to create meaning beyond and through her silence. A sign or symbol in its essence, begs to be translated into an understood concept or truth. The fact that her body can be seen as providing for a multitude of possible meanings, works to powerfully illuminate Lavinia’s power in demanding to be seen and known, while denying to be defined or created by the words of others. The difficulty of this enigma can be seen in Marcus’s drawn out initial reaction to finding her in this state.

Upon seeing Lavinia, Marcus is astonished and mortified: “If I do dream, would all my wealth would wake me; / If I do wake, some planet strike me down / That I may slumber in eternal sleep” (2.4.13-15). Unaware that she has also lost her tongue, he begs
her to name the “ungentle hand” that took her own (2.4.16). Unable to speak directly of her perceived injury, Marcus turns to metaphor and simile, likening her lost hands to branches of a tree that have been lopped off, and then to “ornaments” which kings have yearned for (2.4.18-19). This reaction becomes even more awkward when Marcus, upon seeing that she has also lost her tongue, opts to describe every detail of the blood pouring from her mouth:

Alas, a crimson river of warm blood,
Like to a bubbling fountain stirred with wind,
Doth rise and fall between thy rosèd lips,
Coming and going with thy honey breath. (2.3.22-25)

For some, Marcus’s odd descriptions here seem detached and weak because they work to “minimalize” the true nature of her bloody situation (Barber and Wheeler 96). Alternatively, John Russell Brown suggests “the obviously contrived words identify what is present for all to see and so lead an audience to think carefully through every aspect of her condition” (20). Rather than minimizing the severity of her condition, Marcus’s words actually force the audience to delve deeper into Lavinia’s meaning. In fact, as he searches for some understanding, his first instinct is that she has been raped—“sure some Tereus has deflow’red thee” (2.4.26). Aptly, Marcus seems to recognize the intention alluded to by Aaron and Tamora’s sons initially in 2.1. It is this vision that engrosses his every thought for the next seventeen lines.

Seeing Lavinia is blushing, even while losing so much blood, suggests to Marcus that Lavinia is ashamed of her current state. Understanding that like Philomela, Lavinia’s tongue has been cut “lest [she] shouldst detect” her attacker, Marcus offers to “speak for”
Lavinia and wishes he “knew [her] heart, and knew the beast, / so that [he] might rail at [the beast]” (2.4.27, 33, 34-35). But it also occurs to him that he is dealing with “A craftier Tereus” in taking away Philomela’s mode of communication, by removing “those pretty fingers” and her tongue (2.4.41-42). Arnold suggests this shows that “Marcus, to be sure, knows that Lavinia has been raped [. . .] but the mystery of the rapists’ identities bedevils” him, and eventually, the Andronici (119). Marcus soon seems to lose or forget this “knowledge,” which is confusing. Kahn suggests that Lavinia’s “blush” at Marcus’s comparison of her to Philomela “implicitly confirm[s] his suspicions” (158). In spite of this, somehow he only understands that she is ashamed to be seen in this state and pays no attention to her blush as a response to his specific suggestion and his focus shifts to defining that which she has lost (158). Marcus cannot understand how anyone who knew, or met, Lavinia, could have mutilated her in such a way; he suggests if the “monster” had only seen her fingers play the lute, he would not have cut them off, or had he heard her sing, he would not have taken her tongue (2.4.44-51). Finally his focus turns to how this will affect Titus, only returning to her condition in a brief wish that “mourning [could] ease [Lavinia’s] misery” (2.4.57). Marcus’s reactions seem odd or insufficient in the face of such atrocity on the pages of the play text.

Some scholars find that his words may be understood as negatively affecting Lavinia. Romeo argues that when “Marcus [. . .] offers to speak for [Lavinia], [he is] denying her once and for all the possibility to express herself” (88). Romeo does not consider that spoken language in this play has lost the ability to truly create meaning, and her body on the stage does more to express her shame and pain than any one of Marcus’s words. Aebischer discusses the inadequacy of Marcus’s speech in “metaphorical
‘translation’ of pain into poetry” and suggests that the play offers “clusters of images that politicize Lavinia as ‘Rome’s rich ornament’ in ways that work to gloss over, sublime and ultimately negate her physical pain and suffering” (28). This is understandable since Marcus’s hopes are to end his own pain and suffering—he wants to know the “beast” who’s done this to Lavinia so he “can ease [his] mind” and not Lavinia’s pain (2.4.35).

Once again, Peter Brook found Marcus’s speech to be so problematic that it was cut entirely from his 1955 production. He chose instead to focus solely on the presence of Lavinia on stage in his Stratford production, importantly showing the power of the image of her body. As Jonathan Bate points out, while many following productions did not completely cut Marcus, they did tend to severely cut the speech (“Staging,” 104-5). While Brooks’ decision to portray the entrance through Vivien Leigh’s stylized representation of Lavinia with ribbons flowing like blood is brilliant and powerful, cutting Marcus entirely out of the scene takes away from the possible power of his poetic response. Bate finds value in Marcus’s reactions to being confronted with Lavinia’s mutilated body. After seeing Deborah Warner’s production, which began in 1987 at the Swan in Stratford-upon-Avon, Bate came to realize that “Marcus needs a long speech [. . .] to learn slowly and painfully to confront suffering” (“Staging,” 106). He goes on to suggest this “lyrical speech” is also necessary “because it is only when an appropriately inappropriate language has been found that the sheer force of contrast between beauty and Lavinia’s degradation begins to express what she has undergone and lost” (“Staging,” 106). Though the audience clearly understands the impact of what Lavinia has “undergone and lost”—the audience is in fact well aware—there is strength in the language’s “appropriate inappropriateness.” While Marcus’s poetry in the scene makes
facing the mutilation and rape on the stage difficult for some audiences, for others it has a
positive effect. Marshal writes that the “narrative ordering must occur for Lavinia’s plight
to become the occasion for sympathy” (127). The Andronici will prove incapable of
naming Lavinia’s pain, but they are quite aware of it and clearly sympathize with her, as
misguided as their responses may be. Furthermore, the audience members sympathize
with Lavinia when they see even Vivien Leigh’s ribbed Lavinia, much less the more
gruesome and realistic visions often portrayed. So why then, if Lavinia’s body suffices in
creating emotional response and understanding for the audience, do I suggest that
Marcus’s speech is not only important, but also necessary?

The value in Marcus’s puzzling reactions and changes of focus is in what they tell
the audience. In other words, what is it that gives Marcus so much trouble and seems to
muddle his thoughts and distract him from the real urgency and pain of the situation? The
speech is necessary given Lavinia’s lack of voice and the inability of those confronted
with her body to register what is sometimes quite obvious. Detmer-Goebel highlights that
the necessity of the raped woman’s voice in distinguishing rape from abduction was clear
in the English laws since 1558, and becomes key after this second rape (i.e., the sexual
rape rather than Bassianus’s accused rape in act one). This “importance is immediately
underscored when Lavinia’s silence is mocked” in the beginning of 2.4 by Chiron and
Demetrius (Detmer-Goebel 80). Detmer-Goebel goes on to point out that though Marcus
initially mentions Lavinia’s plight in connection to Philomela, the fact that he seems to
forget this suggestion or misunderstand her blushing response, “highlights men’s ultimate
reliance on Lavinia’s words” (81). The victim of sexual rape must name the crime and
provide the identities of the attackers in order for the men (or the law) to adequately
understand and identify the crime and react appropriately. Clearly, while laws concerning rape did not differentiate between sexual violence and abduction, and only required men’s voices to be defined, sexual violence is differentiated in tragedy by the fact that the victim’s voice of nonconsent becomes necessary for the men to act.

Further, we can also look to the traditional necessity of the rape victim’s words in providing the knowledge of her attack to her would-be avengers. Men, in revenge tragedies, typically rely on the victim’s voice or words to know the appropriate reaction. Ovid’s Philomela had to create a tapestry naming Theseus before Procne’s retribution could begin. Lyly’s Lucretia (or Lucrecia) had cried out Sextus’ terrible acts before Brutus and her father could take revenge. The problem for Marcus is that Lavinia does not have the typical means (i.e., voice or hands) to “name” what has been done to her or who did it. Lavinia cannot fulfill the “normal reenactment of the rape,” because she cannot initially identify her assailants or their actions; thus the “performative transfer to patriarchal space” cannot occur, because the men’s experience is “incomplete” (Solga 63-65). Marcus is the representative of the patriarchal society (an idea not so far fetched considering he stood as “tribune and trust” of the “people of Rome” [1.1.184, 83]); it becomes clear that what makes this plight so difficult is the missing transfer. Since Marcus cannot “know” the cause of Lavinia’s condition, he cannot “rail at” her attacker and is also unable to adequately name Lavinia (2.4.35). And because he cannot name her or her value, Marcus is at a loss and can only describe what he sees. A troubling vision stands before Marcus:

far from being a retreat from the awful reality into some aesthetic distance,

[. . .] Marcus’s conceits dwell upon this figure that is to him both familiar
and strange, fair and hideous, living body and object: this is, and is not, Lavinia. (Palmer 322)

The body that demands reaction, denies any adequate option for such a response.

This idea disturbs Eugene Waith who finds “the action” of Titus Andronicus “frustrates, rather than re-enforces, the operation of poetry,” and complains that Lavinia’s mutilated body “should not block our vision,” but does and therefore makes Marcus’s Ovidian speech “unpalatable” (48, 47). This misses the central point. The operation of poetry must be frustrated at this point in the play in order for us to truly appreciate, not only what has happened to Lavinia, but more specifically, what has been destroyed in Titus’s Rome along with Lavinia’s voice. The words represent the value and power of spoken language in the mouths of the Andronici to create meaning entirely. While Marcus’s description is Ovidian in the lyrical sense, in this dramatic portrayal it simply works to reinforce what can be seen. In such a world, meaning must be made through actions and words inscribed in bronze for its inhabitants to truly understand their own purpose and find the right “words” to describe what it is they have been through. In the absence of words, Lavinia has become the “visual image of (these) inadequacies of communication” in a play where “gestures become ornaments; actions become signs” (Carducci 2). Her body on the stage will grow to “demonstrate the deterioration of Rome under Saturninus and Tamora. [A Rome where] the city, like the forest, [has] become a place where the good are victimized and rendered incapable of human speech and action” (Miola 57). And Lavinia’s “amputations [. . . will become] the incarnation of the ‘unspeakable’ of [all] the wrongs sustained by the Andronici” (Aebischer 27; 5.3.125). This “unspeakable” nature of Lavinia’s condition, unknown to the others at this
time, causes Marcus to bring Lavinia forth to “make [her] father blind” (2.4.52). Marcus realizes there is no appropriate response—he cannot name what it is that Lavinia has become, and all that he knows is her image is the stuff of nightmares. His words and efforts to name Lavinia, whether “gentle niece” or “Philomela” (2.4.16, 43), have proven insufficient. This is what forces him to forget his previous guess at the cause of her suffering and why he chooses to bring Lavinia forward to Titus with the claim “This was thy daughter” (3.1.63), as if to indicate that for him Lavinia is no longer his niece. And Titus, unaware that language will not suffice, even in naming his own, responds with the matter of fact “Why, Marcus, so she is” (3.1.64).

**Wresting an Alphabet**

By the time Lavinia reemerges on stage to greet her father, Titus has just witnessed his sons being led to their deaths for a crime they surely did not commit and learned of the banishment of his remaining son Lucius. Language is still powerful for the judges who can sentence men to death and exile them; at the same time Titus begins to realize his words have no effect. Faulted by Lucius for pleading his “sorrows to a stone,” Titus continues in hopes something will take in his words and tears (3.1.29). A man whose entire life has been symbolized by actions and command must learn how to beg for an audience, and slowly realizes his words, even if heard, would create little result or “pity,” so he resorts to “tell [his] sorrows bootless to the stones” (3.1.35-36). And after finding his words produce little effect, Titus recognizes others still possess the power his own language once promised. For example, Titus tells Lucius the “tribunes with their tongues doom men to death,” and learns “the judges have pronounced / [Lucius’] everlasting doom of banishment” (3.1.47, 50-51 emphasis added). The use of references
to tongues and pronouncements here points to the irony in the inability of Andronici’s words to affect others or to adequately define their own situation. Marcus’s re-introduction of Lavinia to Titus and Lucius returns the focus back to the visual.

When Titus sees his brother approaching, he does not at first recognize who accompanies Marcus. So even as they approach, Lavinia appears unrecognizable. After Marcus warns Titus to “prepare his noble eyes to weep” because what he has to show will “bring consuming sorrow,” Titus, hoping to be distracted from his current sorrow at the loss of his sons, commands Marcus to show him the sight sure to make his “noble heart break” (3.1.59-61). Sixty-three lines into the third act the focus returns to the difficulty of naming or fashioning Lavinia into something comprehensible or bearable. Marcus’s “This was thy daughter,” and Titus’s response, “so she is” initiates a back-and-forth between the three men on stage who consistently attempt and fail to name and therefore understand Lavinia; no name provided seems adequate in solidifying what or who Lavinia now represents.

Like Marcus when he found Lavinia, Titus now appears at a loss for an appropriate response. Lucius also cannot pinpoint a confident interpretation. After Titus’s “so she is,” Lucius only musters the term “object” to describe the mutilated Lavinia as she stands before him (3.1.64). Three different attempts to define who or what Lavinia is emerge—former daughter/niece, daughter, and object—and yet the confidence in these descriptors is fleeting. For Leggatt, these attempts illustrate that the “question is not, what has happened to [Lavinia], but, who she is?” (Shakespeare’s Tragedies, 1). Oakley-Brown suggests the exchanging of names “shows how Lavinia oscillates between the virtuous subject of daughter and violated object that defies nomenclature” (27). As
Lavinia moves in the void between her several identities, the root cause of this defining question, which begs to be answered, remains as important as the question itself. Leggatt appears to negate the naming is central, but the male characters’ inability to name her lies precisely in the fact they do not know what happened to her. This is why Titus, like Marcus before, falters and alternates in his responses. Jane S. Carducci finds that like Marcus’s speech, Titus’s “vacuous rhetoric [. . .] [is] painfully inadequate” when compared “to the speechless presence of his mutilated child” (4). However inadequate the language, it remains appropriate by reinforcing the idea language itself is powerless upon the tongues of the Andronici in the face of the all too powerful body standing before them.

Lavinia’s presence on stage demands and defies not only definition, but also a concentrated and definable male gaze in the play. Immediately after demanding Lucius “arise and look upon” Lavinia, Titus can only attempt to understand what and who she is, but because he too cannot hold that gaze demanded by her body, his focus turns to his own pain and grief just as Marcus’s focus had (3.1.65-80). And yet at the same time, the audience cannot peel their eyes from her body; words play little on their ears compared to the image of horror on the stage, not because the words are inadequate in quality, but because they further distinguish the divide between language and action. Titus complains of his grief which “now like Nilus [. . .] disdaineth bounds,” and this forces his attention to his own hands which he wants to cut off because he finds them useless whether in service to Rome or folded in “prayer” (3.1.73-74, 76). Not realizing the use Lavinia might have for her hands, Titus says simply “‘Tis well, Lavinia, that thou hast no hands, /
For hands to do Rome service is but vain’” (3.1.80-81). Titus’s attention, completely removed from the painful situation his daughter faces, turns to his own decline in Rome. Coming to some sense, Lucius recognizes briefly it is his “sister” who stands “martyr’d” before him, but the term he chooses to describe her condition demonstrates another attempt at naming (3.1.82). In Lavinia’s silence following both Titus’s and Lucius’s requests she tell them what happened to her and who did it, Marcus attempts to express his visual experiences. Though still unable to speak directly, Marcus again turns to metaphor and simile as an attempt at understanding:

O, that delightful engine of her thoughts
That blabbed them with such pleasing eloquence,
Is torn from forth that pretty hollow cage
Where, like a sweet melodious bird, it sung
Sweet varied notes, enchanting every ear! (3.1.83-87)

And because he cannot add any more knowledge concerning her condition, Marcus continues in metaphor to inform his brother and nephew of Lavinia’s attempt to hide herself from his view like a mortally wounded deer (3.1.90-91).

While Marcus’s choice to turn to metaphor here again appears less than appropriate, considering the true barbarity of her tongue being cut out and the apparent shame at being found, the language potentially acts as a barrier between these realities and the Andronici’s inability to deal with or understand them. On the other hand, Albert Tricomi argues “metaphor strives instead to unite language and action in an endeavor to render the events of tragedy even more real and painful” (12). This seems not to be the case for metaphor in Titus Andronicus. The Andonici seem to turn to metaphor as if
describing Lavinia directly would dig too deeply into their own pain. Leggatt claims this is unavoidable; “Lavinia has lost the ordinary capacity for language [. . .] and those who can still speak find their own language tainted by her loss” (“Standing Back.” 111). The language in this scene seems most “tainted” in the fact it rarely concerns Lavinia’s own needs and pain, whether physical or mental (Aebischer 26-27). Titus fares no better than Marcus. In fact, he follows Marcus’s lead and continues the deer metaphor, though here again, he turns the focus onto himself; “It was my dear, and he that wounded her / Hath hurt me more than had he killed me dead” (3.1.92-93). More important than Titus’s apparent inability to focus on Lavinia here, his choice of words is telling as he continues to attempt to reposition what Lavinia is now. Though Titus’s use of “her” shows recognition of Lavinia as human, the phrase “It was my dear” seems to counter his initial claim that “she is” his daughter. Like Marcus’s initial use of “was thy daughter” when he introduced her to Titus in her new state, the words while pointing to the fact that the deer hiding was his, also allude to the idea that this no longer represents his Lavinia.

As Titus fluctuates between Lavinia’s and his own conditions, Lavinia’s “lively body” defies a simple response (3.1.105). Titus focuses again on what Lavinia does not possess and cannot perform; his statements—“Thou hast no hands to wipe away thy tears, / Nor tongue to tell me who hath martyr’d thee”—further defines and clarifies the problem (3.1.105-6). Lavinia’s inability to comfort herself places the onus on her family standing before her. Unfortunately, since she cannot name her attackers, the men lack the ability to provide the only comfort they know—revenge. Accordingly, when he can hold some focus on Lavinia, Titus cannot grasp the appropriate action or interpretation. Notice here that, just as Lucius thirty lines earlier, Titus uses the term “martyred” to describe what
has been done to her. According to the OED, the term means “inflict[ing] (usually severe) suffering or pain on; to torment, torture” (OED\textsubscript{2}a) or “inflict[ing] wounds or disfiguring blows on (a person); to mutilate” (OED\textsubscript{2}b). Both of these definitions of the verb “martyr” make sense in this situation. Lavinia has been martyred because has been mutilated, and because she has suffered severe pain.

After offering to kiss her, Titus begs Lavinia to “make some signs how [he] may do [her] ease” (3.1.121-22). As we will find repeatedly, signs prove useless to the Andronici, as they fail here to steer Titus in the right direction. In fact, Titus’s following attempts to offer comfort show just how inept the men are at finding an appropriate response. His suggestions range from all four of them watching themselves cry into a fountain, to cutting off all of their hands, to sitting around in “dumb shows” (3.1.123-132). Realizing these acts of mourning will do no good for Titus, because he has no answer. His display of grief only makes Lavinia cry the more. Though each suggestion appears ridiculous, Titus’s offers are interesting. In the face of such tragedy, when the typical response cannot be issued, the only option is to attempt to join in the victim’s grief. His ideas for actions, rather than continuing to attempt to rename her, represent Titus realizing just how useless his own words have become, especially when responding to his own daughter. The suggestions are misguided but do carry some sense. Noticing Lucius’s attempt to dry Lavinia’s tears, Titus cries, “O, what a sympathy of woe is this: / As far from help as Limbo is from bliss!” (3.1.149-50). Titus finally realizes Lavinia’s purgatorial state represents closer proximity to hell than heaven, showing the futility in their prior efforts in lifting her up.
The first 150 lines of act three place Lavinia in a new light for the characters of the play and for the audience. Lavinia, mutilated and silent on stage, stands “available for interpretation [. . . as] an object of contemplation for her uncle Marcus, and ‘objective correlative’ for Titus’s grief, an ‘object’ the sight of which figuratively ‘kills’ Lucius” (Aebischer 28). Interestingly, whatever she has become for each of these men on the stage, they find themselves incapable of action and unable to locate a means for comfort. Lavinia’s mutilated body profoundly affects the play at this stage. Without a word of her own, she speaks volumes. Tzachi Zamir discusses the apparent contradiction:

_Titus Andronicus_ is a play of images rather than a play of words [. . .] its philosophical suggestiveness stems from a contraposition of the overwhelmingly powerful images of an amputated Lavinia mercilessly parading for a prolonged stage time, with the strenuous, at times pathetic, attempts on behalf of other characters to verbalize her pain. (277)

Interestingly, the relationship between images and words forces a certain reaction upon the audience. Faced with the constant inability of the Andronici to find the appropriate response, the audience, well aware what led to her state, must constantly consume the disturbing image and simultaneously attempt to decipher meaning in the words of those around her. As the characters repeatedly try and fail to redefine the world around them, the audience witnesses the impact of Lavinia’s physical presence on those characters and suffers along with them.

Philippa Berry suggests “in its move from ignorance to knowledge, tragic _anagnorisis_, or recognition, often involves a complex, indeed highly contradictory, visual experience: a spectacle whose semiotic instability unsettles any confidence that what is
seen can be intellectually deciphered and understood” (73). This forced recognition on the part of the Andronici requires the audience to attempt to understand what Lavinia has become in addition to what she will become for the Andronici. The constant emblem of rape for the audience, but not for the Andronici forces the audience to realize Lavinia represents more than rape. Lavinia represents a central problem to the play that requires a solution and a confident translation in order for action to move forward and Rome to find order. While Hammond views tragedy as the “failure of translation” (33), this only initiates the tragedy in *Titus Andronicus*. Through failed interpretations of others, the characters must look beyond tradition to find new means to move forward. Only by finding these means can translation succeed and tragedy find its ending. Until then, the play only provides a canvas for trials and failures both pathetic and telling.

Subsequently, Lavinia is momentarily forgotten when Titus suddenly receives an opportunity to “save” his sons, Martius and Quintus, offered by Aaron. She then begins to rejoin her family as she kneels beside her grieving father as he prays for his hand to bring back his damned sons (3.1.209). In rejoining Titus, she again demands at least part of his focus and emerges as the “weeping welkin” to his “earth” (3.1.226). When the messenger returns with the heads of her two brothers along with Titus’s severed hand, Lavinia reacts with compassion as she kisses the heads. Unlike Marcus and Lucius, who again react with words as useless as they have become, or Titus who can only laugh out loud at this nightmarish reality, Lavinia reacts with the actions of one who understands what pain is, and who once wished she had been so lucky herself to receive such reprieve from the wretched world that is now Rome.
Titus now seems to stand on the edge of his own sanity. Believing he must find the truth, he promises to “right [his family’s] wrongs” (3.1.279). Before achieving that, Marcus and Lavinia, along with Titus, must partake in the bearing of the two heads and his hand, and Lucius must go raise an army with the Goths. As Lavinia departs the stage, she takes with her Titus’s severed hand in her mouth. Some opine that this act is the grotesque display of an immature playwright intent upon shocking his audience, yet there is more at play in Lavinia’s action. Taking Titus’s hand in her mouth empowers Lavinia and does not serve to further demoralize her. Lavinia shows a new potential for action and participation she lacked earlier in the play. With all of the Andronicus’s words focused on what Lavinia lost and can no longer do, there is potential in this act of participation, a potential Lucius fails to notice, as he remains alone on the stage.

In his lone soliloquy, Lucius can only say he would rather Lavinia was as she “tofore hast been,” but he believes that “now nor Lucius nor Lavinia lives / But in oblivion and hateful griefs” (3.1.295-97). While correct in adding Lavinia’s griefs must be revenged, he fails to see the necessity of her participation in identifying her assailants and understanding what they did to her before seeking revenge.

**If Gesture Could Mean**

Jonathan Bate claims that *Titus Andronicus* “is a play concerned with giving language back to a silenced woman” (*Shakespeare and Ovid*, 117). Throughout the central scenes, the Andronicus have searched for language in Lavinia’s mutilated body. In shock from her disfigurement, they consistently misread even her most obvious signs. Kahn states that the “emphasis shifts” as we enter into the infamous fly scene of 3.2, from
Titus’s “grief to the problematics of Lavinia as signifier” (60). This creates a focus on the Andronici’s inability to read the signs Lavinia offers and their continual effort to name and define her.

Titus is beginning to understand that before Lavinia can become a signifier, she must help them in their quest to define her meaning. The symbolism of her character is beyond the grasp of those who must understand her. This realization comes slowly. At the beginning of 3.2, the family sits to dine and Titus points out his connection to Lavinia, both lacking the hands to “passionate [their] tenfold grief / With folded arms” as Marcus is doing (3.2.6-7). Although seemingly insignificant, this line is important. Titus realizes that language for Lavinia is more limited than he initially understood. As Adrian Curtin notices, Lavinia, though she “continues to gesticulate” to no avail, lacks “the hands with which to gesture” (54). Lavinia has lost the “tools” of creation—writing, speaking, and gesturing. Her language must be recreated, but the Andronici fail to see or understand that it is Lavinia who must provide it, despite her insufficiencies. Most importantly, Harris and Kahn argue that Titus’s first words towards Lavinia in the “fly scene” provide her only potential to be the signifier. Rather than understanding Lavinia’s capability to create, Titus continues to see her only potential as something to be read.

Titus begins his address by pointing to exactly these two things. He calls Lavinia, a “map of woe, that thus dost talk in signs” (3.2.12). As a “map,” to be read, Lavinia offers little direction for her father. As if missing the key, Titus is unable to find any meaning, but the obvious sadness she portrays. David Palmer suggests that the audience is aware that “Titus’s passion is a continued struggle, not merely to endure the unendurable, but to express the inexpressible” (330). But what makes Lavinia’s position
or meaning inexpressible? Perhaps, the men continue to solely look internally to their
own grief to understand Lavinia’s pain. Titus sees that Lavinia talks in signs, however, he
considers them as little more than tools of grief, and not as active agents in creating
meaning. As Leggatt suggests about 3.1, “desperate for dialogue, the family goes from
questioning Lavinia to trying to supply the answers she would give” by reading her
reactions; but Marcus and Titus fail, which shows that “any reading of Lavinia [including
our own] could be wrong” (Shakespeare’s Tragedies, 19-20). Though Kahn is correct to
notice that more attention is being paid to reading Lavinia, Titus continues to look to his
own anguish as central and necessary for achieving an understanding of Lavinia’s
language. Since Lavinia has no communication other than her “unreadable” signs, Titus,
like the others, in “trying desperately to read Lavinia [. . .] reads only himself” (Leggatt,
Shakespeare’s Tragedies, 21). What Titus and his brother are missing is the concept of
any potential within Lavinia to provide her own meaning.

For Titus, Lavinia’s current potential lies in symbolic suicide. He thinks her
“sighs” and “groans” have the potential to quiet her heart which beats with grief. For
Titus, Lavinia’s tears may help to drown her heart entirely (3.2.15-20). Rather than
understanding the possibility of agency, Titus attempts to fashion Lavinia as a mere
picture whose only potential power is in displaying and reacting to woe. Kim Solga sees
more in his words; Titus’s instructions on suicide are “less teaching Lavinia about suicide
than he is trying to teach her how she might, despite her limitations, play Lucrece instead
of Philomela and bring her performance of the ravished heroine to its inevitable
conclusion” (66). This suggestion does not take into account is the necessity of the telling
of the rape before Lucrece’s option of suicide is available to Lavinia, regardless of
whether or not Lavinia could actually take her own life. It is evident that Titus is simply speaking of that which cannot be achieved, something that becomes common as he moves further from the realm of possibility. Lavinia’s tears can no more drown the “lamenting fool” in her chest, than Titus’s arrows can reach the gods later in the play (3.2.20). However, it is exactly Titus’s unwillingness to consider only clear “possibility” that soon leads him to realize Lavinia’s potential to create meaning. In his very next speech, Titus begins to suggest his growing awareness.

When Lavinia will not drink, Titus boasts that he “can interpret all her marty’rd signs” (3.2.26), but his reading shows little promise of this ability. Again, he returns to the odd quality he associates with tears. He claims Lavinia “drinks no other drink but tears” (3.2.37), suggesting some hopeful healing power in tears to quell sadness if imbibed. Titus is threatened to continue with the established pattern in which Lavinia’s signs “are largely indeterminate, although this does not prevent [. . .] (male) characters from (mis)reading her” (Curtin 54). Two lines later, Titus reveals that he understands his own limitations as a reader of signs. By calling Lavinia “a speechless complainer,” Titus admits he cannot read her signs, so he vows to “learn [her] thoughts” (3.2.39). Titus finally sees the potential ability for Lavinia to create meaning. In the next few lines he outlines the tools that she has. Titus finally realizes what the audience has seen all along in the constant presence of Lavinia’s body on the stage. Lavinia’s potential for meaning is in her sighs, handless gestures, facial expressions, and physical actions; from these tools, Titus vows he “will wrest an alphabet / And by still practice learn to know [Lavinia’s] meaning” (3.2.44-45). This moment of clarity, in which Titus realizes his own limitations in understanding Lavinia, shows he finally understands that Lavinia must
make meaning through unconventional means. But before he can act on it, once again, Titus becomes distracted.

The interruption of his focus on Lavinia comes in the famous killing of a fly. Titus’s initial lambasting of Marcus for killing the “Poor harmless fly,” who likely had a family, is easily distracted by the suggestion that the fly is like the Moor, Aaron (3.2.63-68). Marcus sees Titus losing touch and understands that “Grief has so wrought on him / He takes false shadows for true substances” (3.2.79-80). Titus’s willingness to join in the mutilation of the fly shows his rage at Aaron and Tamora, but, more significant, is what these words and actions reveal about all of the men’s limitations thus far. Over and over, the Andronici, especially Titus, have read Lavinia in a similar way just as Titus “(mis)read” the fly. Kahn suggests “Lavinia unwittingly disrupted language by conveying meanings she did not intend” (61). But, it is not Lavinia who has disrupted language. Instead, it is the very characters that attempt to create meanings for Lavinia who obstruct the interpretation of her being. Because language failed before she became the “map of woe,” the audience recognizes the unlikelihood of the Andronici’s success in defining Lavinia’s pain with the appropriate words. The problem lies in her body’s refusal to be translated, or, at least, the ability of others to read her signs. This denial is what leads Lavinia’s family over and over to attempt to find the words in their own sorrow; while they can feel sympathy for Lavinia, they cannot empathize because they have no clear picture of what she has been through. The question this scene leaves is which Titus is next—Titus intent on “wresting an alphabet” from Lavinia’s own actions, or the one who finds only “false shadows” of his own grief projected onto Lavinia and takes them “for true substance?”
A Return to the Masters

Language for the characters is ineffective and the ability to read the signs is far from attainable. On its own, Lavinia’s body has been “beyond the taming power of linguistic tropes, [and] a reservoir of half-glimpsed truths and insufficient syllables, a dwelling place and expression of cries for vengeance, a cipher for disclosure and a source of revelations that extend beyond her” (Cunningham 73); however, the required disclosure has proven impossible. So long as Lavinia is unable to provide the “words” the Andronici so desperately need, her body on the stage serves as a powerful reminder of her painful experience only for the audience. For the Andronici, she is only a sign of their own pain. In the beginning of 4.1 Lavinia’s “missing hands are [still] ‘letters’ or ‘tydings’ whose mute silence marks and conveys the loud voices of her conquerors” (Goldstein 122). This quickly changes when Lavinia provides the Andronici with the vocabulary to read her by finally communicating with a method thought to require the hands that she is missing, and for this she turns to Ovid and a little help from her uncle.

Bate defines the next scene as possibly Shakespeare’s “most self-consciously literary moment” (Shakespeare and Ovid, 103), as Ovid is physically brought onto the stage in the form of a book. As if Lavinia suddenly discovers her voice, 4.1 begins with her chasing Young Lucius onto the stage, his hands full of books. Again Marcus is attempting to understand her signs, but this time, he seems to finally recognize her truth when he notices her attention is on Young Lucius. Attempting to calm the boy, Marcus reminds Young Lucius how his aunt read to him of “Sweet poetry and Tully’s Orator,” and asks the boy if he can “guess wherefore she plies [him] thus?” (4.1.14-15). Unfortunately, Young Lucius is not any better in his interpretation of Lavinia than his
grandfather or uncle; his guess is she has been driven “mad,” like “Hecuba of Troy” because of her “sorrow” (4.1.20-21). At this moment the audience’s attention is drawn to Lavinia shuffling through books upon the ground.

Strangely, Titus becomes the perceptive character that we saw only briefly earlier in the play. Upon seeing Lavinia rifling through the books, Titus orders them opened, and, as if by accident, he stumbles over the topic Lavinia is focused on. Thinking she simply wants to read to pass the time, Titus offers his own library so that Lavinia may “so beguile [her] sorrow, till the heavens / Reveal the damned contriver of this deed” (4.1.35-36); still not looking for the revelation to come from Lavinia, Titus places his hopes in the gods. As Lavinia raises each of her stumps, Marcus, in typical fashion, initially gets it right, but immediately offers an alternative answer: “I think she means that there were more than one / Confederate in the fact. Ay, more there was, / Or else to heaven she heaves them for revenge” (4.1.39-41). Lavinia finally locates the source of her voice as she focuses in on Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*. Titus identifies the poem Lavinia flips to clumsily with her stumps as “the tragic tale of Philomel, / [Which] treats of Tereus’ treason and his rape” and finally comes to the apt conclusion that “rape [. . .] was root of [Lavinia’s] annoy” (5.1.49-51). Upon further pressing the question, Lavinia is able to sign the affirmative and, again Lavinia has a voice and her answers are finally translated correctly. She, like Philomela, was “Forced in the ruthless, vast and gloomy woods” (4.1.55). Now that the crime is apparent, Titus must determine who committed it.

In questioning, “What Roman lord it was,” Titus’s first guess is the possibility of Saturninus that “as Tarquin erst / [. . .] left the camp to sin in Lucrece’ bed” (4.1.65-66). For Danielle A. St. Hilaire, by
reading in Lavinia’s mangled body the story of Philomela [. . .] [Titus] starts to repair the damage by reconnecting Lavinia to her tradition, comparing her to Livy’s Lucrece, another chaste, innocent woman raped by an iniquitous man. (323)

While confident that the Philomela tale describes the events and the place of Lavinia’s attack, Titus is not certain which classical part Lavinia is to play—is this Philomela or Lucrece that stands before him? In order to answer this question, Titus must know the identities of the attackers. In the next moment, Marcus finds Lavinia’s next tool for language, and shows her how she may write the offender’s name by taking his staff in her mouth and guiding it with her feet. She writes in the sand using her stumps as guides instead of her feet—“Stuprum, Chiron, Demetrius” (4.1.80).

Some scholars argue that it is the men who create language in this scene and, because Marcus teaches Lavinia the new method of communication, Lavinia’s personal agency is removed. For example, Romeo suggests Lavinia’s final voice is a “patriarchal stick” in her mouth (88). There is more to this than the power of the patriarchal pole being held in a suggestive manner in her mouth; it is the moment of creation briefly returning to the realm of language. Cunningham describes the scene as one of “self-translation [. . .] exposing ‘the traitors and the truth,’ and verifying both with her body” (74; 4.1.76). Lavinia’s act of joining her “hands” with the text effectively “remake[s] Ovid [. . .] into a commenter on her fate [. . . by] transform[ing] herself into a writing instrument” as she translates her body’s meaning (Cunningham 74). Kahn adds that Lavinia “passes from a state of liminality and passivity to an active role as communicator of her own meaning” (58). Lavinia has had no say in making her own meaning from the
very beginning. When the play began, men of power bestowed names upon Lavinia, but all the names were removed by Chiron and Demetrius. Since her rape and mutilation, Lavinia has served as a body of text in need of translation that has been continually misread and spoken for. For the first time since her mutilation, Lavinia has “spoken” and been heard.

Still others point to Renaissance education, where it was namely boys and men who carried Latin, and yet, Lavinia shows that she can read and write Latin. Agreeing with Detmer-Goebel, Oakley-Brown claims that Lavinia actually becomes the translator of Latin; the use of “stuprum” shows not “the ‘fact’ of [Lavinia’s] rape” alone, but also that Lavinia “is capable of close textual analysis and [. . .] can critically use Latin” (34). Notably, while the men have continuously failed to offer any reliable translations, it is Lavinia who finally creates a link to Rome’s tragic past by acting as Rome’s current master poet / interpreter. This mastery is further explained by understanding that the word “stuprum” is a word “not found in Philomela’s story. [. . .] this term for unchastity (possibly through rape, possibly in the context of the fable) is used only once in Metamorphosis, Book 2, the story of Callisto” (Detmer-Goebel 86). In the context of Metamorphosis, after Callisto was raped by Jove and is found pregnant, Juno calls his wife “‘Stupri’ as if calling her ‘whore’” (86). Thus “stuprum” instead of “raptus” shows “Lavinia does more than identify the crime,” because the choice of the word “is suggestive not only of her sense of shame; it also testifies to the consequence of her defilement” (Detmer-Goebel 86). What Lavinia has shown is not just that she can finally “speak,” but that she can do so efficiently and intelligently through the use of learned interpretation and translation.
In less than a hundred lines, Lavinia’s potential for meaning is realized. Ironically, she is exactly what Chiron and Demetrius bragged that she could not be and identifies them. By writing in the sand with the pole in her mouth guided by her stumps, “Lavinia’s lips do speak; her handless hands, indeed do write!” (Tricomi 16). In a play noted (and often criticized) for its over-abundance of words, it takes only a quick nod to Ovid to finally provide the pattern and precedent for revenge, and only three words to further clarify the severity of that precedent and the direction that revenge should take. Antonucci suggests the choice of Metamorphosis provides this pattern and alludes to the precedent. More importantly Antonucci proposes that this shows Lavinia’s choice of text “speaks on her behalf, showing that she does not claim suicide for herself,” but simply “suggests a literary precedent to channel revenge” (127). Rather than moving forward to avenge Lavinia, for the men, Ovid is not enough. Lavinia has provided the words to speak her crime, and yet the men must assume the power of creation from her once she named her attackers.

Titus has already turned to Livy, but next it is Seneca he invokes; “Magni dominator poli, / Tam lentus audis scelera, tam lentus vides?” (4.1.83-84). He begs to know why the gods were so slow to point them in the direction of their revenge. Next Marcus will return to Livy:

And swear with me—as, with the woeful fere
And father of that chaste dishonored dame,
Lord Junius Brutus swore for Lucrece’ rape—
That we will prosecute by good advice
Mortal revenge upon these traitorous Goths,
And see their blood, or die with this reproach. (4.1.91-96)

Titus knows this will not be an easy revenge. It will take cunning, and so as not to forget their cause, he “will go get a leaf of brass / And with a gad of steel will write these words” that will soon be lost in the wind-blown sand (4.1.104-5). This act chimes with the remembrance and recognition of how ineffective spoken language is up to this point. The constant returns to the classics in this scene are the only words that suffice. Titus is aware that it is the word’s permanence within the text that gives them power. So, to avoid losing the three words like a whisper in the wind bound never to echo, he will etch them in brass so that Lavinia’s written words, like those of the Roman poets, will be made permanent and therefore powerful. This realization is apparent again in the next scene when the weapons inscribed with Titus’s message recalling lines from Horace are gifted to Lavinia’s rapists; the gifts lead to another episode of misreading by Chiron and Demetrius.

For four scenes, the challenge of translating the message in Lavinia’s body was central to the lives of the Andronici and the attention of audience. In the two scenes following Lavinia’s rape, despite their efforts, neither Marcus nor Titus could find her meaning, and this left Lavinia’s power to communicate in question. It was the men who “desire[d] for control over language, reading, and interpretation” (Detmer-Goebel 85), and, yet, the men constantly failed in their task. Because of this failure, Detmer-Goebel continues that “Lavinia may be dependent on men to tell her story, but at the same time, the men are positioned as dependent upon her; without her authorship, they cannot know, let alone revenge, the rape” (85). Again the play offers commentary on the violated women’s legal position. While all action and protection is for men in early modern laws,
it was the women’s voice that must differentiate between abduction and sexual violence. By using the word “stuprum,” Lavinia fulfilled her part in creating meaning by distinguishing exactly what sort of rape she has experienced.

The necessity of the feminine voice is clear through the action of physically creating language. Lavinia reenacted her rape through Ovid and the act of writing, and, thus, she fulfilled her part in the required pattern of rape and revenge. Although she claimed the part of Philomela suggesting her desire to be transformed or metamorphosized into something once again beautiful, Lavinia’s future is uncertain at this point because of the other possible source stories suggested by her elders. Her fate lies in question, and so again does her identity. Now that she has spoken, what is Lavinia to become and how will others see her as they move from translation to action in the final scenes of the play? One clue is that she is only spoken to twice in act four, scene one after she reveals her attackers. First, she is told to kneel by her uncle, and then ordered “Lavinia, come” by Titus (4.1.87, 120). Significantly, following her most powerful moment of agency and voice, Lavinia seems to return to a realm of silence, a realm in which she again lacks choice in even her own movements.

Re-Enter Silence

Lavinia’s presence alone on stage acts as a powerful image of nightmares from which neither the Andronici nor the audience can awaken. Her body alone powerfully represents something unutterable and indefinable. As strong as this image is to the viewer, its greater strength lies in its potential interpretation. Yet, as soon as that potential is achieved, Lavinia disappears from the stage and creates a notable void after such a
constant presence. R. A. Foakes suggests Lavinia’s “silent presence on the stage in so many scenes [after she is mutilated] shows Shakespeare making the most of the violence done to her” (55). Now that he has done so, she can be removed. Absent for the next four scenes, she only returns 165 lines into the penultimate scene 5.2 at the moment revenge is taken on Chiron and Demetrius. What explains such a disappearance from the action? A look back at events occurring since her rape provides a clue.

When Lavinia enters the stage raped and mutilated and accompanied by the taunting boys, her body clearly exhibits physical change, but she lost more than hands, tongue and chastity. The acts of Chiron and Demetrius deprived her of value as an object of trade, whether political, economic or familial. That loss resulted in Lavinia’s character gaining a new value. In her potential to mean, to “speak” the names of her attackers, silence empowered Lavinia; with the recovery of language that power appears to be lost, and Lavinia becomes “the thing to be avenged” (Leggatt, *Shakespeare’s Tragedies*, 26). Once she fulfills her potential to mean by finally “speaking” the names of her attackers and identifying the nature of their crimes, Lavinia returns to the realm of women she belonged to in act one of the play—outside of the action and silent – whose value now lies in her significance as the image of Rome’s collapse and the righteousness of revenge. Once shared with the “public” Lavinia loses all potential value and thus necessarily must die or transform to fulfill the raped woman’s role in revenge tragedies.

All that is left now for the Andronici is revenge on those who have harmed them. What seems to be forgotten is Lavinia’s own position. Titus sees her rape and mutilation as an injury to himself. Deprived of her potential value, in the tradition of revenging rape by telling of her rape, Lavinia loses all agency in revenge. This is because “the task of
avenging [rape] passes into male hands” (Kahn 66). When Lavinia finally returns to the stage at line 165 of in the second scene of act five, she serves merely as a receptacle as she holds a basin for the blood of Chiron and Demetrius and a witness to their deaths. After revealing her killers of 4.1, Lavinia no longer possesses the ability to create meaning or choose her own actions. Again, words are spoken to Lavinia and about her, but she is no longer a participant in the conversation.

When she enters with Titus, he demands, “Come, come, Lavinia” and tells her, “look, thy foes are bound” (5.2.166). After having Chiron’s and Demetrius’ mouths “stopped” so they may only listen, Titus goes on to refer to Lavinia only as proof of the boy’s crimes. Interestingly, Titus returns to the use of metaphor to describe Lavinia; “Here stands the spring whom you have stained with mud, / This goodly summer with your winter mixed” (5.2.170-71). After adding their fault in his sons’ deaths, Bassianus’s death, and the loss of his own hand, Titus finally gets direct: “Both her sweet hands, her tongue, and that more dear / Than hands or tongue, her spotless chastity, / Inhuman traitors, you constrained and forced” (5.2.175-77). Finally it seems all of Lavinia’s state has become utterable; Titus receives the language needed to directly respond to what Lavinia has become. It is at this moment Titus can finally stop using metaphor in place of direct description. The rest of his lines outline his plan to kill them and feed them to their mother.

Titus makes sure to tell Chiron and Demetrius that Lavinia will participate in their murder by “receiv[ing their] guilty blood” in the basin she is holding “’tween her stumps” (5.1.183, 182). He then proceeds to define the defense for his own heinous actions; he tells Chiron and Demetrius, “worse than Philomel you used my daughter, / And worse
than Progne I will be revenged” (5.1.194-5). Once more Lavinia only receives direction in the form of command when she is told to “come, / Receive the blood” (5.1.196-97), and she apparently complies. For some scholars her participation in this ritual of death is difficult to swallow, but only because they view it as a choice that belongs to her.

Lugo, for example, writes “in [Lavinia’s] willingness to take revenge upon those who have wronged her, she cannot see that she herself crosses the line […] she has become her enemy, and adopted all the savagery the position entails” (413). This line of thinking assumes she is capable of choosing to do otherwise. Instead, I argue that Lavinia has returned to the play’s realm of women defined in act one and reemerged as an object to be maneuvered and used by men of power. Without the potential to speak she first gained with marriage and then most powerfully with the loss of the “engines of speech,” Lavinia literally possesses no say in what she does and does not do. She is something to act on behalf of and will again be proven an object to be acted upon. And because this is a tragedy, little reason exists to expect Lavinia will develop into anything more. As Bate puts it, “Ovidian release into metamorphosis is a relief that tragedy does not offer” (Shakespeare and Ovid, 116). Unlike Philomela, there can be no return to music and beauty for Lavinia. With revenge initiated and no hope of Philomela’s flight, the alternative texts often referenced offer only death as an option, and the only question left is how it will occur.

**Death Becomes Her**

In the final scene of *Titus Andronicus*, Titus enters to his guests Saturninus and Tamora, Rome’s Tribunes, Lucius, and Marcus sitting at the table. At his side, in walks the veiled figure of Lavinia. After dishing up the boys-made-meals, Titus enters into his
clear plan of action. He asks Saturninus an interesting question: “Was it well done of rash
Virginius / To slay his daughter with his own right hand, / Because she was enforced,
stained and deflow’red?” (5.2.36-38). When asked why he said yes, Saturninus provides
the logic behind it: “Because the girl should not survive her shame, / And by her presence
still renew his sorrows” (5.3.41-42). As if he got the answer he expected, Titus moves
forward with his plan:

A reason mighty, strong and effectual:
A pattern, precedent and lively warrant
For me, most wretched, to perform the like.
Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee,
And with thy shame thy father’s sorrow die! He kills her.

(5.3.43-47)

The initial shock of Titus’s quick slaying of Lavinia is clear in Saturninus’s
response, and often shared by the audience as well. Perhaps the slaying of Lavinia at first
appears “Unnatural and unkind!” as Saturninus declares (5.3.48). This response causes
Vernon Guy Dickson, to suggest Titus’s “act is seen as monstrous and inhuman,
inappropriate for Titus as both father and person”; Saturninus’s agreement to the
theoretical actions of Virginius, Dickson finds, does not match with Saturninus’s true
feelings (377). The issue with this line of thinking, however, is that after hearing Titus
proclaim he has “a thousand times more cause [than Virginius] / To do this outrage,”
Saturninus changes his tune (5.2.51-52). The knowledge of Lavinia’s rape justifies
Titus’s actions in Saturninus’s mind. He no longer focuses on Titus’s action, but on who
committed the rape (5.2.53).
Aebischer responds to the slaying in a slightly different way; “Lavinia’s last-minute betrayal by her father and her murder can [. . .] be read as the culmination of the silencing and violent disciplining of her transgressing body that began with her rape and dismemberment” (57). Aebischer and some others view this act as a betrayal positing Titus has misappropriated Virginius’ story as a precedent for the killing of his own daughter, Lavinia. In Livy’s original story, Virginius kills his daughter, Virginia, before she can be raped. If Shakespeare had this version in mind, Aebischer and others seem not to consider the fact that the sources used as precedents for action in the play may be manipulated. For Cunningham, sources or “texts carry no special privilege as reliable guides to interpretation: they, too, can be made to say what the interpreter desires” (75), regardless of the actuality of the texts themselves. In addition, in his book *Shakespeare and Ovid*, Bate argues, Titus’s justification for killing Lavinia—because he is “as woeful as Virginius was, / And [has] a thousand times more cause than he / To do this outrage” (5.3.50-52)—is just one example of several of Titus practicing *imitatio*, or “imitation,” a common part of the “rigorous rhetorical training” that was required in the Early Modern English “upper schools” (21-22). Bate later adds, “*dissimilitudo* and *contrarium* are as important to *imitatio* as are *similitudo* and *collatio*”; the upper school student was taught not merely to reproduce texts, but to move beyond them (105). Shakespeare combines his Latin sources throughout the play, and for Titus, killing Lavinia became an act made necessary and defendable by the events of the play itself; “it is as if the Ovidian text has licensed [all of] the violent action” of the play (Bate 107). Dickson goes into further detail, considering the term emulation, which was used interchangeably in Early Modern Grammar Schools; he adds that in addition to following and utilizing the source, the
practice of emulation “emphasiz[ed the] creative nature [. . . in] finding ways to personalize the text, often besting the original” (378). Bate and Dickson both suggest this is exactly what Shakespeare is doing with the Virginius tale among others.

If Titus is referring to the Virginius text where Virginius kills his daughter before she can be raped, Saturninus apparently misses the disparity. Alternatively, Titus could be referring to a much more recent version of the story than Livy’s. Robin L. Bott notes that “by the sixteenth century [. . .] there are two versions of the Virginius and Virginia story, Livy’s version [. . .] and an alternative version, in which Virginius murders Virginia after she is raped” (189, emphasis added). Both versions were commonly used in texts throughout the medieval and early modern periods. If, as this suggests, Shakespeare had this alternative available to him, then no “misappropriation” of the Virginius tale actually occurred, and Titus’s precedent is in fact textually accurate. In essence, all that Shakespeare has done is combined the tales of Ovid and Livy to create a gruesome, but quite effective end. As I’ve suggested, the defense of Virginius’s actions given by Saturninus is two parts. Because the daughter “should not survive her shame,” she must perforce be killed. The second part of Saturninus’s defense is key—she must be killed to end the father’s “sorrows,” which are sure to continue as long as the violated daughter remains alive (5.3.41-2). Titus claims his sorrow dies along with Lavinia just as he takes her life.

Lavinia’s meaning just before her death identifies what she has come to symbolize once and for all, at least for the Andronici; she can be nothing except a cause for sorrow. Now that she has been revenged, her body as an impetus for that revenge no longer retains value. Kahn points to her veil as a sign of this loss of value, in that it may
“be read to indicate her liminal status as neither maid nor wife, polluted by the stain of rape” (72), though notably this is the only occasion she has been veiled since the attack. Because she no longer possesses potential value, like all victims of rape in revenge tragedies, she must die; the raped women’s “deaths purge the lives and honor of the men they have ornamented” (Stimpson 61). In addition, since “the raped woman is more than a devalued property, she is a ‘contaminant’ to her family, and her rape is a ‘pollution,’” the only way to cure the family is to “amputate the diseased limb” (Bott 193). If this is the case, it is not clear to Tamora, who asks, “Why hast thou slain thine only daughter?” (5.3.55). At this point Titus finally reveals the justification of his action. In Titus’s mind, Chiron and Demetrius killed Lavinia when the boys “ravished her and cut away her tongue, / And they, ’twas they, that did her all this wrong” (5.3.57-58). There was no alternative, Titus merely “completes Lavinia’s definition as ‘dead’”; up to this point Lavinia’s mutilated body represented an “image of life-in-death” (Liebler 147, 146). As such, Lavinia could not be adequately translated or fashioned into anything comfortable or comforting for her father. And now that she has been revenged, her usefulness evaporates even as the symbol of rape and reminder for revenge. For this reason, Titus realizes, if this method of revenge as salvation [for Lavinia as well as himself] is to work, he must complete all of the texts cited in Lavinia’s mangled body [. . .] If Lavinia the allusion is thus to be made whole, Lavinia the character must die. (St. Hilaire 324)

Each of these suggestions point to Lavinia’s death as inevitable and somewhat necessary, but one problem remains.
Because Lavinia is veiled in the final scene, she “is harder to read than ever,” and we do not know Lavinia’s thoughts as Titus commands her to die and kills her (Leggatt, *Shakespeare’s Tragedies*, 26). No direct evidence suggests she was aware of the plan, or even whether she consented to his reasoning at this moment. Solga looks back to 3.2, where she suggested the true nature of Titus’s description of suicide, was to teach Lavinia she had options on how to die. Solga continues that if this is the case, then her “death may [. . .] prove beyond doubt her non-consent and complete the transfer of suffering from her body, moved beyond its misery, to [Titus], left to the exigencies of conventional mourning” (66). Her non-consent is not transparent simply because Titus had spoken of the very Roman act of suicide. Looking back, even in her own heart she had long been dead. For example, she told Tamora just before her tragic attack, that it is “not life that [she has] begged so long: / Poor I” says Lavinia, “was slain when Bassianus died” (2.3.171). Even before her mutilation and rape, she existed in the unbearable space of “life-in-death”; the mutilation of her body and her physical presence on stage make this initial fact more perceptible to those forced to look upon her. Lavinia herself, is beyond a cure; rape and mutilation cannot be taken back. What other option exists absent death when life cannot be had? So Titus sees her as already dead, and Lavinia’s own words exhibit agreement. Rome simply served as a Limbo “far from bliss” in which a spirit remained to complete something left unfulfilled and to identify how she had been wronged. Once achieved, her spirit, finally free to go, simply needed the assistance of Titus to make it possible.

All that remains for the play is the completion of Titus’s revenge as he tells Tamara that she has digested the bodies of her sons and quickly kills her, is then killed
himself by Saturninus, and finally, as if to leave no loose ends, Lucius kills Saturninus. After such a quick succession of deaths, the play moves to Marcus and Lucius’s offerings of defense for their actions and revenge, and Lucius’s naming as emperor. The remaining speeches seem strange and unnecessarily drawn out for some. The return to oratory offers little hope of a bright future regardless of their righteousness, especially when one considers the complete lack of effect that oratory has held since midway through the first act. All that really seems necessary is the removal of the multiple mutilated bodies from the stage; in final death each character has lost any sense of potential meaning or purpose.

**Conclusion**

Through silence and mutilation Lavinia’s character in fact reached a level of “development, an increase in eloquence, rather than a stopping or reversal” (Fawcett 266). In her silence, she emerges as the most powerful and meaningful presence on the stage. For Leggatt, Lavinia was “destroyed, then interpreted, then destroyed again” (*Shakespeare’s Tragedies*, 5). Lavinia’s silence and mutilation, while certainly nightmarish, actually create a potential far beyond any previously available to her. From the start, Lavinia clearly fulfilled one element of Shakespeare’s “ideal woman.” Norman Rabkin describes this ideal woman as “always utterly feminine in charm and acceptance of her place in the social hierarchy,” but to this he added the ideal woman comes “equipped with a masculine will as strong as iron” (126). Only in her silence do we witness Lavinia’s “will” on display. Her will is so strong that Lavinia actually transcends Shakespeare’s ideal, as she, even if only for a moment, surpasses even the men around her.
In fact, not only does Lavinia represent one of the most powerfully physical and visible female characters in Shakespeare’s tragedies; she epitomizes tragedy itself. “[I]n tragedy [...] the self dies and decomposes long before the actual physical death of the body, which, however horrific or pitiful, is often but an afterward to the deep work of drama: it is not death which makes tragedy tragic, but the path which leads to it” (Hammond 39). No other character in Shakespeare’s tragedies so clearly represents the death of self and the decomposition of the body on stage more directly or vividly than Lavinia in her silence. At once demanding translation and yet denying definition, she presents the central problem of the play and one of tragedy in general. On her path towards death, she refuses to be fashioned or properly named until she has completed her necessary functions. As the final scene draws to a close, the namesake of the play receives the final loving embraces of his remaining kin, while Lavinia’s body lies mute as ever on the stage. I can’t help but take my eyes from the actions of the Andronici to her lonely body to admire the power her silence achieved and appreciate the quiet peace surrounding a body where once so many unnatural woes emanated.

In Shakespeare’s earliest tragedy, *Titus Andronicus*, we have been battered beyond belief by the stuff of nightmares. The clear success of the play in early modern England suggests audiences of the period demanded these nightmarish visions. Even today, as the play has found new audiences, the necessity of the violence remains clear. The play’s success on the stage suggests that despite moments of apparently unsuccessful words on the page, language alone cannot always adequately translate imagery—namely, that of Lavinia’s silent and mutilated body on the stage. The uneasiness that causes many readers of *Titus Andronicus* to dislike the play as literature, often thought to result from
the inadequacy of the formal speeches in the play, now becomes easier to understand. The power and emotions in the play only translate properly in the presence of the actions and scenes they attempt to describe. In *Titus*, more so than in any other Shakespeare play, physical actions and reactions transcend language. The true power of the play lies in its requirement of the audience’s participation in defining Lavinia, resulting in the truest challenge for the editor of *Titus Andronicus*. How best can one share a play with an audience as a text when the strongest elements of the play occur between the lines and words of its characters?

In these pages I have attempted to illustrate how the forced voyeuristic act of watching the play effectively positions the audience and the characters on stage in parallel situations necessitating very particular reactions. Lavinia is at the center of this connection. The onus falls on the editors to bridge this gap in an edition of the play. Providing an edition based on the text that most thoroughly presents evidence of the stage represents a logical step in achieving that goal. In the following chapter of this introduction, I examine the extant texts of Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* and determine that the 1623 First Folio contains the most evidence of theatrical influence, even in the face of recent scholarship that questions the very traits previously relied upon to prove connections to the theater.
Empirical Editing and the Copies Behind the Printed Texts of Titus Andronicus

Since W.W. Greg, in his Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses: Stage Plots, Actors’ Parts, Prompt Books (1931), first posited the terms “foul papers” and “promptbook” as the two states of manuscripts used to print plays in the early modern period, the two terms have influenced textual scholars that are intent on discovering the copies behind each of Shakespeare’s printed play texts. The lack of any extant texts fitting the description of either of Greg’s states has bothered some scholars, including Greg himself early on. Regardless, Greg would go on to promote and further define each of the terms in increasingly assuring tones for the next thirty years. In 1942, he published The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, in which he offered his first full-blown definition of “foul papers,” and the influence of Greg’s concept has been clear in nearly every modern edition of Shakespeare’s plays published in the last sixty years (Werstine, Early Modern, 28-29). Titus Andronicus is an interesting play in this regard, as the copies behind two major extant texts, the 1594 Quarto (Q1) and the 1623 Folio (F), have been seen as falling into the “foul paper” and “promptbook” categories by textual scholars since Greg’s initial claims that the copy for Q1 must be Shakespeare’s “foul papers” (Editorial Problem, 62) and that the copy used to print F was most likely Q2 annotated with a theater “promptbook” (First Folio, 205). While major editors have since made the more plausible suggestions that Q3 was the text annotated, most have stuck with the idea that the annotations to Q3 likely come from a “promptbook,” whether theatrical manuscript or otherwise.
With the rise of New Textualism beginning in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, scholars such as Paul Werstine and Margreta de Grazia have been somewhat less willing to use the terms “foul papers” and “promptbook.” As they moved the focus away from individual authorship, New Textualists began to dig deeper into the data of the many facets involved in creating the final printed copy. Slowly, “foul papers” morphed into the less controversial “authorial manuscripts,” and “promptbooks” became “theatrical manuscripts,” because the terms were more historically correct. At the same time, some practitioners of New Textualism have been less willing to give up the terms, instead opting for slight revisions of the traits that are associated with “foul papers” and “promptbooks,” or as with the most recent Oxford Complete Works, opt to place “foul papers” in parenthesis (Wells, et al. 209). While this brief history admittedly oversimplifies the alternative preferences, the connections between the terminologies will become more apparent in the upcoming discussion.

In February of 2013, Paul Werstine published *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*; in it, he puts forth several arguments aimed at revealing the misappropriation of the “foul paper” and “promptbook” designations, and offers suggestions about their use from this point on. Werstine outlines the inconsistencies that arose between what the “early Greg” admitted about playhouse manuscripts and the theories that Greg would later put front and center of his rational behind copy texts. First outlining the clear necessity for retracing Greg’s discovery of “foul papers” in his work with Edward Knights’ transcript of *Bonduca*, Werstine goes on to look into the transcript itself. He finds that the transcript is “‘a bad reproduction of a good manuscript’—one that led Greg and all of his followers to a mistaken conception of
the meaning of the term ‘foul papers’” (8). What caused the mistake was Greg’s reading of Knight’s reference to his transcript suggesting that they were “the fowle papers of the Authors wch were found” (Fletcher 23), and his determination that the obvious messiness and incomplete state of Knight’s transcript indicated that the manuscript he was copying was in many ways illegible. Next, Werstine looks into the contradictions surrounding Greg’s definition of the “promptbook.” Again he finds the later Greg ignoring his earlier work with playhouse manuscripts, and moving towards a more theoretical consideration of what an early modern “promptbook” would have been. By studying actual playhouse manuscripts, Werstine shows that Greg’s definitions fail to account for the empirical evidence that we do have available to us, evidence of which Greg, at an earlier time, had been well aware. Werstine argues that Greg’s terms “promptbooks” and “foul papers” have no real place in discussions of the copies behind early modern printed texts, because the manuscripts that Greg intended them to define never truly existed in the states Greg defined.

The following essay will discuss how the terms, foul papers and promptbooks have influenced editors working with Shakespeare’s first tragedy, Titus Andronicus, since their inception. Based on Werstine’s empirical study, our recognition of those involved in the productions of texts must grow. With this new knowledge, I will attempt to indicate how this forces us to redefine our understanding of the copy behind the earliest printed text of Titus Andronicus in First Quarto of 1594. The focus will then shift to Werstine’s evidence from the playhouse manuscripts clarifies our understanding of “promptbooks” and how this affects the copy used to print the 1623 First Folio, including the first printed text of the “fly scene.”
In the previous essay I’ve shown that *Titus Andronicus* is a play that is most effective on the stage, because the actions and images on the stage reinforce and heighten the language of the text. For the purposes of this edition of *Titus Andronicus*, this current study directly affects my choice of copy text, and must be performed in order to determine if there is any foundation in the thought that the 1623 Folio text of the play provides a text that represents the closest relationship with the early modern English theater. The question that must be answered is what can still be determined with any confidence about the author and bookkeeper’s involvement in the text, and can we confidently determine theatrical influence to any extant?

**The Copy Behind the First Quarto of *Titus Andronicus* (1594) and the Influence of Greg’s “Foul Papers”**

Between 1927 and 1955, Greg established and developed his definition of “foul papers” that would prove to influence editors of major editions in determining the status of the copies behind a number of Shakespeare’s early quartos. Among these early quartos is the printed text of Shakespeare’s first tragedy, *Titus Andronicus*, printed in 1594 and known as the First Quarto. In his 1955 book, *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History*, Greg describes “foul papers” as characterized by:

- loose ends and false starts and unresolved confusions in the text, which sometimes reveal themselves in duplications in print; next, inconsistency in the designation of characters in directions and prefixes alike, and occasionally the substitution of the name of an actor, when the part is
written with a particular performer in view; lastly the appearance of the
indefinite and permissive stage directions, and occasionally of explanatory
glosses on the text. (142)

These are the descriptions that most editors and textual scholars have looked to for
guidance in defining the copies for the texts they are working on. Though Greg admits on
several occasions to the limits of this theory and the variability of manuscripts, he comes
short of letting the fact that no extant version of a manuscript fits these characteristics
completely. Building upon Pollard's descriptions of “good” and “bad quartos,” Greg
posits that good quartos often “display features that suggest Shakespeare’s rough drafts,
or ‘foul papers’” (Jowett 99). As John Jowett points out, the features

  include difficulties resulting from handwriting, undeleted first sketches of
  a phrase or passage that stood alongside its replacement, misplaced
  interlinear or marginal insertions, inconsistent forms and abbreviations of
  speech prefixes, and imaginatively descriptive but theatrically redundant
  wording in stage directions. (99)

Gabriel Egan notes that Greg did include caveats and qualifications for the traits of each
term including the variety caused by the “casual ways of book-keepers,” and quite
correctly Egan notices the problem is that “this checklist of features belonging to each
class of documents is ripe to be exploited by editors looking for simple rules” (53). And
in fact, the traits Greg lists are the ones most often used to identify Shakespeare’s early
quartos as deriving from “foul papers.” Influence by McKerrow’s earlier claim that
character names would be clear in copies intended for the theater, Greg finds these “foul
paper” texts were in no way reflective of what would end up being used as
“promptbooks” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 114-15). Considering these brief descriptions, it is clear why most editors are drawn to claim that Q1 of *Titus* was printed from “foul papers”; while theories of the exact nature of the copy have fluctuated at times, Greg’s traits have often been used to show an identifiable source for Shakespeare’s authorial manuscript, whether editors use the word “foul papers” or not.

In his 1948 edition of *Titus Andronicus* for The New Shakespeare, John Dover Wilson agrees with Greg’s claim that the copy is most likely the author’s foul papers. Since his edition, most editors have agreed to some degree (Maxwell 1953, xvi; Waith 1998, 39; Wells 1997, 209; Hughes 1994, 145, 159; Bate 1995, 98; and Evans 1997, 1097). In their *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor come pretty close to using the phrase themselves, claiming that Q1 “is agreed to derive from an authorial manuscript (‘foul papers’) in an unpolished state” (209). In his edition, McDonald calls the copy an authorial or scribal manuscript (1.i), while Hughes adds some clarification to his thought that it might be “foul papers” or Shakespeare’s “working manuscript,” by also suggesting that the copy could be an imperfectly corrected manuscript (160). In 2007, Bate and Rasmussen suggest that the copy is “perhaps Shakespeare’s manuscript, but with one or two signs of revision in the process of composition” (xxvii). This is a slight change to Bate’s 1995 agreement with Hughes that the copy is probably Shakespeare’s “working manuscript,” but disagrees with Hughes thought that the play may not represent what was performed and suggests that “Q1 represents something unusually close to the play as Shakespeare wrote it and as it was first performed” (Hughes 159; Bate 98). While the language and nature of description of copy has varied, as is to be expected with new editions, each of these editors points to
traits that Greg describes as features of “foul papers” listed above, and a reconsideration
of the Q1 text of Titus suggests these findings would be correct if we could still trust that
traits that editors are using to identify copy are actually right. However, if any of Greg’s
descriptions are proven to be incorrect indicators of a “rough draft,” we must reconsider
what the evidence in the play actually tells us about the copy.

As early as 1955, in On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists, Bowers began to depart from Greg’s claim that the author would send the “foul papers” to the company for printing, claiming “There is no evidence whatever here or elsewhere in Henslowe that an author ever submitted for payment anything but a fair copy, or that the company required a dramatist to turn over the original foul sheets along with the fair copy (Bowers 15 qtd. in Egan 55-56). In addition, as Berger and Mowat point out, “It is not clear that this [Greg’s] evidence can bear out Greg’s opinion that the copy was authorial, rather than, say, a playhouse manuscript” (viii). Early in 1931, Greg himself had noted “as a rule” bookkeepers left stage direction alone (Berger and Mowat viii; Egan 50), and so stage directions cannot determine whether or not the copy is authorial.

While textual scholars have considered these points from time to time, and in recent years the term “foul papers” has lost some favor in some circles, Greg’s influence is still noticeable. But now it seems that that influence in terms of “foul papers” could finally see an end.

Paul Werstine finishes the first chapter of his 2013 book by outlining “the six major problems with Greg’s claim that so many early texts of Shakespeare’s were printed either directly or indirectly from ‘foul papers’” (Early Modern, 49-50). After considering the results of his own study of Bonduca and reading an unpublished 1927 essay by Greg,
Werstine notes inconsistencies between Greg’s initial “discovery” of “foul papers” in Edward Knight’s manuscript and subsequent definition of the condition of the copy behind Knight’s manuscript. Werstine comes to the conclusion that Greg’s findings suggest “a kind of MS that cannot be visualized in the imagination and that is not known to ever have existed among MSS associated with the public theatres” (Early Modern, 50). He adds that Greg’s “explanation of the process of Knight’s transcription” does not consider that the traits or errors that Greg points out are not found in ‘foul papers’” (Early Modern, 50). Further, Greg never updated his theory of “foul papers” and suggested that with such confusing alteration and such illegible handwriting that it could be successfully transcribed only by its author or, in Greg’s later thinking, only in consultation with the author; yet Greg and especially his tradition have claimed that a great many early Shakespeare texts were quite successfully printed from transcripts of ‘foul papers’ now said to have been made by their author or in consultation with their author” (Early Modern, 50).

The fourth problem is that the most “essential features of texts that derive from ‘foul papers’” that Greg suggested like “lacunae and shifts in location of passages” are not found in the printed plays of Shakespeare and “strikingly unusual features in the Shakespeare texts are nowhere evident in the Bonduca transcript” (Early Modern, 50). Finally, Werstine points to McKerrow and Bowers, who offered clear “cogent objections to Greg’s paradigm ... the first insisting that acting companies would be likely to leave author’s versions intact when making changes that would serve the company’s interest, the second that there is no documentary evidence that ‘foul papers’ were either sent to or
preserved in the playhouse” (*Early Modern*, 50). For these reasons, Werstine sets out in his next chapter to redefine the term “foul papers” based on actual evidence.

Werstine then successfully proves that “historically, ‘foul papers’ is a term used in relation to ‘fair copy,’ that is ‘foul papers’ refers to a MS that is to be or is being or has been fair copied” (*Early Modern*, 98). In other words the term had nothing to do with the state of the copy, which was to be transcribed. Therefore, “‘foul papers’ can not assume features that would still be visible in a play’s text once it has been set in type, features that would distinguish it from an author’s fair copy or from a theatrical MS” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 99). Because we cannot tell based on the features of Shakespeare’s printed text whether the copy behind the print was ever actually transcribed or meant to be, we cannot accurately know whether or not copy was historically “foul papers” (Werstine, *Early Modern*, 100). Therefore, with the lack of any empirical evidence to locate the newly understood “foul papers” in printed texts, we are left at an impasse, or so it seems.

Werstine sets out to investigate twenty-one extant playhouse manuscripts in the next two chapters to rethink another contradiction in Greg’s conception of “promptbooks”—the ones that were expected to have cleared up all of the problems of Greg’s “foul papers”—and in the process Werstine discovers that playhouse texts and annotated quartos have many of the characteristics associated with Greg’s “foul papers” (*Early Modern*, 130). Werstine goes on to prove how this contradiction between Greg’s fiction and the actual extant texts clearly indicates that he was wrong about what we should expect from his “promptbooks,” and I will discuss how this is important to our consideration of the copies behind the Folio and the added “fly scene” further on in this
essay. Werstine’s study of what bookkeepers did and did not actually do offers useful tools to reconsider the copy behind the First Quarto of *Titus Andronicus*.

One of the key determining features in Greg’s conception of “foul papers” was the condition of the stage directions throughout the text. Now that we have reconsidered the term “foul papers” in its historically accurate sense, the question becomes whether we can still associate those early quartos with authorial drafts as Greg and most editors since have done. Werstine examines manuscripts that were used for performance in his own work, some of which are authorial while others are scribal. Looking mainly at signs of bookkeepers’ intervention, or lack thereof, we can determine to some extent how sure we can be in defining the relationship of some early plays to the theater.

Even Greg noticed that bookkeepers often left stage directions alone. Werstine corroborates this, noting that bookkeepers rarely touched stage directions to edit or to regularize (*Early Modern*, 115-17). He also shows that they were often indifferent in recording secondary persons in stage directions, nor did they consistently fix ghosts or double entrances or clarify names because actors did not use them for performances (*Early Modern*, 124-25). From this we realize that compositors rarely altered stage directions, so it might seem easy to determine that the stage directions that make their way into print would be those that existed in the manuscript before the bookkeeper began working with it. What we may assume is that each of the examples of stage directions listed above that Greg associated with “foul papers” based on their untidy state, might have originated in the manuscript. What we cannot say is whether they were the author’s or another scribe’s creations, and this presents critical repercussions for authorship studies and the foundation of New Bibliography in being able to determine “authorial
intent.” But then Werstine throws a wrench even in this determination, by compiling evidence of what bookkeepers did actually sometimes do. The thought would be then, that if we find a possible sign of bookkeeper intervention in a text like Q1 Titus, we might be able to connect the manuscript used for copy to the theater—a thought considered unlikely by all previous editors.

Werstine notes that bookkeepers did write petitory stage directions (or directions that offer a suggestion to be determined by another for performance, 125-27). For Greg such imprecise stage directions remaining in the text showed no connection with the theater, but to “foul papers.” But Werstine locates numerous examples of the bookkeepers not only leaving such indefinite directions alone, and based on a finding by Michela Calore, shows that we have at least one example of a bookkeeper writing a petitory stage direction on a backstage plot, which Calore cited as stating “Enter Sarda with as many Jewels robes and Gold as he can carry” (257; qtd. in Werstine, Early Modern 126). Based on Tiffany Stern’s Documents of Performance in Early Modern England, 2009, it is clear to Werstine that “the appearance of this petitory SD (stage direction) in a document written by a bookkeeper and designed for use in the playhouse (Stern, Documents 201-31) shows that this form of SD belongs every bit as much to the playhouse as to the author” (Werstine, Early Modern 126-27). Two years before her 2009 article, Tiffany Stern joined Simon Palfrey to write that “‘plots’ or ‘plats’ ... state all entrances” as opposed to “parts” which indicate exits, and that “‘plots,’ the documents that seem to have hung backstage, provided a scene-by-scene list of when actors should enter and, sometimes, further information concerning whom actors were to ‘enter to,’ what they were to carry (and so forth)” (86). This seems to further clarify the connection
of a petitory stage direction to the stage, and show that it is not as “a particularly distinctive mark of the author” as Greg would have it (Werstine, *Early Modern* 126). The location of a petitory stage direction in a printed quarto would then no longer directly point to the author, but could also point to a bookkeeper’s involvement.

Such a stage direction does occur in Q1 *Titus Andronicus*, in the very first scene. At line 69, in the stage direction for the mass entrance of Titus, his sons and the Goths returning from war we find a good example. In the direction, none of Titus’s four sons are named, though they are to enter two at a time, before and after Titus. And while Tamora, Chiron, and Demetrius are listed, Alarbus is not included. The most imprecise part though is at the end, when the stage directions “others as many as can be” is added (1.1.69). Scholars have pointed to this lack of clarity to suggest that Shakespeare was unfamiliar with the size of the playing company (Bate 98). Clearly, that statement is not necessarily true. The fact that a bookkeeper could provide a similar type of direction, knowing full well the capabilities and holdings of his company, shows the possibility that the petitory stage direction does not necessarily indicate a lack of association with the theater or company. All that we can determine from such a direction is a reasonable suggestion to fill the stage.

Also, other apparent marks of Gregian “foul papers” are indefinite or permissive stage directions. Greg, in 1942, attempts to separate “foul papers” from “promptbooks” by claiming that “indefinite or permissive directions like ‘Enter four or five citizens’, ‘A boy the least that can play’ ... [as] directions [that] would be the business of the bookkeeper to make definite” (36-37; qtd. in Werstine, *Early Modern* 125). Greg found indefinite and permissive stage directions that did not clarify the number of characters,
mute supers or speakers, needed on the stage to be a clear sign that “foul papers” were the
copy behind many of Shakespeare’s early quartos. And again, when studying the various
theatrical manuscripts, Werstine notes that bookkeepers, although noted for leaving most
stage directions untouched, were, at times willing to create stage directions that might fall
into the categories Greg considered authorial. Werstine notes, “In writing their own SDD,
bookkeepers often failed to spell out not only the number of mute supers who should
enter, but also the number of speakers” (Early Modern, 177). One example that he
provides from The Second Maydens Tragedy requires “four soldiers [that] have speaking
parts, [yet] the bookkeeper is content to write only ‘Enter Soldier,'” (Early Modern, 177).
There are several examples of unnumbered mute supers in Q1 Titus Andronicus.

In the first two stage directions of the play, the specific number of characters is
unclear. In addition to the one spoken of just above, the opening stage direction calls for
“Tribunes and Senators aloft” and for “followers” for each Saturninus and Bassianus,
none of which speaks at all, but all three groups are referenced in the dialogue of the play
and, therefore necessary (1.1.0). However, there is no clear indication of how many of
each type of character is intended (similar directions occur at 1.1.140, 4.2.0, 4.3.0,
5.3.16). But these examples can no longer be a sign that “foul papers” lay behind the
printed copy, as similar unnumbered entrances are found in manuscripts, both authorial
and scribal, that have been used for the stage, and in some cases, the calls for supers, are
created by the bookkeepers themselves. There are also instances in Titus Andronicus,
where the numbers are left unclear, even when certain characters speak. For example, one
stage direction reads, “Enter Lucius with an Army of Goths with Drums and Soldiers”
(5.1.0). Each of these examples could have been caused by bookkeeper involvement with
the text and the stage directions themselves, and so no longer can be used to identify “foul papers.”

Another major piece of evidence that Greg proposes indicates “foul paper” origin, is located in the naming of characters. As suggested above, Q1 Titus provides a high level of variability when it comes to names. In identifying “foul papers” as the copy behind Shakespeare’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Greg places significance on the “multiple designations of the same character” (Werstine, Early Modern 130). However, Werstine’s study of the playhouse manuscripts and the annotated quartos again indicates this trait is not one that can be found to be unique to authorial manuscripts. Not only did authors and scribes sometimes provide multiple forms of character names, but so did the bookkeepers. While rarely taking the time to disambiguate certain character names, bookkeepers “just like McKerrow’s imagined authors, on occasion identified dramatic characters in terms of their proper names and sometimes of their functions ... or their peculiarities” (McKerrow 464; Werstine, Early Modern 150). Sometimes the bookkeepers are found to “introduce variations found nowhere else in these MSS (manuscripts) in the naming of characters in stage directions and speech prefixes (Werstine, Early Modern 150).

An example of characters being named by function is found in the beginning of act 3, scene 1, when we get the stage direction, “Enter the Judges and Senators with Titus two sons bound, passing on the stage to the place of execution, and Titus going before them pleading” and then at line 11, when “Andronicus lieth down, and the Judges pass by him.” Two of the main antagonists in the play are also often referred in association with their function. Saturninus, who is also called Saturnine in the dialogue, speech prefixes,
and stage directions, is often referred to as either *Emperor* or *King*. Tamora is also named by her function as *Empress* and *Queen*, though on fewer occasions than Saturninus.

Beyond Tamora and Saturninus, the only other “named” character to be referred to based on function is Emillius; at 4.4.58, his entry direction reads, “Enter Nutius Emillius.” *Nutius* is Q1’s misspelling of “Nuntius,” Latin for messenger. On all other occasions, he is simply described by the name Emillius.

If we were to remain within Greg’s frame of mind, and determine that Q1 *Titus Andronicus* was in fact copied from authorial “foul papers,” we would have in this play a very interesting look into Shakespeare’s apparent biases or intentions. However, Werstine provides ample evidence in his examination of Knight’s transcription of *The Honest man’s Fortune*, where “multiple designations for these characters originate not with the author, but with the bookkeeper” (*Early Modern* 151). In other manuscripts, Werstine finds bookkeepers altering speech prefixes for various reasons. For example, the manuscript Werstine identifies as Henry Glapthorne’s *the Lady=mot<her* or *Lady-mother*, a single character is referred to as “Judge, Sir Hugh, and Recorder” and Werstine finds that the names “derive not from authorial conceptions of his changing functions or peculiarities arising during the heat of initial composition, but from customary theatrical practices of censorship and annotation” (*Early Modern*, 152). The bookkeeper was just as likely to be involved in the names reflected in the stage directions and speech prefixes of the play as the author is, and “took no more care to provide characters with unambiguous designations than they did to keep naming consistent” (Wrestine, *Early Modern* 155), the apparent “interplay between racial and individual identification” becomes little more than a representation of alternate preferences of the individual in the moment of transcription.
or annotation. Since “it becomes impossible to assume that any particular SP must be authorial just because it is irregular” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 155), and there is no proof of great rhyme or reason behind bookkeepers’ practices in identifying characters, the “interplay,” if at all relevant, is more than likely accidental.

This inconsistency and ambiguity seems to be the trend in Werstine’s findings in various manuscripts he encountered. The same kinds of inconsistencies that made Greg include Q1 *Titus Andronicus* amongst Shakespeare’s early plays that were printed from “foul papers” in 1942, are found being created by the bookkeepers themselves throughout the Early Modern manuscripts. In fact, Werstine finds “plenty of indications in playhouse manuscripts of bookkeepers reaching into the SDD and SPP (which do see print) to introduce multiple designations of characters of the kind McKerrow thought theatrical personnel would expunge” (*Early Modern*, 150). The fact that Greg’s interest in finding the author in the text made it easy followed McKerrow’s thinking, at the same time he was unable to consider that such inconsistencies could derive from anyone other than the author. Now that there is evidence to the contrary, we can no longer think that stage directions that create problems for readers of the play and force editors and directors to make sometimes-difficult choices can be blamed on Shakespeare’s carelessness. Greg had enough of these instances of inconsistency in *Titus Andronicus* to make him think the copy originated in “foul papers” and would have been tidied up. This allowed New Bibliographers to take on the responsibility of doing the disambiguation that bookkeepers would “surely have done” and allowed for great freedoms in emendation defended as clarification or disambiguation. So what are we left with now?
In *Titus*, the First Quarto provides a great number of these ambiguous stage directions and speech prefixes. When, for example, we get the direction “*Titus two sons speaks*” at 1.1.263, not only are we faced with an incorrect verb tense in “speaks,” which should be “speak,” but we also have a greater problem. There are three of Titus’s sons present in the scene. The only one to have spoken thus far in this section of act 1 is Lucius, and he is named as Lucius in his speech prefix. This causes all editors to assume that the direction must be referring to the two other remaining sons, Quintus and Martius who are never identified in this scene in speech prefixes. However, the next direction reads, “*Titus son speaks*” (1.1.265), and now we have at least two of the sons to guess from, if not all three. The fact that throughout the play, speech prefixes and stage directions like those for Tamora, Saturninus, and Aaron, fluctuate regularly and sporadically—sometimes on the same page going from one form to another—makes the choice even harder. Is it any less likely that Lucius would be referred to as both “Lucius” and “Son” in speech prefixes and stage directions on the same page, than Saturninus would be both King and Saturnine or Aaron would be both Moore and Aron? The answer to that question now seems harder than ever before. It seems that this is why McKerrow and Greg were so unwilling to allow for the possibility that such ambiguity could occur in what McKerrow termed the “promptbook.”

How could the play be performed well with such issues left undetermined in the book that was believed to be the not just “‘guide to’ but also ‘(potentially) a record of performances’ and thus a document that would need ‘to show clearly what was said and done on stage’” and presumably who said and did those things (Howard-Hill, “Crane’s 1619” 150, 169; in Werstine, *Early Modern* 108)? The simple fact is that these choices
were not clarified by bookkeepers. Not only were the books not used “as records of performance” as I will discuss later, but they provided little more than a rough guide to the action of the play.

Furthermore, there is also evidence that the instability did not appear to bother bookkeepers. In fact, “Rather than fixing every SP on paper, the bookkeeper was evidently able to rely on his intimate acquaintance with the play’s text or on his memory, the high quality of which is witnessed by a number of the interventions preserved in playhouse MSS” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 204). Apparently, according to Werstine, bookkeepers would have no problem remembering that ambiguous or simply different names referred to certain characters. For example, in *Lady=Mother*, the bookkeeper uses “‘Steward’ to refer to the role of Alexander Lovell even though Glapthorne, the play’s author, refers to this creation of his only by its proper name” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 204). Not only does this example indicate the bookkeeper’s apparent comfort with multiple names for the same character, but it also is yet another example of a bookkeeper actually creating the alternate name. In addition to altering names, “bookkeepers would cut or expand roles, scenes, or parts giving rise to stage directions that leave out characters needed in the scene” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 158).

With this in mind, the various entry directions located in *Titus Andronicus* that are missing characters that are needed in the scene create the need to discover who was responsible for the stage directions’ condition. Scholars can no longer determine whether the fact that Alarbus is not mentioned in the entrance of the Goths as prisoners at 1.1.69 is a clue that the Alarbus episodes were added later, or a sign that the bookkeeper cut him out of the entrance, but did not bother to delete his lines. This has clear implications for
those who consider such evidence to represent “second thoughts” or later revision. We
can no longer say with certainty whether the fact that Young Lucius is missing from the
entrance in 5.3, the final scene in which he will later be called to grieve for and kiss his
deeased grandfather, an oversight by Shakespeare, or an inadequate cut by the
bookkeeper. Werstine notes that bookkeepers are responsible for “some SDD [which]
simply omit characters necessary to the following dialogue and action” (Early Modern,
206). There are also cases in Werstine’s study, where bookkeepers’ tendency to copy
stage directions to the left margin and from the tops of versos to the bottoms of preceding
rectos ... provide yet another occasion for the introduction into playhouse MSS of
incomplete entrance SDD” (Early Modern, 160). When we now consider that every
single example given above to propose “foul papers” as printers copy can also be shown
to be found in manuscripts that were annotated and used in the theater, it becomes
apparent that any claims of the original copy and its connection to the author is tenuous at
best. The one thing that is clear is that untidiness can no longer be taken to be a trait of
authorial papers alone.

As Werstine notes,

In 1931 Greg understands theatrical texts typically to be scribal copies and
defines such promptbooks in contradiction to authorial MSS, which for
him, are typically ‘foul papers,’ disqualified from theatrical use by the
untidiness essential, for him, to their definition. According to Greg, then,
by extension it also is possible for any MS, even if it is not “foul papers,”
to be too untidy to be a “promptbook.” (Early Modern, 112)
But “many early modern theatrical texts sport marginal insertions of dialogue and incomplete deletions that impair their tidiness” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 112). These incomplete deletions and additions, result in the kinds of “loose ends” and “false starts” that Greg considered were a clear sign of the author. Honigmann also “speculate[s] that the frequency of duplicated dialogue in Shakespeare’s texts arise form the dramatist’s own distinctive habit of failing to mark for deletion discarded passages in a manner that would be clear to the printer” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 185). Now it seems clear that this is not necessarily the case, since it is just as likely that such duplication occurs at the hands of the bookkeeper. There are several examples in Q1 *Titus Andronicus*, of apparent false starts for duplications in dialogue. But Werstine’s survey of the 19 manuscripts, again shows bookkeepers creating the same kinds of duplication and displaying inconsistent marks (some hardly noticeable) for deletion. Werstine concludes that, “Duplication provided by the playhouse MSS indicate that the phenomenon is not unique to authorial papers and the presence of such duplication in printed texts cannot be used to eliminate the possibility that they were set from a playhouse MSS in favor of printers’ copy being Gregian ‘foul papers’” (*Early Modern*, 190). So what does this all mean for the First Quarto, *Titus Andronicus*?

Apparently, with “foul papers” no longer being a legitimate description of the copy for *Titus Andronicus*, because there is no way of knowing if the copy was ever transcribed or meant to be and we can no longer legitimately connect so called “foul papers” to “authorial manuscripts,” we are left with a view that is less clear than it has been for over 70 years. We cannot responsibly say whether the copy behind Q1 *Titus* is authorial or scribal, but can we now associate Q1 with the theater? You will remember
that some scholars identified a few stage directions that showed the author’s “awareness of theater,” while at the same time others point to Shakespeare’s lack of awareness when it came to the company size. The question is, given the fact that playhouse manuscripts show similarly vague directions as well as references to specific aspects of the theater in the hands of bookkeepers and authors, what can we really say about the relationship of a printed copy’s source to the theater itself? Any one of the many inconsistencies in the play may have or may not have been created by a bookkeeper, but we cannot say for sure based on the evidence that is located in printed plays. What we can say for sure is that the traits of authorial manuscripts have apparently long been misunderstood, and that at the same time, a transhistorical definition of the so called alternative “promptbook” did not make it any easier to get past the expectations set by Greg and solidified in the minds and practices of editors since 1955. We will have to delve into this problem, before answering whether or not we can truly detect theater involvement in Q1 Titus Andronicus.

**Gregian “Promptbooks” and the Text Behind Titus Andronicus, in the 1623 First Folio**

Shakespeare’s 1623 First Folio text of Titus Andronicus offers the other side of the spectrum in Greg’s conception of the manuscripts that served as printer’s copy for the texts of Shakespeare’s plays. According to Greg, F1 Titus has the traits associated with “promptbooks.” Not long ago, T. H. Howard-Hill examined the term “promptbook,” and writes that “a promptbook is not just, as in OED, “a guide to” but also “(potentially) a record of performances and thus a document that would need ‘to show clearly what was
said and done on stage” (“New Light,” 150, 169), and Werstine points out that this seems to be Greg’s conception of the term. Greg’s consideration of what to expect from an early modern “prompt book” is based on more current theatrical practices, and not on what can be found in the early modern texts themselves. “Greg assumed (wrongly) that bookkeepers would use texts in which roles are labeled consistently and unambiguously in SDD and SPP, and in which entrance SDD are precise in listing which characters enumerating which extras were to go onstage at a particular time” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 148). In addition, Greg followed “McKerrow’s *a priori* expectation ... that bookkeepers would ‘likely’ tidy away ghosts, mutes, and double entrances from the SDD of playhouse texts” in addition to disambiguating loose ends and providing “to those directions the names of characters that playwrights have forgotten to include” (Werstine, *Early Modern* 124). Also associated with the Gregian concept are “additional or different sound calls in the Folio play, as there are, for example, in *Titus Andronicus*” (Greg, *First Folio* 237; qtd. in Werstine 135). As mentioned earlier, the Folio text of *Titus Andronicus* fell tidily into what Greg believes to be evidence of “promptbooks.”

For Greg, the signs of textual tidiness combined with annotation for theatrical use are typical of Folio plays printed from manuscript or with reference to a manuscript. Greg’s influence on editors of *Titus* is easily evident. Dover Wilson makes the suggestion that the Folio copy could be the “promptbook” Shakespeare had given to the acting company in 1594 or at least another text consulting one (97). However, most editors of the New Textualists have, I think correctly, found the main source behind the play to be a copy of Q3 (1611), that was annotated with “reference to a theatrical manuscript” (Egan 185). Jowett suggests the Folio text is “from Q3, with light annotation and addition of the
fly scene from a theatre manuscript” (*Shakespeare and Text*, 189). This description of light annotation is due to the number of errors that still remain in the F copy. For Greg, the finding of Q2 errors in the F text first led him to suggest that it was the text that had been annotated, but Waith disagrees and suggests “sporadic consultation of a manuscript was more likely” (43). In describing their decisions for the *Oxford Complete Works*, Wells and Taylor write, “certain changes, particularly in stage directions and the addition of 3.2, indicate that the copy of Q3 used by printers had been annotated by comparison with another source, probably a promptbook” (*Textual Companion*, 209). Even Mowat and Werstine in their edition, while not content to use the word “promptbook” suggest that “the manuscript may have been a theatrical one” (xlviii). While some have disagreed on the printed copy that was used, most editors agree that the copy used for the Folio has some relation to the theater, and it is easy to see why. As Wells summarizes it, usually editors follow Greg and agree “the copy of Q3 used for the Folio had been annotated for use as a prompt-book ... or that it had been annotated by comparison with a copy of Q2 which had been marked in the same way” or they follow Dover Wilson and later Waith who came to the conclusion that it is a “copy of Q3 that had been directly annotated from a manuscript promptbook” (Wells, *Re-Editing* 79; see also Greg, *Editorial Problem*, 120).

For Greg, who expected “promptbooks” to tidy things up from the “foul papers,” added sound directions and names of company actors in place of character names showed clear “promptbook” tendencies, and Werstine admits that while these addition identifiers are correct, one cannot expect tidiness to be a result. A look at the Folio text of *Titus* shows both connections and disconnections with Greg’s theory. Bolton points out that the
Folio text altered 17 stage directions and created 19 new ones (771), and these “do represent early seventeenth century theatrical practices” according to Bate (98). Mowat and Werstine, along with a number of editors, argue that there are “a few readings, mainly in the stage directions, which seem to exceed the capacity of any printer to introduce” (xlviii). There are a total of 8 directions for “Flourish” added to the Folio text (1.1.1, 63, 150, 235, 404; 5.1.1, 165; 5.1.15). One direction in particular seems to show clear evidence of the play’s action. At 1.1.235, we get the direction “a long flourish till they come down.” Surprised that Maxwell did not even discuss this added stage direction, Wells points out this is a “double direction” and especially the second direction, “they come down” is “important as a confirmation of what is easily to be deduced from the dialogue” (Re-Editing, 93). Clearly, as Wells shows, Marcus, Saturninus, Bassianus, and the Tribunes must descend from their position aloft, to the lower stage. The extended “Flourish” provides the time for them to do so, and “emphasize[s] the importance of the proclamation” that Saturninus is now the Emperor of Rome (Wells, Re-Editing 93). In several other cases more technical sound calls replace those found in all three quartos.

At 1.1.502, while creating a more deliberate scene break, “Flourish” replaces Qq’s “sound trumpets” (see also 4.2.48). As Wells notes the term Flourish is a more “technical term” than “sound trumpets” (Re-Editing, 91). The more technical terms used for stage directions seem to “reflect playhouse practice” (Bate 106). On two occasions, the directions replace the instruments called for, at 4.2.48 and then at 5.3.25, “Hoboyes (Hautboyes)” replace trumpets, and at the beginning of the play, “Colors” replaces “Trumpets;” “for either practical or aesthetic reasons, or both” (Wells, Re-Editing 85). The more technical nature of the sound calls here is proof for most editors that a
theatrical text or “promptbook” was at least consulted; the stage directions are purposeful and seem to have the authority of the playhouse. As Hughes suggests, “While the Q stage directions may represent Shakespeare’s intentions, those in the Folio are probably taken from a prompt-book” (165). For a number of editors who see Q1 as “foul papers,” the Folio changes move us further from Shakespeare’s “first intentions,” but some suggest that the Folio directions “probably represent what happened in the theatre” (Wells, Re-Editing 85). Hughes takes it another step and considers the example to show a change, “presumably with the author’s sanction” that “may represent Shakespeare’s second thoughts, and could therefore be taken as authoritative” (165). However, on at least one occasion, the addition of a sound call creates duplication.

Duplicate sound calls are recognized as “unique to theatrical manuscripts” and were used by Greg, in this case correctly according to Werstine, to identify the “promptbooks” as connected with the theater (Werstine, Early Modern 233). At 2.2.10, the Folio adds the direction “Wind horns” before the existing direction which it reprints from Qq: “Here a cry of hounds and wind horns in a peal, then enter Saturninus, Tamora, Bassianus, Lavinia, Chiron, Demetrius and their Attendants.” Obviously, this would require two separate occasions for the horns to be played, which is rare, though not unheard of. Early on we get another possible duplication with one of the Folio’s added “Flourish” directions. At 1.1.150, the Quartos read “Sound Trumpets and lay the Coffin in the Tomb”; the Folio, beyond making Coffin into Coffins, changes the beginning of this directions to read “Flourish. Then Sound Trumpets.” For Wells, “‘Flourish’ is most plausibly interpreted as a prompt-book annotation,” but notes that while “more technical” it “nevertheless simply duplicates the Quarto’s ‘Sound Trumpets’” (Re-Editing, 91). A
number of Editors have even emended their Q1 based editions to include both sound calls, suggesting that they believe that it is not a case of accidental duplication. I will come back to this question shortly.

The Folio does clarify some actions on the stage, and Greg expected this of texts printed using theatrical “promptbooks.” In the first entrance of the play, the Folio adds the seemingly obvious notation, “at the other” to the stage direction, which in Qq has “Saturninus and his followers at one door, and Bassianus and his followers” (1.1.0). Clearly someone felt the need to clarify for possible confusion, and this someone sounds like Greg’s bookkeeper (for further attempts at clarification in the Folio see 1.1.17, 2.3.199-200, and 247-49; attempts to clear up some of the indefinite entrances and exits 2.2.0; 2.3.193, 210, and 308; 2.4.10; 3.1.15 and 289). In all, the Folio’s added directions and sound calls, for the most part do clarify some of the action in the play, though some remain or create new ambiguities.

In the first act at 1.1.130, the Quartos’ direction reads “Exit Titus sons with Alarbus,” and the Folio changes the direction to “Exit Sons with Alarbus.” Though fairly clear that “Sons” refers to Titus’s children as Lucius has just said “Away with him” and that they will create a fire and “hew his limbs” (3.1.128-30), Tamora’s other two sons are also on stage. This kind of ambiguity is what Greg so often associated with “foul papers.” The other example of this kind of change occurs later in the same scene, when Qq’s “Exit all but Marcus and Titus” is replaced by the Folio’s “Exit” (1.1.396). Clearly the two brothers must remain on stage, as Titus’s three remaining sons must exit after entering Mutius in the tomb. Marcus and Titus each have lines, and the sons are to reenter with Bassianus and Lavinia nine lines later. However, unlike the first instance, the removal of
clarity may have been caused by a lack of space here on the page here and the change
could be attributed to the compositor. The last two examples are clearly the exception. It
seems that the Folio’s changes to and additions of stage directions worked to clarify
ambiguity and to correct error, much more often than doing the opposite. This is not to
say that all stage directions that were needed have been added, or that all of the indefinite
ones have been clarified. A majority of those discussed in the previous section on Q1 still
remain in the text of the Folio.

It is this same tendency in the plays A Midsummer Nights Dream, The Merchant
of Venice, and Much Ado About Nothing that caused some to conclude that “persistence
in a number of these Folio plays of many of the irregularities in naming and SDD from
their quarto counterparts indicates that in preparation of quarto copy the theatrical MSS
were consulted in only a cursory fashion” (Werstine, Early Modern 135). Again, Greg
and McKerrow’s expectations that “promptbooks” would clarify the kind of ambiguity
still found in some Folio texts, does not persuade them to discount their theories, but only
to suggest the fault lies with the annotator. More recently, in the case of F1 Titus
Andronicus, Waith points out that “for one reason or another the Folio printer’s copy of
Q3, though greatly altered by collation with a ‘promptbook’ is by no means identical to a
‘promptbook’” (Waith 41). Whatever the theory, the term “promptbook” still appears
quite frequently in modern scholarship.

As with Greg’s “foul papers,” speech prefixes have also been used to measure for
evidence of bookkeeper involvement. As Bolton notes, in the First Folio text of Titus
Andronicus, the speech prefixes are normalized, though not thoroughly; he counts 27
instances of altered speech prefixes without a change to the speaker (205). As Bate has
noted, however, some of these alterations are mistakes (115), and as will be clear, there is no consistency in the names. There are seven instances, for example, of the Folio text replacing “Moore” with the speech prefix “Aaron” in 2.1; however, in the same scene, at lines 30 and 52 “Aaron” is changed to “Moore.” “Moore” is then used as the speech prefix at lines 150, 174, and 187 in 3.1, and one more time at 4.2.24. Afterwards, the speech prefixes are consistently “Aaron” for the rest of the play. Clearly, while at times the speech fixes were “normalized,” we see the same kind of inconsistency noticed in Gregian “foul papers” and not what we would expect in a “promptbook” copy that had normalized them. The only consistent change to speech prefixes is in the case of Young Lucius. In the First Quarto, he is consistently “Puer” and in the Folio, every speech prefix is changed to “Boy.” While there is clear alteration of many of the speech prefixes between the quartos and the Folio, most of the changes found in the Folio fail to clear up any confusion. However, on two occasions there appears to be an attempt at disambiguating or simplifying.

The speech prefix at 1.1.373 reads “3. Sonne” in the first scene of all three of the quartos, and the possible confusion has been discussed above. The Folio seems to attempt to clear this up by changing it to read “1. Sonne.” While we are still left with the same question of which son is actually meant here, the attempt to make sense of the odd numbering of the speakers is clear. Further on in the scene, “Son” replaces Q3’s “All” in an attempt to avoid the problem that Q3 created (there is no speech prefix in Q1 or Q2)—“All” clearly refers to Marcus, Lucius, Martius and Quintus, but there are many others on the stage as well here—though again this seems to be just as confusing, as there are three sons on the stage.
The Folio text also adds a few speech prefixes missing in the quartos at 2.3.194 and 208. But again, we are brought back to examples that are more often associated with “foul papers.” There are still two missing speech prefixes at 1.1.17 for Marcus and at 4.2.8 for Young Lucius. In the text of the Folio, there are also still cases of multiple speech prefixes that remain vague or ambiguous (see 1.1.358, 5.1.0, and 5.3.73). While some of the alterations of speech prefixes in the Folio do clear up errors, there are still far too many cases of indefinite and erroneous speech prefixes and a lack of regularity in character names to truly be considered a “cleaned up text.” However, this has been explained by the suggestion that the annotator only took a cursory look at the “promptbook,” an explanation that as we move forward will become less convincing.

Editors have used each of the examples listed above since Greg to point to the involvement of a prompter in the copy used for the printing of *Titus Andronicus*, in the First Folio. There are however, several changes that seem to be more consistent with someone other than a prompter. These tend to include changes to the dialogue. A line is added at 1.1.404 and the odd two-word line “What book” is found 4.1.37. The most curious change to the dialogue made in the Folio text is discussed at length in the textual notes for 3.1.33-36, and is notable because it brings back a part of the text that had been omitted from Q1 and also another piece only found in Q2. It was the return of the partial line that made Greg initially claim that the annotated copy used for the Folio was in fact Q2 (Waith 43n1), but Greg would later change his mind and agree with the majority of editors who think that Q2 was simply consulted and not used for the entire copy.

There are also five lines that have been omitted from the quartos in the Folio text, and most seem to think this too was an error. For Hughes, only one makes any sense. At
4.2.76, the Folio has dropped Aaron’s line “I have done thy mother.” Wells and Taylor agree with Hughes, and say it is “obviously censorship” (209; Hughes 164). The lines that were removed at 2.1.101 and 5.3.52 were just fine and no editor finds reason for their removal. Also, Lucius’s line and speech prefix listed above at 4.2.10 is clearly an error. And finally, the line removed at 5.2.16 “erodes the sense” (Hughes 164). The final “non-prompter” change is the addition of Act Division throughout the text of the Folio, though they clearly “reflect the introduction of division to Jacobean Theater” (Bate 115), and are integral to the structure of the revised play (Wells and Taylor 209).

It is clear that based on Greg’s definition of “promptbook” traits, the Folio text of Titus Andronicus doesn’t quite fit any longer. Now considering Werstine’s study of the playhouse manuscripts, several of Greg’s expectations for “promptbooks” no longer seem valid. As Werstine writes, “Greg’s judgment concerning the use of ‘promptbook’ in the preparation of copy for the Folio suffers from the mistaken belief that, in Baldwin’s words, bookkeepers and/or theatrical scribes bestowed perfection on playhouse manuscripts” (Early Modern, 135). However, Werstine admits, that whether there were cuts in the Folio text, like in Richard II or King Lear, or additional or different sound calls in the Folio as in Titus, A Midsummer Night’s Dream, or The Merchant of Venice, or the name of company members in the Folio alone, then “Greg’s identification of the sources in the theatrical text is solidly grounded” (Early Modern, 135). As early as 1863, the Cambridge editors of the Folio noted that “before printing [of the Folio’s Titus, a copy of Q3] received additions and alterations which can only have come from the theatre” (Wilson 94). What bothered Greg was the number of inconsistencies in the changes, and this led him to guess that the annotations were only done sporadically.
William B. Long counters Greg’s theory, and “argued that contrary to New Bibliographical assumptions that prompt-books could be irregular and untidy: actors did not fix permissive or inconsistent stage directions in the scripts they received, so we cannot tell whether the manuscript copy underlying an early edition was authorial or theatrical simply from stage directions” (“Stage Directions” 122 qtd. in Egan 155). As Egan notes, Long’s argument “revived the theory of continuous copy from Pollard and J. D. Wilson” (155). A potential problem with Long’s study is that it was based on only one text, *Woodstock*, but Wells seems to agree that “in all probability [the copy] would be a palimpsest, with directions for later performances added to, and in some cases substituted for, earlier ones,” citing *Edmund Ironside* and *A Looking Glass for London and England* as further evidence (*Re-Editing*, 80). Egan explains that “Long’s claims that promptbooks could be untidy is unproven because we can’t prove his manuscripts were made for performance” (166). But Egan’s claim is not convincing. Werstine noticed that the text of *Woodstock* has the marking of at least 9 different hands and, “however much or little *Woodstock* was performed, there has never been any doubt that the MS was designed to guide performance” (260, 275). In addition to the other 18 manuscripts studied by Werstine, Long’s ideas about the untidiness of “promptbooks” now seem irrefutable.

John Jowett writes that “one important conclusion reached in the work surrounding the Oxford Shakespeare, was that the licensed promptbook was rarely if ever released to supply direct copy for the Folio composers” (103; see also Jowett and Taylor, *Shakespeare Reshaped* 237-43). This could be seen to support the idea that the annotation of Q3 must have occurred within the company, but some scholars disagree. Sonia Massai, for instance, writes that at least in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love’s Labor’s
Lost (two plays often considered to derive from playbooks), she finds evidence that “the Folio variants ... are more likely to derive from idiosyncratic and sporadic manuscript correction added by annotating readers than from annotation for performance or from sporadic consultation of a theatrical manuscript” (140). Massai argues that the bookkeeper “had no reason to annotate his book in order to ensure that all its speech prefixes were consistent or his stage action systematically regulated by timely and full direction” (Massai 139). Massai’s most ardent complaint is that, for example, the stage directions in the Folio Romeo and Juliet are in fact less accurate than in the Q3 text of the play and suggests that directions “derived from a playbook used in the theatre would make the stage action less clear seems counterintuitive” and prefers to see the annotating reader as responsible for the attempted “corrections” of “speech prefixes, stage directions and dialogue” (158). Werstine notes the possibility of such non-theatrical influence;

While there is evidence in the actual theatrical texts that bookkeepers add [directions such as sound calls] where they were absent from authors’ or scribes’ inscriptions ... there is also ample evidence that the authors and scribes included the sound calls themselves. (Early Modern, 139)

This seems to bring our ability to answer the question surrounding the copy for the Folio text of Titus Andronicus to even less steady ground.

Clearly there are any number of possibilities concerning who is responsible for the alterations made in the Folio text, and this is consistent in Werstine’s finding after studying the playhouse manuscripts. What we can say about the changes that were made to Q3’s text and found in the Folio is that they do clear up some of the ambiguities but not nearly all of them. We can say that the kinds of alterations found in the Folio text of
Titus were made by bookkeepers in playhouse manuscripts; but they were also made by non-theatrical scribes, theatrical scribes, and authors in both manuscripts and printed texts. As noted in our discussion of the Quarto text, bookkeepers are found by Werstine to have done any of the following: give rise to inconsistency in entrance directions; delete and sometimes add stage directions that created loose ends, false starts, and unresolved confusion; cancel lines, duplicate lines, and add lines to the dialogue; provide names for speech prefixes when missing; identify characters by both proper names and function; introduce multiple designations in stage directions and speech prefixes for characters; leave some speech prefixes unindicated; and leave the numbers of speakers unclear in some cases (Early Modern, 107-194).

Bookkeepers did not fix problematic stage directions with any regularity either, so we cannot expect the kind of tidiness in a playhouse text that Greg did with his “promptbook theory” (Werstine, Early Modern 178). Instead, as Werstine argues,

Playhouse texts of the early modern period are not promptbooks. ... In early modern playhouse texts character designations can vary more and be rendered more ambiguously, rather than less so, after theater personal have prepared a text for the stage. Bookkeepers’ versions of SDD ... can be less reliable as a guide to or record of who entered at a particular juncture in performance than the SDD playwrights furnished. (Early Modern, 194)

Werstine considers those like Howard-Hill, who believed that a “promptbook” is a document that “is both ‘the source of other performance materials’ and, as Greg too thought, ‘a guide to and (potentially) a record of performances” (Howard-Hill, “Crane’s
in early-modern London professional playhouses, there was thought to be no point in having a promptbook as a record of performances, containing what was said and done on stage. All that was thought required in a playbook was a performance guide that evidently did not need to be complete or accurate in detail. (Early Modern, 172)

This finding goes against the reasoning used by a number of editors who follow F’s stage directions because they provide “indications of how the play was performed” (Waith 98) or as Hughes suggests, because they “seem to derive from [Shakespeare’s] company’s working prompt copy [so he] included them, on the assumption that they may represent what was actually done in performance” (61). If these statements are in fact too strong in that they expect the alterations and additions from a playhouse text to present a record of performance, we can still take the view that if promptbooks were guides to performance. If this is the case then Bate’s claim that the more sophisticated Folio directions “seem to reflect [seventeenth century] playhouse practice” can still hold (98). But can we say for sure that the text used to annotate the third quarto actually derived from the theater in the face of what we now know?

While the person responsible for the text in question cannot be said to be the bookkeeper any more than Shakespeare or another scribe, it appears we can still find the Folio Titus text to be connected to the theater. Werstine notes that though bookkeepers did in fact make the kinds of changes that are found in Titus, so did authors and scribes. He also clearly states that the manuscripts themselves often already had the kinds of stage
directions that we have often associated with the theater. These findings, at first seem to threaten even our ability to claim that the copy used to annotate the Third Quarto actually does derive from the theater, but Werstine did find a few positive indicators of playhouse manuscripts. Greg was correct, Werstine argues, to claim theatrical provenance when he located actor’s names and duplicate sound calls. Werstine uses these two specific kinds of evidence to connect Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* (which has the stage direction “*Enter Will Kempe*” on sig. K3r) and Q2 *Hamlet* (which has the duplicate sound call “*Drum, trumpets and shot. Florish, a peece goes off*” on sig. N4r7r) to the theater. As we writes about *Hamlet*, “such duplications of sound and music calls are well recognized as features unique to theatrical MSS. This one indicates that Q2 *Hamlet* has picked up a bookkeeper’s annotation and has therefore, like Q2 *Romeo and Juliet*, been printed from a playhouse MS” (*Early Modern*, 233).

If the duplication of a single sound call is enough to connect the copy to theatrical manuscript, and I think it is, then we can confidently make the case that the Folio Text of *Titus Andronicus*, was printed from a copy of the third quarto annotated with a theatrical text, and that a bookkeeper’s “annotation” has been “picked up” in the printing process. In the second act of the play, the stage direction “*Wind Horns*” followed on the next line by the direction that begins “*Here a cry of hounds, and wind horns in a peel*” (2.2.10.1-2). Greg noticed this and suggested that the “direction already in the text was also marked in the margin causing doubling” (*First Folio*, 205). Add to this example, the possibility that occurs at 1.1.150, and begins “*Flourish. / Then Sound Trumpets.*” Though some have noted that two calls are for different kinds of musical sounds are not unheard of, a claim
could be made that this is in fact a second example of a duplicate sound call and therefore
and indication of a connection to a theatrical manuscript.

There are only four instances in the Folio text of Titus in which the first line of a
stage direction is shorter in length than those that follow. Two of those instances include
the two “duplicate sound calls” listed above. The third example is the stage direction at
the beginning of the added scene, 3.2 that reads, “A Bnaket (sic). / Enter Andronicus,
Marcus, Lavinia, and the Boy.” The final example occurs in the last scene of the play, at
Titus’s entrance. The direction begins, “A Table brought in. / Enter Titus like a cook,
placing the meat on / the Table, and Lavinia with a vale over her face” (5.3.25.1-3). In
each case the shorter first line includes a stage direction that has been added to the text of
Q3 and brought into the Folio. Not only this, but in all three cases the shorter direction is
centered, and not to one side. Any other time that a stage direction calling for sound is
added to the Folio text it either falls to the far left or far right of the column. It seems at
least plausible, that the shared traits on the printed page of the text in the Folio, could tell
us that the directions shared similar placement or style in their location on the annotated
copy of Q3, and so made their way into the Folio text in a uniquely similar ways. Thus, it
is reasonable the multiple calls for sound at 1.1.150, could be argued to indicate a
marginal notation, no different than the one that caused to two instances of “Wind
Horns.” This might also be more likely, considering that on at least two other occasions
at 1.1.502 and 4.2.48, the direction “Flourish” was apparently written in to replace Q3’s
“Sound trumpets” and “Trumpets sound.” So with two possible ways to have entered the
text accidentally, either as a replacement for an existing call or a marginal notation made
by the bookkeeper, the case is even stronger.
With that said, if we have two occasions for duplicate sound calls in the play, it appears we can say with confidence that the text used to annotate Q3 was theatrical in nature, and this creates at least the possibility that the majority of the changes or additions in the First Folio text of *Titus Andronicus* are likely signs of theatrical influence, though for now the persons responsible for that text will continue to elude textual scholars. But this still leaves us with the “fly scene”—an entire scene (3.2) in the third act that only appears in the 1623 First Folio text—which itself has caused scholars to speculate on origin and relation to the theater and must be considered before a determination is made on the value of the Folio as a copy text.

**A Brief Discussion of 3.2 and Empirical Understanding**

In 1919, as W. W. Greg developed his theory of memorial reconstruction to explain the existence of additional scenes, he offered a possible scenario for the sudden appearance of the new “fly scene” in the Folio’s *Titus Andronicus*. He suggests the scene must be a memorial reconstruction; the play’s copy had been lost in the 1613 fire at the Globe Theatre, so the King’s Men were forced to purchase a copy of Q3 (1611), and add the newer scene to the text from memory (Greg, “*Titus Andronicus*,” 322-3; qtd. in Egan 103). But Greg did not go any further into offering any actual evidence in the scene to provide any sign of memorial reconstruction. As Egan notes, in his coverage of the rise and fall of memorial reconstruction in textual scholarship, Greg’s view of 3.2 is “only incidentally associated with memorial reconstruction,” and so, Egan decides, there is no need to show any negative evidence against Greg’s suggestion of the memorial reconstruction of the “fly scene” (103). The fact that few editors ever mention Greg’s
early theory suggests its lack of value. But the exact medium of the copy used to print the scene was never in question.

Having appeared in no other printed version of the play, it is clear that the “fly scene” must have been in the manuscript state. However, the questions do remain in determining just what kind of manuscript it is—theatrical, authorial, or nontheatrical scribal—how it came to the printers of the First Folio, its relative connection to the rest of the text, and when it was written. In his 1968 edition of *Titus Andronicus*, Wilson suggests the text “exhibits clear traces of prompt-book influence” (vii), most likely as an insert.

If the “new readings [in the Folio] and 3.2 come from the same manuscript, it is most likely theatrical,” suggest Mowat and Werstine in their Folger edition. Wilson points to the appearance of “O, O, O” (3.2.68) in the scene as evidence of “the influence of Burbage’s performance” (95n1). The value of the scene seems appreciated and clear in the fact that every major edition since the discovery of Q1 has included the scene, even though by far the majority uses Q1 as their copy text. Most editors tend to relate the text to the theater by connecting it with the so-called “promptbook,” as either an insertion or part of the manuscript itself. Based on our considerations of what we can and cannot say about the provenance of texts, does the evidence in the text of the “fly scene” actually connect it to either the bookkeeper or theatrical performance?

Looking again to Paul Werstine’s recent work with theatrical manuscripts, and what has been determined about the First Quarto and the majority of the First Folio of *Titus Andronicus*, we should be able to see if this scene, like the others discussed above, shows any sign of theatrical connection. A majority of the evidence that Paul Werstine
used to dispel the terms “foul papers” and “promptbooks” as legitimate descriptions of
texts is based on the appearance of stage directions and speech prefixes that did not fit
with either terms expectations. As you may recall, Werstine shows that stage directions in
playhouse manuscripts were rarely made less ambiguous or indefinite by bookkeepers. In
some cases, stage directions that are indefinite in the original manuscript were made more
so by the bookkeepers themselves. In the “fly scene” of Titus Andronicus, there are no
ambiguous stage directions. All three stage directions are actually quite definite, though
the entrance direction has the misspelling in “Bnaket” for “Banket” the usual spelling for
“banquet” in the Folio. The opening direction reads, “A Bnaket. / Enter Andronicus,
Marcus, Lavinia, and the Boy.” None of the character names used in this stage direction
is unique to this scene. While “Andronicus” on its own is rare in the Folio stage
directions, it is found on at least 3 other occasions in the play before scene 3.2 (1.1.143,
2.3.260, and 3.1.11). “Marcus” is used again in this scene at line 51 and on many
occasions throughout the Folio text, “Lavinia” is the most common form in the stage
directions for her character, and this is the first entrance for “the Boy” in the play, but
“Boy” is used again for his entrance in the very next scene in the Folio. The next stage
direction reads, “Marcus strikes the dish with a knife” (3.2.52). The direction is very
specific, as opposed to many found in the Folio text, in that it calls for the weapon and
the intended object to be struck. Of course, the knife at least, is clearly identified in the
next line by Titus when he asks his brother what he has “struck with [his] knife” (3.2.53).
The third and final stage direction in the scene is “Exeunt” indicating the clearing of the
stage and the end of the scene; again the direction leaves nothing unclear. Unlike the
many examples discussed above of indeterminate, ambiguous, or erroneous stage
directions found in the rest of the play, the directions in the “fly scene” seem clear, simple, and effective. The only point of discussion considering directions in this scene is the clear indications that Marcus gives Titus his knife and that Titus “strikes” the fly twice. Titus demands to Marcus, “Give me thy knife” which apparently Marcus does, then after indicating he will pretend the fly is the “Moore, / Come hither purposely to poison me,” Titus says “There’s for thyself, and that’s for Tamora” apparently striking the dish at each point (3.2.74). Of course, as Werstine notes, these kinds of specific stage directions are rare and not at all common in playtexts, though bookkeepers did in fact provide descriptive stage directions on occasion.

In addition to the stage directions in 3.2, there are three specific speech prefixes worth discussing in the scene: “An.” for Titus, “Mar.” for Marcus, and “Boy.” for Young Lucius. Two things can be said about these. For one, the speech prefix “An.” is not found anywhere else in the play, and is the only one used in the scene. While the uniqueness as suggested is, for Greg and others, a clear sign that the scene derives from a different “scribal origin” than the rest of the play, this theory is not necessarily the case. Werstine notes that bookkeepers can be found “reaching into SDD and SPP ... to introduce multiple designations of characters” some of which are “found nowhere else” in the speech prefixes or stage directions (Early Modern, 150)—this could also explain the appearance of the uniquely spelled “Tamira” in the dialogue at line 74). The problem is that inconsistent speech prefixes are also found in authorial manuscripts as well. The other two speech prefixes in the scene are not unique to the scene and are found regularly in others.
The second feature that is interesting when it comes to speech prefixes is that 3.2 is the only scene in which there is no variation in speech prefixes themselves, or between the speech prefixes and the names found in the stage directions at any point. Not only are the names consistent, but there are also no missing or incorrect speech prefixes. As has been noted previously, both Greg and Werstine found inconsistency in naming throughout Shakespeare’s texts. For Greg, inconsistency is a sign of “foul papers,” but as Werstine shows, it is quite common in playhouse manuscripts and cannot be used to suggest that the copy for a printed play was authorial manuscript. So here again, the condition of the speech prefixes, like the stage directions, offers no further clues of the provenance of the text. What we have, then, is a manuscript text that might have been used once as evidence of Greg and McKerrow’s “promptbook,” because the stage directions and speech prefixes are clean. But of course, Werstine has shown that we can no longer expect texts prepared for the stage to exhibit the cleanliness and tidiness that had been a defining feature of “fair copy.” However, the clarity of the stage directions alone seems to be a clear indication that the origin of the scene is not the same as that of original manuscript used as copy for Q1. With no clear evidence of whether or not the text of 3.2 derives from the theater in the speech prefixes or stage directions, next we turn to the dialogue.

While many of Greg’s considerations of theatrical texts no longer stand, like stage directions and speech prefixes, dialogue will show certain features that can still be associated with the theater as well. These include duplicate dialogue, second thoughts, and apparent loose ends. As Werstine writes, these traits can actually “increase and originate” from the bookkeeper himself, and they are often caused in printed plays by
incomplete or unclear marks for deletion or additions in the form of “marginal insertions” on the text being used for copy (Early Modern, 178). But these traits are also found to be present in authorial manuscripts before a bookkeeper’s involvement. Regardless, there is neither evidence of second thoughts within the scene (though admittedly the scene itself may represent quite a large single second thought), nor are there any apparent false starts or loose ends. What we do have in the dialogue is the occasional misspelling, and evidence of few missing words and irregular meter in the lines, all of which are discussed in the previous section on Compositor E. A look back at the section on E in the introduction reveals that the little that can be successfully attributed to E from the fly scene places editors even farther away from a determination of the state of the text used to print the scene.

While no one can dispute the fact that the copy of the “fly scene” was a manuscript of some form, not much more can be said. Had it been part of a complete playhouse manuscript used to update Q3 for printing the Folio text of Titus Andronicus, one would expect to find the specific attributes now associated with theatrical manuscripts that had been prepared for the stage or that show signs of bookkeeper involvement at some point. In other words it should contain similar traits as those found in the Folio text of the play that still can be said to point to theatrical or bookkeeper involvement. The fact is that none of these signs are evident. Nor can we say for sure who was responsible for the manuscript; the possibilities range from Shakespeare’s authorial manuscript to nontheatrical scribe to a scribe in the theater itself. While the regularity of the speech prefixes, could suggest that it is a transcription of an earlier manuscript, the lack of clarity in the dialogue seems to make this argument less likely.
The more likely claim seems to be that the copy behind the scene was a manuscript of the scene created separately and kept separate from any printed text or full manuscript. Whether it was an insert in a playhouse text or not is unknown, but most likely it derives from the King’s Men’s holdings that were provided for the production of the First Folio. The lack of verifiable bookkeeper involvement makes it hard to say whether the manuscript was ever used in the theater.

As this chapter concludes, I have attempted to shed light on some of the things we can now say more confidently and those that we cannot concerning the major texts of *Titus Andronicus*. It appears, based on empirical evidence from playhouse manuscripts, that “foul papers” and “promptbooks” may have taken their final blow as useful terms to discuss Early Modern manuscripts. What this forces us to reconsider for *Titus Andronicus* is now clear.

For the First Quarto text of the play, we no longer suggest with confidence that it was printed from “foul papers,” nor can we make as strong of a connection to “authorial manuscripts” either. The determinable traits that exist in playhouse manuscripts show evidence of the involvement of a number of agents, from authors to bookkeepers, it seems clear that we at least have to allow for the possibility that Q1 has at least some relationship to the theater, though not nearly as completely as the Folio text.

Paul Werstine has successfully lowered the amount of evidence we can confidently use as indications of bookkeeper involvement or scribal tendencies; however, the evidence of the theater can still be confidently located in the duplicate sound calls found in the 1623 Folio *Titus Andronicus*. While the agent or agents behind the manuscript used to annotate the Third Quarto, are even more elusive than we thought, the
ability to locate the theater is key for this edition. Finally, the “fly scene” seems destined to remain difficult to define. While clearly it is a manuscript copy of a scene written by Shakespeare, how that copy came to the printers, its overall legibility, and the hand or hands responsible for the state of that are still yet to be determined with any more confidence than we had before. While the evidence is not as clear as it once was thought to be, the Folio still proves to have the greatest connection to the Elizabethan theater, and for this reason I have chosen the 1623 Folio text for my copy text for this edition.
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William Shakespeare’s

*Titus Andronicus*
List of Characters

SATURNINUS, eldest son of the late Emperor of Rome, who will succeed as Emperor
BASSIANUS, his younger brother
TITUS ANDRONICUS, General of the Roman Army

LUCIUS
QUINTUS
MARTIUS
MUTIUS

Ttitus’s sons

LAVINIA, Titus’s Daughter
MARCUS ANDRONICUS, Titus’s brother, a Roman Tribune
YOUNG LUCIUS, Titus’s grandson
PUBLIUS, Marcus’s son

SEMPRONIUS
CAIUS
VALENTINE

Titus’s kin.

TAMORA, Queen of the Goths

ALARBUS
CHIRON
DEMETRIUS

Tamora’s sons

AARON*, a Moor*, Tamora’s lover
AEMILIUS
CAPTAIN, MESSENGER, NURSE, CLOWN, GOTHS, Senators, Tribunes (Judges)*, followers of Saturninus and Bassianus, Attendants, Soldiers, Romans*

*AARON in Exodus, Aaron is an “eloquent” and “persuasive” speaker, and Shakespeare’s audience would have been well aware of the connection (Bate 125n34).
*Moor a member of the Muslim people, descending from Berber and Arab descent. For Elizabethans the Moor was a symbol of barbarity, exoticism, and virility. Moors were not necessarily black skinned, though in Titus Andronicus, the term is synonymous with Aaron’s blackness.
*Senators, Tribunes (Judges) the Tribunes of ancient Rome were elected officials, assigned to protect the plebeians, or commoners, while Senators were members of the Senate early on elected by patricians (1.1.1), or aristocrats, and later by the plebeians and patricians.
THE LAMENTABLE TRAGEDY OF TITUS ANDRONICUS

Act 1, Scene 1

Flourish. Enter the Tribunes and Senators, aloft. And then enter Saturninus and his followers at one door, and Bassianus and his followers at the other, with Drum and Colors.

SATURNINUS

Noble patricians, patrons of my right, Defend the justice of my cause with arms. And countrymen, my loving followers, Plead my successive title with your swords.

I am his first-born son that was the last That wore the imperial diadem of Rome: Then let my father’s honors live in me, Nor wrong mine age with this indignity.

Abbreviations in Notes

Q1=1594 First Quarto; Q2=1600 Second Quarto; Q3=1611 Third Quarto; Qq=all three quartos; F=1623 First Folio; F2=1632 Second Folio; F3=1663 Third Folio; F4=1685 Fourth Folio; SD=stage direction; SP=speech prefix; ed(s).=editor(s); t.n.=textual note; n.=commentary note; l.=line; ll.=lines

* Act 1, Scene 1 Location: at line 12, “this passage to the Capitol,” may indicate that the scene takes place on or near the Capitoline Hill in Rome, which was thought to be on the way to the senate house. John Dover Wilson notes that “all Eliz[abethan] dramatists, except Ben Jonson, [mistakenly] regarded the Capitol, [or Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus on the hill], as the Roman Senate-house or Parliament” (101). Herodian, a Roman historian, records a tenuous moment in Roman history during the reign of the emperor Bassianus when the Senate assembled “not in the Coorte as thei were wonte before, but in the Temple of Jupiter Capitolyne, the hyche beynge buylded in the highest place of the Citie” (Herodian, 7.10.2).

* 0.1 Flourish. trumpets sounding to indicate the entrance of important persons.

* 1-17 SATURNINUS Editors differ on whether the brothers are addressing only their followers, or the Senators and Tribunes as well, but usually suggest the two follow the same action. However, based on the present language and future actions of the two brothers, it seems possible that while Saturninus addresses only his followers—“patricians, patrons of my right”—directly and pleads for them to “defend” his “cause with arms,” Bassianus is more inclusive, calling to all “Romans” in addition to the “favorers of [his] right.”

* 1 patrons of my right defenders, protectors of his successive title, or primogeniture (his hereditary claim to the throne as the “first born son”); Bate suggests the term could possibly indicate a “technical Roman sense of legal advice.”

* 6 diadem crown

* 8 mine age my status as the eldest son
BASSIANUS  
Romans, friends, followers, favorers of my right,
If ever Bassianus, Caesar’s son,
Were gracious* in the eyes of royal Rome,
Keep* then this passage to the Capitol,
And suffer not dishonor to approach
Th’imperial* seat: to virtue consecrate*,
To justice, continence* and nobility:
But let desert in pure election* shine,
And, Romans, fight for freedom in your choice.

Enter MARCUS Andronicus, aloft, with the crown.

Princes, that strive by factions and by friends
Ambitiously for rule and empery*,
Know that the people of Rome, for whom we stand
A special party*, have by common voice*,
In election for the Roman empery,
Chosen Andronicus, surnamèd Pius

* 8 indignity Bassianus, a younger son’s attempt to block his “passage to the Capitol,” and call for an election.
* 11 gracious acceptable
* 12 Keep guard, block
* 14 consecrate dedicated
* 15 continence self-restraint i.e. often connected to restraint from sexual intercourse. The Elizabethan’s understanding is seen in Elyot’s description: “Continence is a vertue which keepeth the plesaunt appetite of man under th' yoke of reason” (1580, 179). Elyot’s use of “yoke” suggests the man’s sexual appetite is a force that must be tamed or conquered. See n. l. 30 below.
*16 pure election free “choice” through the vote of the Roman people (as opposed to primogeniture)
* 17.1 Enter ... crown. F’s SD here seems to present a more specifically effect stage moment with the solo entrance that puts the focus on Marcus and the centerpiece of the play thus far—the crown. Editors who use Q1 as copy suggest having Marcus enter with the other Tribunes which to many is more logical; however, as Waith points out, Marcus need not to have heard the brothers speeches to be aware of the situation.
* 19 empery emperorship of Rome
* 21 special party i.e. the elected Tribunes, of which Marcus is one (see n. ll. 1.1.0.1.2, and 1.1.182).
* 21 voice an oral vote (this sense is used often in Cor.)
For many good and great deserts to Rome:

A nobler man, a braver warrior,
Lives not this day within the city walls.
He by the senate is accited home
From weary wars against the barbarous Goth,
That with his sons, a terror to our foes,

Hath yoked a nation strong, trained up in arms.
Ten years are spent since first he undertook
This cause of Rome and chastised with arms
Our enemies’ pride: five times he hath returned
Bleeding to Rome, bearing his valiant sons

In coffins from the field,
And now at last, laden with honor’s spoils,
Returns the good Andronicus to Rome,
Renowned Titus, flourishing in arms.

Let us entreat, by honor of his name,
Whom worthily you would have now succeed,

* 23 **surnamèd** Pius Titus has been given an honorary epithet, denoting the religious, patriotic and just nature of his character; these traits suggest Rome’s legendary founder, Virgil’s “Pius Aeneas.”

* 24 **deserts** deeds deserving reward

* 27 **accited** called, summoned

* 28 **barbarous** Hughes conjectures that the meter suggests that the word should be pronounced as disyllabic.

* 30 **yoked** conquered. In farming practices, the yoke is a frame around the heads or neck, which would join two animals, such as oxen, to work together pulling field equipment such as plows. A similar device was used to shackle the hands and heads of prisoners or criminals. Hughes notes that it “was a Roman custom to make vanquished enemies pass under a yoke” (see also l. 69 and l. 112).

* 30 **trained up in arms** instructed in the art of war/battle

* 35 the t.n. records three and a half lines found only in Q1, which erroneously indicate that the sacrifice of Alarbus has already occurred. Most editors agree that the lines are relics of an earlier draft, and were meant to be deleted. For an argument to retain these lines see, Joseph S. G. Bolton’s “A plea for 3 ½ rejected Shakespearian lines,” SQ 23 (1972), 261-263.

* 38 **flourishing in arms** having succeeded or excelled in battle

* 39-40 **by honor ... succeed** There are several interpretations for this line, depending on how one reads “his.” The most likely reference is to their dead father, whom they have just tried to succeed, which Capell follows, defining the line as “for the honor of the dead emperor”; he tried to clarify this meaning by emending “succeed” to “succeeded.” The Riverside eds. followed Stoll’s conjecture that “succeed” is a contracted form of the past participle, though, as Bate points out, comparable cases are hard to find. Waith reads it as referring to the “candidate you favor,” though the fact that Marcus is addressing the
And in the Capitol and senate’s right,*
Whom you pretend* to honor and adore,
That you withdraw you and abate your strength,
Dismiss your followers and, as suitors* should,
Plead your deserts in peace and humbleness.

SATURNINUS
How fair the tribune speaks to calm my thoughts.xxiv  
[Aside?]xxv

BASSIANUS
Marcus Andronicus, so I doxxvi affy*  
In thy uprightness and integrity,  
And so I love and honor thee and thine,
Thy noble brother Titus and his sons,
And her, to whom my thoughts are humbled all*,  
Gracious Lavinia, Rome’s rich ornament*,  
That I will here dismiss my loving friends,  
And to my fortunesxxvii and the people’s favor
Commit my cause in balance to be weighed*.  
Exeunt [Bassianus’s] Soldiersxxviii

SATURNINUS
Friends, that have been thus forward in my right*,xxix
I thank you all and here dismiss you all,

Saturninus and Bassianus, makes this reading less likely. Bate’s suggestion that “his” could refer “to the brothers themselves” is plausible, but seems unlikely.

* 41 Capitol ... right the given rights of the Capitol and senate
* 42 pretend claim
* 44 suitors petitioners
* 46 SD [Aside?] Saturninus’s may be saying this line sarcastically, and would thus unlikely be saying it aloud to Marcus. If so, the line would be an Aside to himself or to his followers.
* 47 affy trust
* 51 all entirely
* 52 ornament “a person who enhances or adds distinction to his or her sphere” i.e. through beauty or other traits (OED n. c.); Compare to “She is the ornament of womankind” (Spenser, Colin Clout, 1595).
* 55 cause...weighed i.e. for my cause to be justly compared against that of Saturninus
* 55 SD Exeunt ... Soldiers The presence of the followers on stage is not required, and that the Captain’s “Romans, make way” could be a call to attention as much as a request for space to be cleared. Waith argues that staging most likely requires that all of Bassianus’s and Saturninus’s soldiers leave the stage here and at line 59, and reenter as part of Titus’s entrance (W08, p. 44). However, he and others do point out that the Captain’s request for “Romans” to “make way” (l. 64), could suggest the presence of some followers on the stage still. G. K. Hunter suggests this address could be to the audience as well (“Flatcaps,” 18-20).
* 56 forward in my right zealous is supporting my claim.
And to the love and favor of my country
Commit myself, my person and the cause.

Rome, be as just and gracious unto me
As I am confident and kind to thee.

Open the gates and let me in.

BASSIANUS
Tribunes, and me, a poor competitor.

Flourish.

[Saturninus and Bassianus] go up into the Senate House.

Enter a Captain.

CAPTAIN

Romans, make way: the good Andronicus,
Patron of virtue, Rome’s best champion,
Successful in the battles that he fights,
With honor and with fortune is returned
From whence he circumscribèd with his sword
And brought to yoke, the enemies of Rome.
Sound drums and trumpets, and then enter two of Titus’s sons [Martius and Mutius]. After them, men bearing [two] coffin[s] covered with black, then two other sons [Lucius and Quintus]. After them, Titus Andronicus [in a chariot], and then [as prisoners] Tamora, the Queen of Goths, and her (three) sons [Alarbus, Chiron and Demetrius], with Aaron the Moor and others, as many as can be. They set down the coffin[s] and Titus speaks.

TITUS

Hail, Rome, Victorious in thy mourning weeds!
Lo, as the bark that hath discharged her freight Returns with precious lading to the bay
From whence at first she weighed her anchorage,
Cometh Andronicus, bound with laurel boughs.

---

*69.2 SD [two] coffin[s] This emendation, suggested by Wells, accounts for the multiple sons lost by Titus (see l. 84 “These that I bring unto their latest home” and l.88 “sons,” and more). However, if an already large cast is performing the play, as Waith suggests, then it may be that a single coffin was used to represent all of the dead (pp. 43-44); Bate agrees and reminds us that the Elizabethan stage was more emblematic than literal.

*69.1-3 SD the order in which Titus’s sons enter is pure conjecture. I have followed the order used by most eds. since John Dover Wilson. Hughes’s points out that Lucius, the oldest son, would enter first leading in Mutius, because of the assonance of their names, and their prominence in Act I, seems arbitrary. It makes more sense that the eldest son would be walking nearest to Titus, who is holding the position of honor in the procession.

*69.3 SD [in a chariot] Waith points out that Titus’s offering of his chariot along with his sword and prisoners at l. 251 could indicate that Titus has been drawn in on this chariot here, though Wells argues that Elizabethans stagecraft was rarely literal and it would not be necessary to have the chariot on stage (90)

*69.4 SD (three) sons [Alarbus,] Alarbus must enter here along with the other prisoners (Rowe). The naming of only “two sons” in Qq, F could suggest, that the execution of Alarbus, was added at later date from the original composition, which would explain Q1’s three lines discussing an execution that has already taken place (see n. l. 35 above)

*69.4 SD others as many as can be Waith indicates that the “indefiniteness is characteristic of stage directions in an authorial manuscript”; see the final essay in the introduction for further discussion.

*71 mourning weeds garments indicating a state of mourning for the former emperor’s death

*72 as bark ... his freight like a ship that has delivered cargo. Qq and F’s fraught, was first emended to freight by Rowe (suggesting a likely misreading of “au” for “ei” when printing from manuscript). Some editors emend him to “her,” and suggest yet another misreading of a manuscript “hir” (Bate).

*73 lading cargo

*74 weighed her anchorage embarked, pulled up anchor
To resalute his country with his tears,
Tears of true joy for his return to Rome.
Thou great defender of this Capitol,
Stand gracious to the rites that we intend.
Romans, of five and twenty valiant sons,
Half of the number that King Priam had,
Behold the poor remains, alive and dead!
These that survive, let Rome reward with love:
These that I bring unto their latest home,
With burial amongst their ancestors.
Here Goths have given me leave to sheathe my sword:
Titus, unkind and careless of thine own,
Why suffer’st thou thy sons unburied yet
To hover on the dreadful shore of Styx?
Make way to lay them by their brethren.

They open the tomb.

There greet in silence, as the dead are wont,
And sleep in peace, slain in your country’s wars.

---

* 75 laurel boughs the laurel branch symbolized victory
* 76 resalute salute anew; i.e. upon his return
* 78 defender i.e. Jupiter Capitolinus
* 79 Stand gracious be accepting or disposed to grace
* 79 rites religious observances
* 81 Priam King of Troy during the Trojan War, who lost forty-nine of his fifty sons in the attack.
* 84 latest last, final
* 85 With i.e. reward with
* 86 Here ... sword Waith notes the irony of this reference, considering Titus has defeated the Goths (see lines 68-69 above)
* 87 unkind unnatural; see 5.3.48 “Unnatural and unkind!.” There is also a connection here to familial responsibility to bury his sons; see Hamlet 1.1.65 “A little more than kin, and less than kind.”
* 89 hover ... Styx it was only after proper burial that the souls of the dead could cross this river or lake into Hades.
* 90 brethren pronounced breth-er-en here, and in other cases where meter requires it (Waith). Q3’s spelling “bretheren” most clearly indicates three separate syllables.
* 90 SD tomb likely a curtain is drawn to reveal an entrance to “the tomb.” Some editors offer that a tomb could be present on stage now and later removed. Others suggest the opening of the stages trap to represent the tomb. The argument that the tiring-house doors are used here seems least likely, especially if they have served for the entrances and exits of Bassianus and Saturninus.
O sacred receptacle* of my joys,
Sweet cell of virtue and nobility,

95 How many sons of mine hast thou in store,
That thou wilt never render to me more!

LUCIUS

Give us the proudest* prisoner of the Goths,*
That we may hew his limbs, and on a pile

Ad manes sacrific* his flesh*

Before this earthly prison of their bones,
That so the shadows be not unappeased,
Nor we disturbed with prodigies* on earth.

TITUS

I give him you, the noblest that survives,
The eldest son* of this distressed queen.

TAMORA

Stay, Roman brethren, gracious conqueror,
Victorious Titus, rue* the tears I shed,
A mother’s tears in passion* for her son:
And if thy sons were ever dear to thee,

---

* 93 receptacle emphasis on the third syllable, “receptàcle,” is required by the meter.
* 97 proudest a) most prideful, b) highest in rank (see OED adj. II.5.a)
* 97-150 Give ... souls Building on Greg’s finding that the sacrifice of Alarbus was an “addition to the original composition used for Q1,” John Dover Wilson concluded that if ll. 97-150 are omitted, the text of l. 96 “runs strait on” to Titus’s speech at l. 151. The omission of these lines also would explain and support the inclusion of Q1’s 3 lines at l. 35 (see n. 1.1.35 and collations)
* 99 Ad manes fratrum To the spirits/shades of our brothers (Latin)
* 99 sacrifice Bate notes “Rome prided itself on not allowing human sacrifice,” and suggests this act shows that Rome is becoming more barbaric.
* 101 That so so that
* 101 shadows spirits, ghosts (manus)
* 102 prodigies ominous happenings
* 104 eldest son i.e. Alarbus; Bate suggests that the eldest son is chosen because it was Titus’s eldest son, Lucius, who made the request. However, this need not be the case. As the eldest, it would clearly be assumed that Alarbus would represent the “proudest prisoner” (see n. 97.b).
* 104 Waith and later editors suggest that at least Tamora kneels when speaking these lines. The evidence they suggest is in ll. 461-462 “to let a queen/ Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain.” Also, Tamora’s later mention of kneeling and begging in the streets could be an exaggeration of the scene she is describing to Saturninus and not necessarily an account of what actually occurs here.
* 106 rue pity
* 107 passion emotion, grief
O, think my sons\textsuperscript{lxiii} to be as dear to me.

Sufficeth not\textsuperscript{110} that we are brought to Rome
To beautify thy triumphs,\textsuperscript{*} and return\textsuperscript{lxiv} Captive to thee and to thy Roman yoke\textsuperscript{*}? But must my sons be slaughtered in the streets
For valiant doings in their country’s cause?

O, if to fight for king and commonweal\textsuperscript{*}
Were piety in thine, it is in these\textsuperscript{*}.
Andronicus, stain not thy tomb with blood.
Wilt thou draw near the nature of the gods?
Draw near them then in being merciful:*

Sweet mercy is nobility’s true badge.
Thrice-noble Titus, spare my first-born son.

\textbf{TITUS}
Patient\textsuperscript{*} yourself, madam, and pardon me.
These are the\textsuperscript{lxv} brethren\textsuperscript{*} whom you\textsuperscript{lxvi} Goths beheld, Alive and dead, and, for their brethren slain,

Religiously\textsuperscript{*} they ask a sacrifice:
To this your son is marked, and die he must, T‘appease\textsuperscript{lxvii} their groaning shadows that are gone.

\textbf{LUCIUS}

\textsuperscript{* 110} \textbf{Sufficeth not} does it not suffice. i.e. is it not enough
\textsuperscript{* 111} \textbf{triumphs} ceremonial processions of a victorious general entering Rome, and displaying his captives and trophies of war
\textsuperscript{* 111} \textbf{triumphs, and return} Theobald found a problem with suggesting that Tamora was being returned to Rome, having no evidence she had been there before, and so emended the phrase to “triumph and return.” However, most editors since have kept the original comma placement, pointing to the common use of “triumph” to refer to the entire procession (see n. 111 above)
\textsuperscript{* 112} \textbf{yoke} see n. 1.1.30
\textsuperscript{* 115} \textbf{commonweal} state, community
\textsuperscript{* 116} \textbf{these} i.e. my sons.
\textsuperscript{* 119-120} \textbf{Wilt ... merciful} English Proverb, “It is in their Mercy that kings come closest to gods” (M. P. Tilley, M 989); see also \textit{MM} 2.2.59-63
\textsuperscript{* 122} \textbf{Patient} calm, control
\textsuperscript{* 123} \textbf{the brethren} F’s emendation of Qq’s “their” to “the” makes more sense, as all of Titus’s sons, “alive and dead,” are still on stage (the coffins have not been interred into the tomb); the next line’s “their brethren slain” is then the first instance where Titus singles out his four living sons. If Qq’s “their brethren” is kept, then the reference is to the dead sons only here, and “alive and dead” refers only to the dead who the Goths witness fighting in life and now dead.
\textsuperscript{* 125} \textbf{Religiously} i.e. in observance of their religious duty to the dead (see n. l. 102); ironic considering Rome’s early pride in not allowing human sacrifice (see n. l. 99)
Away with him, and make a fire straight*,
And with our swords, upon a pile of wood,

Let’s hew his limbs till they be clean consumed*.

TAMORA lxix
O cruel, irreligious piety*!

CHIRON

Was ever Scythia* half so barbarous? lx

DEMETRIUS
Oppose* not Scythia to ambitious Rome.

Alarbus goes to rest and we survive

To tremble under Titus’ threatening looks lxii.
Then, madam, stand resolved, but hope withal
The self-same gods that armed the Queen of Troy

With opportunity of sharp revenge

Upon the Thracian tyrant in his tent*

May favor Tamora, the Queen of Goths —

When Goths were Goths and Tamora was queen —

To quit the bloody wrongs upon her foes.

Enter the Sons of Andronicus again. lxv

LUCIUS
See, lord and father, how we have performed

Our Roman rites: Alarbus’ limbs are lopped,

---

* 128 **straight** right away
* 130 **clean consumed** entirely consumed by the fire
* 131 **irreligious piety** the oxymoron reflects back to l. 116 and 125; “piety” was also
commonly interchangeable with “pity,” though this meaning makes sense, it carries less
weight in conjunction with the earlier comments on the gods and religion.
* 132 **Scythia** an ancient region in what is now southern Ukraine, north of the Black Sea,
known for the savage reputation of its inhabitants.
* 133 **Oppose** compare
* 133 **ambitious** presumptuous
* 137-139 **the ... tent** In Ovid, the Queen of Troy (Hecuba) avenges the death of her son,
Polydoros, by blinding his murderer, the Thracian tyrant (Polymestor). In Euripides’
Hecabe, he has the queen kill Polymestor’s two sons. Either version could work for this
play, as she does get revenge on both Titus and his children, though neither version is
followed specifically in this description. The main concern with relating either
specifically, is the use of his tent, which does not coincide with either; this caused
Theobald to emend “his” to “her.”
* 142 **quit** requite, revenge
And entrails feed the sacrificing fire,
Whose smoke like incense doth perfume the sky.
Remaineth naught but to inter our brethren
And with loud ’larums welcome them to Rome.

TITUS
Let it be so, and let Andronicus
Make this his latest farewell to their souls.

Flourish.
Then sound trumpets, and lay the coffins in the tomb.

In peace and honor rest you here, my sons:
Rome’s readiest champions, repose you here in rest,
Secure from worldly chances and mishaps.
Here lurks no treason, here no envy swells,
Here grow no damned grudges, here are no storms,
No noise, but silence and eternal sleep:
In peace and honor rest you here, my sons.

* 143-144 See ... rites Waith suggests that the sons may hold up their bloody swords here, and this seems possible considering the importance of witnessing the results of violence later in the play.
* 147 Remaineth naught Nothing remains
* 147 inter deposit in the tomb
* 148 ’larums alarums, military trumpet calls
* 150.1 SD Sound trumpets F’s inclusion of two separate sets of trumpet calls here could be intentional, the first “welcom[ing] them (the dead sons) to Rome” and the second signaling their entrance into the tomb. This could be a duplicate sound call that was entered into the margins by a bookkeeper (see final chapter for a discussion of duplicate sound calls, and Waith). Another possibility is that “Flourish” was written in to replace Qq’s “Sound Trumpets” as is the case several times in the Folio.
* 150.2 SD coffins F has emended Qq’s “Coffin” to “coffins.” This agrees with Wells’s suggestion at l. 69 (see n. above).
* 152 readiest most willing
* 154 envy malice (obs., also see 2.1.4)
* 155 grudges Q3’s “grudges” does make clear sense, as it is in line with “envy.” Q1-Q2’s “drugges” is often defended as correct and defined as poisonous plants which can “grow.” But just as “treason” can “lurk” and “envy” can “swell” so can grudges “grow.” This is also in line with the tree imagery throughout the play which is often connected to the human body and mind.
* 153-156 Secure ... sleep (see n. l. 178)
* 151-157 the verbal repetition here “marks this speech as a formal panegyric or praising of the dead” (Hughes).
Enter Lavinia.  

LAVINIA

In peace and honor live Lord Titus long:
My noble lord and father, live in fame!  

Lo, at this tomb my tributary tears
I render for my brethren’s obsequies,
And at thy feet I kneel with tears of joy
Shed on the earth for thy return to Rome.
O, bless me here with thy victorious hand,

Whose fortune Rome’s best citizens applaud.

TITUS

Kind Rome, that hast thus lovingly reserved
The cordial of mine age to glad my heart.
Lavinia, live, outlive thy father’s days
And fame’s eternal date, for virtue’s praise.

[Enter Marcus, below]

MARCUS

Long live Lord Titus, my belovèd brother,
Gracious triumpher in the eyes of Rome!

TITUS

Thanks, gentle tribune, noble brother Marcus.

MARCUS

And welcome, nephews, from successful wars,

* 158 SD Enter Lavinia Cam1 places the entrance a line earlier so that Lavinia “hears” and can repeat the beginning of Titus’s last line.  
* 160 tributary tears tears in tribute to the dead  
* 161 obsequies funeral ceremonies  
* 167 cordial comfort  
* 169 fame’s eternal date the day that fame will die  
* 169 SD Enter Marcus, below it makes sense here that Marcus would be interacting directly with Titus (see the offering of the pallium at 183), and thus on the main stage. Many editors have Marcus remain aloft with Saturninus and Bassianus from line 63, citing F’s SD at 235 “A long flourish till they come down” as an indication that the tribunes, brothers and Marcus must be together aloft. This is not necessarily so, because Saturninus and Bassianus can easily be left aloft from line 63 on, watching as the procession and following action occurs on the main stage. Hughes suggests that the staging is “more dramatic” if we have Saturninus and Bassianus remain off stage until just before their speeches at 203 and 214.  
* 171 triumpher victor; also one who has celebrated a Roman triumph (OED) (see n. 1. 111)
You that survive and you that sleep in fame.

Fair lords, your fortunes are alike\textsuperscript{xcv} in all,
That in your country’s service drew your swords:
But safer triumph is this funeral pomp
That hath aspired\textsuperscript{*} to Solon’s happiness
And triumphs over chance in honor’s bed.\textsuperscript{*}

Titus Andronicus, the people of Rome,
Whose friend in justice thou hast ever been,
Send thee by me, their tribune and their trust,
This palliament\textsuperscript{*} of white and spotless hue,
And name thee in election for the empire

With these our late-deceased\textsuperscript{xcvi} emperor’s sons:
Be \textit{candidatus}\textsuperscript{*} then and put it on,
And help to set a head on headless\textsuperscript{*} Rome.\textsuperscript{xcvii}

\textbf{TITUS}

A better head her glorious body fits
Than his that shakes for age and feebleness.

What,\textsuperscript{*} should\textsuperscript{xcviii} I don\textsuperscript{xcix} this robe and trouble you?\textsuperscript{c}
Be chosen with proclamations today\textsuperscript{ci},
Tomorrow yield\textsuperscript{*} up rule, resign my life
And set abroad\textsuperscript{cii} new business for you all?\textsuperscript{ciii}
Rome\textsuperscript{civ}, I have been thy soldier forty years,
And led my country’s strength successfully,
And buried one and twenty valiant sons,
Knighted in field\textsuperscript{*}, slain manfully in arms

\textsuperscript{*}178 \textbf{aspired} risen
\textsuperscript{*}177-179 \textbf{safer ... bed} Titus’s dead sons are now safe from all worldly chance or trouble (see l. 153-56). “Solon’s happiness” According to Herodotus’s \textit{Histories} (1.32), Solon, and Athenian lawgiver, said, “Call no man happy until he is dead.”
\textsuperscript{*}183 \textbf{palliament} robe. One of only two known occurrences of the word. The word appears in Peele’s poem, “The Honour of the Garter” (1593), and proponents of Peele’s hand in the play, use this connection as a main piece of evidence. However, Hereward Price “argued persuasively that the different sense in which the word was used in the play made borrowing by Shakespeare more likely than repetition by Peele” (Waith, 14).
\textsuperscript{*}186 \textbf{candidatus} clad in white (Lat), indicating the a candidacy for office in Rome.
\textsuperscript{*}187 \textbf{head on headless} brings up the body imagery associated with the body politic.
\textsuperscript{*}190 \textbf{What}, an exclamation used regularly throughout the play by Titus and others, usually to introduce a rhetorical question (see 1.1.294, 366). editors who follow Qq, F’s “What should” see it as meaning “why.”
\textsuperscript{*}192 \textbf{Tomorrow yield} to on the next day yield, to tomorrow yield.
\textsuperscript{*}193 \textbf{set abroad} initiate
\textsuperscript{*}197 \textbf{Knighted in field} An anachronism based on medieval European custom of battlefield knighthoods conferred by sovereigns or commanders. In Shakespeare’s own
In right and service of their noble country:
Give me a staff of honor* for mine age,
But not a scepter* to control the world.
Upright he held it, lords, that held it last.

MARCUS
Titus, thou shalt obtain, an ask the empery*.cv
SATURNINUScvii
Proud and ambitious tribune, canst thou tell?

TITUS
Patience, Prince Saturninus—
SATURNINUS
Romans, do me right.
Patricians, draw your swords and sheathe them not
Till Saturninus be Rome’s emperor.
Andronicus, would thou wertcvii shipped to hell,
Rather than rob me of the people’s hearts.

LUCIUS
Proud Saturnine, interrupter of the good
That noble-minded Titus means to thee*.

TITUS
Content thee, prince, I will restore to thee
The people’s hearts, and wean* them from themselves.cviii

BASSIANUScix
Andronicus, I do not flatter thee,
But honor thee, and will do till I die:
My faction, if thou strengthen with thy friendscx,
I will most thankful be, and thanks to men
Of noble minds is honorable meed*.

TITUS
People of Rome, and noblecxii tribunes here,
I ask your voices and your suffrages*,

---

* staff of honor a symbol of honor and respect, as opposed to the scepter’s suggestion of imperial power.
* scepter an ornamental rod symbolizing imperial authority
* an ask the empery if you ask for it. Marcus is suggesting the emperorship is in Titus’s grasp if he wants it; this initiates Saturninus’s following response.
* interrupter ... thee it is not clear how Lucius would know the “good” that Titus plans, Bate suggests that knowing Titus’s “dedication to old values” he would be sure that his father would “favour primogeniture.”
* wean detach
* meed reward
Will you bestow them friendly on Andronicus?

To gratify the good Andronicus
And gratulate his safe return to Rome,
The people will accept whom he admits.

TITUS

Tribunes, I thank you, and this suit I make,
That you create you emperor’s eldest son,
Lord Saturnine, whose virtues will, I hope,
Reflect on Rome as Titan’s rays on earth,
And ripen justice in this commonweal:

Then if you will elect by my advice,
Crown him and say, “Long live our emperor!”

MARCUS

With voices and applause of every sort,
Patricians and plebeians, we create
Lord Saturninus Rome’s great emperor,
And say, “Long live our Emperor Saturnine!”

A long flourish till they come down.

SATURNINUS

Titus Andronicus, for thy favors done
To us in our election this day,
I give thee thanks in part of thy deserts,

* 220 voices and your suffrages oral support, and votes. Previous eds. define “voices” as votes, however the repetition seems unlikely. Vocal support at this stage seems more likely, and the Tribunes give Titus this at 222, though “voice” is used at other points in the play to mean vote (see 232).
* 223 gratulate salute (Onions, Wilson, Waith), congratulate; express joy at (Bate)
* 226 create elect
* 228 Titan’s i.e. the sun’s
* 232 sort social class, defined by the following “Patricians and plebeians”
* 235 SD they come down F’s stage direction here, suggests that Saturninus, Bassianus and all remaining Senators/Tribunes come down to the main stage from aloft. Whatever choice is made at 169 above (see n), dictates who is left on stage. Hughes’s problem with Marcus’s need to crown Saturninus, can easily be solved by having the crowning take place when Saturninus reaches the main stage, as Bate has suggested. We must remember that Marcus wanted Titus to accept the crown, and therefore the order of announcing Saturninus’s election and the actual crowning could understandably be impromptu and yet still create the necessary pomp as Saturninus is crowned among the crowd of actors on the stage.
* 238 in as a
And will with deeds requite* thy gentleness*:

240 And, for an onset*, Titus, to advance
Thy name and honorable family,
Lavinia will I make my empress,
Rome’s royal mistress, mistress of my heart,
And in the sacred Pantheonccxiii her espouse:

245 Tell me, Andronicus, doth this motion* please thee?*

TITUS
It doth, my worthy lord, and in this match
I hold me highly honored of your grace,
And here in sight of Rome to Saturnine,
King and commander of our commonweal,

250 The wide world’s emperor, do I consecrate*
My sword, my chariot* and my prisoners,
Presents well worthy Rome’s imperialcxxiv lord:
Receive them then, the tribute that I owe,
Mine honor’s ensigns* humbled at mycxxv feet.cxxvi

SATURNINUS

255 Thanks, noble Titus, father of my life*. How proud I am of thee and of thy gifts
Rome shall record, and when I do forget
The least of these unspeakable deserts*,
Romans, forget your fealty* to me.

TITUScxxvii

* 239 requite repay
* 239 gentleness nobility
* 240 onset beginning
* 244 Pantheon a temple dedicated to all of the gods. Shakespeare in error may have thought the temple, like a Christian Church, would be used for the wedding ceremony.
* 245 motion proposal
* 241-45 for a discussion of Lavinia’s silence in response to the news that she will be made empress, see part one of the chapter on Lavinia in the introduction.
* 250 consecrate dedicate; usually with religious connotations, though apparently not so here.
* 251 chariot the chariot may or may not be on the stage at this point (see n. 1.1.69.3)
* 254 ensigns tokens; the prisoners (Ravenscroft). Bevington and others suggest that Titus is also referring to the sword and chariot, however we would then have to read “humbled” as “set humbly.” If we consider humbled to be in reference to the prisoners, it is clear that they have been humbled or brought low by Titus.
* 255 father of my life creator of his new life as emperor; possibly future father-in-law as well?
* 258 unspeakable deserts inexpressible good deeds
* 259 fealty feudal loyalty
Now, madam, are you prisoner to an emperor,
To him that for your honor and your state,
Will use you nobly and your followers.

SATURNINUS [Aside] A goodly lady, trust me, of the hue
That I would choose, were I to choose anew.—

Clear up, fair queen, that cloudy countenance:
Though chance of war hath wrought this change of cheer,
Thou com’st not to be made a scorn in Rome:
Princely shall be thy usage every way.
Rest on my word, and let not discontent

Daunt all your hopes. Madam, he comforts you
Can make you greater than the queen of Goths.—
Lavinia, you are not displeased with this?

LAVINIA
Not I, my lord, sith true nobility
Warrants these words in princely courtesy.

SATURNINUS
Thanks, sweet Lavinia.— Romans, let us go.
Ransomless here we set our prisoners free:
Proclaim our honors, lords, with trump and drum.

BASSIANUS [seizing Lavinia]

*263 SD [Aside] Capell first added this SD for the first couplet to be spoken as an aside. The only plausible argument for this line to be spoken aloud, would be that these lines represent the “princely courtesy” of the rest of his speech or, as Bate has suggested, that it would not be “out of character” for him to say this aloud, but I disagree. At this point Saturninus has nothing to gain or display to the audience by being outwardly insensitive to his recent engagement to Lavinia, and the couplet in no way resembles the “courtesy” of the following lines.
*263 hue appearance
*266 cheer demeanor
*267 scorn something contemptible; see Com. Er. “Thou ... art confederate with a damned pack,/ To make a loathsome abject scorn of me” (4.4.106)
*269 Rest on trust, accept (i.e. rest assured)
*273 sith since
*277 SD I suggest here that Saturninus need not make it all of the way off stage, as he could easily be distracted by the freeing of the prisoners and his intention to exit in a flourish; this would account for him not knowing what has transpired when he asks, “Surprised? By whom?” at l. 288. His attention would be gained by Titus’s yelling at the “traitors” over the horns. Most editors have Saturninus exit and then return at 288, but it makes little sense that he would completely leave the stage without Lavinia. Wells suggests that Saturninus may enter aloft here, but there seems little reason or sense in this suggestion.
Lord Titus, by your leave, this maid is mine.

TITUS

How, sir? Are you in earnest then, my lord?

BASSIANUS

Ay, noble Titus, and resolved withal
To do myself this reason and this right.

MARCUS

"Suum cuique\textsuperscript{cxli} is our Roman justice:
This prince\textsuperscript{cxii} in justice seizeth but his own.

LUCIUS

And that he will, and shall, if Lucius live.

TITUS

Traitors, avaunt! Where is the emperor’s guard?—

Treason, my lord: Lavinia is surprised!

SATURNINUS

Surprised? By whom?\textsuperscript{cxiv}

BASSIANUS

By him that justly may
Bear his betrothed from all the world away.

MUTIUS

Brothers, help to convey her hence away,
And with my sword I’ll keep this door safe.

[Exeunt Bassianus, Lavinia, Lucius, Marcus\textsuperscript{cxv}, Martius, and Quintus]

TITUS

Follow, my lord, and I’ll soon bring her back.

[Exeunt Saturninus and Goths]\textsuperscript{cxlvi}

\textsuperscript{282} “Suum cuique” to each his own (Lat); proverbial, Tilley M209.

\textsuperscript{283} prince this and other references to members of Medieval and Renaissance royalty
(i.e. “King,” was common in Roman plays).

\textsuperscript{285} avaunt be gone

\textsuperscript{287} Surprised ... whom? see n. l. 277 above.

\textsuperscript{291 SD Lucius, Marcus} Hughes notes that Lucius’s exit here would create a
“ridiculously quick” return at 297. He also suggests that it would be “beneath his dignity
and alien to his office [for Marcus] to take part in this scuffle, however he may
sympathize with his nephews.” However, it seems doubtful that Marcus would have
watched Titus kill his son and not responded. I feel that it is most likely that he has left
the stage with the others, and does respond “O Titus, see!...” (ll. 346-47) when he returns
to the stage and either sees Mutius’s dead body, or having seen the body if Lucius carries
it away at l. 303.

\textsuperscript{292 SD} see t.n. for possible exit points.

\textsuperscript{296-303} Gary Taylor suggested the Mutius’s involvement in the action here and his
murder may, like that of Alarbus earlier, be a later addition (see Bate 104-107)
My lord, you pass not here.

TITUS

What, villain boy,

Barr’st me my way in Rome?⁵⁴

MUTIUS

Help, Lucius, help!

LUCIUS [returning]⁵⁵

My lord, you are unjust, and more than so:
In wrongful quarrel you have slain your son.

TITUS

Nor thou, nor he, are any sons of mine:
My sons would never so dishonor me:
Traitor, restore Lavinia to the emperor.

LUCIUS

Dead, if you will, but not to be his wife
That is another’s lawful promised⁵⁶ love.

[Exit]⁵⁷

Enter aloft the Emperor with Tamora and her two sons⁵⁸, and Aaron the Moor.⁵⁹

SATURNINUS⁶⁰

No, Titus, no, the emperor needs her not,

Nor her, nor thee, nor any of thy stock.
I’ll trust by leisure* him that mocks me once,
Thee, never, nor thy traitorous haughty sons,
Confederates all thus to dishonor me.
Was none⁶¹ in Rome to make a stale* 

But Saturnine? Full well, Andronicus,
Agree these deeds with that proud brag of thine*,
That said’st I begged the empire at thy hands.—⁶²

TITUS [Aside?]⁶³

O, monstrous,⁶⁴ what reproachful words are these?

SATURNINUS

But go thy ways, go give that changing piece*

---

* 303 SD Some suggest that Lucius carry away Mutius’s body here (see t.n.), but there is really no need other than to placate those bothered by the apparent lack of notice of the dead body by the others on stage.

* 306 by leisure slowly

* 309 stale the meaning is not clear. Early editors suggest “laughing-stock,” however, there is little contemporary support for this meaning. The OED has “a person used as a cover for sinister designs.”

* 311 proud brag of thine there is nothing to support Saturninus’s claim here, this line begins to show Saturninus’s irrational temper.

* 313 SD [Aside?] Tamora and Saturninus seem not to hear Titus comment here.
315 To him that flourished for her with his sword*.
A valiant son-in-law thou shalt enjoy,
One fit to bandy* with thy lawless sons,
To ruffle* in the commonwealth of Rome.—

TITUS [Aside?]*

These words are razors to my wounded heart.

SATURNINUS

320 And therefore, lovely Tamora, Queen of Goths,
That like the stately Phoebe* clix mongst her nymphs
Dost overshine the gallant’st clx dames of Rome,
If thou be pleased with this my sudden choice,
Behold, I choose thee, Tamora, for my bride,

325 And will create thee empressclxi of Rome,
Speak, Queen of Goths, dost thou applaud my choice?
And here I swear by all the Roman gods,
Sith priest and holy water* are so near
And tapers burn so bright and everything

330 In readiness for Hymenaeus* stand,
I will not re-salute* the streets of Rome
Or climb* my palace, till from forth this place
I lead espoused my bride along with me.

TAMORA

* 314 changing piece “small change” (Maxwell), punning on (ex)change (Hughes); a girl regarded sexually (Partridge), elliptic for “piece of flesh.” Compare “Master, I have gone through for this piece you see” (Per. 4.2.4304); and modern “piece of ass,” thus Waith’s “fickle wench.”

* 315 flourished ... sword brandished his sword for her

* 317 bandy brawl

* 318 ruffle swagger

* 319 SD [Aside?] Saturninus’s speech continues straight through Titus’s comment, so here too Titus’s line seems likely to be an aside.

* 321 Phoebe Diana, the moon goddess. In Phaer’s 1558 translation of Virgil’s Aeneid, Diana’s beauty is said to “overshine” that of her attendant demigoddesses. So like Diana, Tamora’s beauty surpasses all Roman women.

* 322 gallant’st i.e. most beautiful

* 328 holy water this is another Christian anachronism; see n. 1.1.244. Here and at 3.1.150, the customs are Roman Catholic.

* 330 Hymenaeus Hymen, the god of marriage

* 331 re-salute greet again; Bate notes that this may be a remnant of a previous draft, as he argues that Saturninus’s refusal to return to the “streets” suggests that Saturninus is at street-level (i.e. not aloft). However, it would not be unthinkable for the Emperor to greet the streets of Rome from aloft and thus above his people.

* 332 climb go up to
And here in sight of heaven to Rome I swear,
If Saturnine advance the Queen of Goths,
She will a handmaid* be to his desires,
A loving nurse, a mother* to his youth.

SATURNINUS
Ascend, fair queen. Pantheon* Lordsclxii, accompany
Your noble emperor and his lovely bride,

Sent by the heavens for Prince Saturnine,
Whose wisdom* hath her fortune conquerèd:
There shall we consummate our spousal rites.

TITUS
I am not bid* to wait upon this bride.
Titus, when wert thou wont* to walk alone*,

Dishonored thus, and challengèd* of wrongs?

Enter Marcus and Titus’s Sons [Lucius, Quintus and Martius]clxiv

MARCUS
O Titus, see! Oclxv see what thou hast done!
In a bad quarrel slain a virtuous son.

TITUS
No, foolish tribune, no. No son of mine,
Nor thou, nor these,clxvi confed’ratesclxvii in the deed

* 336 handmaid willing servant
* 337 mother this comment suggests that Tamora is much older than Saturninus (Waith).
* 338 Pantheon see above, n. 1.1.244
* 341 Whose wisdom suggesting that Tamora’s acceptance of his proposal has wisely “conquered” her bad “fortune” as a captive.
* 343 bid invited. Titus seems surprised that he has not been asked to join the other lords at the wedding ceremony
* 344 wont accustomed, i.e. when was it your habit to walk alone
* 344 alone as the only live person on stage (if the dead body is still present), and figuratively exiled by Rome and sided against his family’s actions.
* 345 challengèd accused
* 345 SD if Mutius body has been carried off stage, it would need to be returned now by the Andronici entering (see n. l. 303).
* 349 these, confed’rates the comma here is based on Qq. F omits the comma. Editors who follow F’s deletion suggest that to include Marcus in the accusation is unjustified and therefore Titus should only be talking to his son. However, Titus, like Saturninus, needs little justification for his accusations in this scene, and at 369 below includes Marcus as being confederate with his sons in disrespecting him. This shared trait of rashness is one of the many that leads to the downfall of both Titus and Saturninus.
That hath dishonored all our family:
Unworthy brother, and unworthy sons.
  LUCIUS
But let us give him burial as becomes*:
  Give Mutiusclxvii burial with our brethren.
  TITUS
  Traitors, away! He rests not in this tomb.

This monument five hundredclxix years hath stood,
Which I have sumptuously re-edified*:
Here none but soldiers and Rome’s servitors
Repose in fame — none basely slain in brawls.
Bury him where you can, he comes not here.
  MARCUS
My lord, this is impiety in you:
My nephew Mutius’ deeds do plead for him,
He must be buried with his brethren.
  TITUS’S 2 SONS SPEAK*clx
And shall, or him we will accompany.
  TITUS
“And shall?” What villain was it spake that word?
  TITUS’S SON SPEAKSclxxi
He that would vouch*clxxii it in any place but here.
  TITUS
What, would you bury him in my despite?
  MARCUS
No, noble Titus, but entreat of thee
To pardon Mutius and to bury him.
  TITUS
Marcus, even thou hast struckclxxiii upon my crest*,
And with these boys mine honor thou hast wounded.
My foes I do repute* you every one,
So trouble me no more, but get you gone.

* 352 becomes is fitting
* 356 re-edified rebuilt
* 363 whether or not two sons were intended to speak, or if Q’s “Titus two sonnes speaks” was an error as Bolton suggested in “Two notes on Titus Andronicus” MLN 45 (1930) 140-41, and was meant to be 2. Son is debatable. But as F does not emend the direction for multiple speakers, I see no reason to do so here, as the use of multiple speakers occurs often in the play.
* 365 vouch uphold, prove
* 369 struck upon my crest purposely dishonored him. The crest suggests the plume atop the Roman helmet (see OED “crest” as a representative of honor).
* 371 repute consider
1. SON
He is not himself, let us withdraw.
2. SON
Not I, till Mutius’ bones be buried.

*The brother and the sons kneel*

MARCUS
Brother, for in that name doth nature plead—

2. SON
Father, and in that name doth nature speak—

TITUS
Speak thou no more, if all the rest will speed*. 

MARCUS
Renownèd Titus, more than half my soul—

LUCIUS
Dear father, soul and substance of us all—

MARCUS
Suffer thy brother Marcus to inter
His noble nephew here in virtue’s nest,
That died in honor and Lavinia’s cause.
Thou art a Roman, be not barbarous.
The Greeks upon advice* did bury Ajax* clxxxi

That slew himself, and Laertes’* son
Did graciously plead for his funerals:
Let not young Mutius then, that was thy joy,
Be barred his entrance here.

TITUS
Rise, Marcus, rise. clxxxiii

The dismall’st day is this that e’er I saw:
To be dishonored by my sons in Rome!

* 373-376 The SP’s for the sons here do not specify which son is to speak in Qq and F beyond a number. Most eds. have attempted to assign the lines between the three sons now on stage based on everything from supposed “characterizations” to order based on seniority. I leave the question open here.
* 377 if ... speed the intention here is obscure. “if the rest of you wish to live” (Wilson), or “if the others are to succeed (in their plea)” (Waith, who suggests this shows that Titus is “especially irritated with his more insistent son”); “if everything else is to go well” (Maxwell).
* 384 upon advice after deliberation
* 384 Ajax The Latin name of the Homeric hero, Aias, who went insane and killed himself after killing sheep that he mistook for Greek generals. The Greeks debated whether he should receive a proper burial, and only after Laertes’ son Odysseus’s pleas did they agree to give him one.
Well, bury him, and bury me the next.

They put him in the tomb.

LUCIUS
There lie thy bones, sweet Mutius, with thy friends,
Till we with trophies do adorn thy tomb.

[MARCUS and TITUS’S SONS] (kneeling)

395 No man shed tears for noble Mutius:
He lives in fame that died in virtue’s cause.

[They rise]
Exeunt. [Titus and Marcus remain]

MARCUS
My lord, to step out of these sudden dumps,
How comes it that the subtle Queen of Goths
Is of a sudden thus advanced in Rome?

TITUS
I know not, Marcus, but I know it is —
Whether by device or no — the heavens can tell.
Is she not then beholding to the man
That brought her for this high good turn so far?
Yes, and will nobly him remunerate.

* 393 friends kin. Waith’s suggestion of friends meaning bones, seems a bit too morbid at this point. A reference to the Andronici that also inhabit the tomb seems more likely.
* 394 trophies memorials
* 395 It is unlikely that Qq and F’s all would refer to Titus who would not be likely to participate in the speech that follows.
* 396 proverbial, Tilley v74
* 396 SD Kittredge and some eds. since have the sons “stand aside” here instead of exiting, citing Tamora’s address to them at l. 478 requires that they remain on stage. However, the son’s presence is easily clarified if we consider the “others” who enter with Bassianus and Lavinia at l. 404 refers to Titus’s sons, instead of the introduction of new supporters of Bassianus.
* 397 dumps bad events. Previous editors suggest melancholy? or mournful song? Hughes notes that this line is non sequitur, and supports Wilson’s suggestion that ll. 346-397 is another late addition to the play, as the line follows logically after the events through l. 345. Most likely F’s emendation to sudden dumps is a reference to Titus’s loss of honor and the recent funeral that have both occurred in quick succession.
* 401 device scheming, trickery, stratagem
* 402-403 beholding ...far does she not owe thanks to the one who brought her here and created the possibility for this new fortune (i.e. Titus, her captor)
* 404 Yes ...remunerate F’s addition of this line shows Titus’s “naive confidence in Tamora’s gratitude” according to Waith, who discounts Malone’s suggestion that Marcus should speak this line.
Flourish. Enter the Emperor, Tamora and her two sons with the Moor at one door. Enter at the other door Bassianus and Lavinia with others [Titus’s three sons].

SATURNINUS

405 So, Bassianus, you have played your prize:
God give you joy, sir, of your gallant bride.

BASSIANUS

And you of yours, my lord. I say no more,
Nor wish no less, and so I take my leave.

SATURNINUS

410 Thou and thy faction shall repent this rape.

BASSIANUS

“Rape” call you it, my lord, to seize my own,
My true-betrothed love and now my wife?
But let the laws of Rome determine all:
Meanwhile I am possessed of that is mine.

SATURNINUS

415 ’Tis good, sir: you are very short with us,
But if we live we’ll be as sharp with you.

BASSIANUS

My lord, what I have done, as best I may,
Answer I must, and shall do with my life.
Only thus much I give your grace to know:

420 By all the duties that I owe to Rome,
This noble gentleman, Lord Titus here,
Is in opinion and in honor wronged,
That in the rescue of Lavinia
With his own hand did slay his youngest son

425 In zeal to you, and highly moved to wrath

*404 the SD and following dialogue between the two brothers mirrors the beginning of the play. This parallel also supports the addition of the stage direction clarifying Titus’s sons as the others in opposition to Tamora’s. In Qq here, as in the beginning, the simultaneous entrances are centered and side by side.

*405 played your prize won the match for Lavinia. This phrase suggests a fencing match.

*410 rape Saturninus switches from a description of a fair match (fencing), to the suggestion that Lavinia has been forcefully taken from him. In Early Modern England, the word “rape” was used for both sexual assault and the seizure of property.

*414 that that which (again at 426). Lavinia here and through the rest of this scene is spoken of as an object of possession.

*422 opinion reputation
To be controlled\textsuperscript{*} in that he frankly\textsuperscript{*} gave:
Receive him then to favor, Saturnine,
That hath expressed himself in all his deeds
A father and a friend to thee and Rome.

TITUS

Prince Bassianus, leave to plead my deeds\textsuperscript{*}:
'Tis thou and those\textsuperscript{*} that have dishonored me.
Rome and the righteous heavens be my judge
How I have loved and honored Saturnine!

[Titus may kneel here]\textsuperscript{cxcvi}

TAMORA\textsuperscript{cxcvi}

My worthy lord, if ever Tamora
Were gracious in those princely eyes of thine,
Then hear me speak indifferently\textsuperscript{*} for all,
And at my suit, sweet, pardon what is past.

SATURNINUS

What, madam, be dishonored openly,

And basely put it up\textsuperscript{*} without revenge?

TAMORA

Not so, my lord. The gods of Rome forfend\textsuperscript{cxcviii}
I should be author to dishonor you\textsuperscript{*}.
But on mine honor dare I undertake\textsuperscript{*}
For good Lord Titus' innocence in all,

Whose fury not dissembled speaks\textsuperscript{*} his griefs:
Then at my suit look graciously on him.
Lose\textsuperscript{cc} not so noble a friend on vain suppose\textsuperscript{*},
Nor with sour looks afflict his gentle heart.—

My lord, be ruled by me, be won\textsuperscript{*} at last,

[Aside]\textsuperscript{cc}

\textsuperscript{*} 427 controlled restrained, i.e. Titus was so moved in zeal to Saturninus, that he could not keep himself from killing his own flesh and blood.

\textsuperscript{*} 427 frankly freely, generously?

\textsuperscript{*} 430 leave to plead my deeds stop attempting to support my love of Saturninus, because you are one of the one’s that caused this situation.

\textsuperscript{*} 431 those Marcus and Titus’s sons

\textsuperscript{*} 433 Saturninus’s command for Titus to rise at 466, requires that Titus kneel at some point. However, it is unclear exactly when he would do so.

\textsuperscript{*} 437 indifferently impartially

\textsuperscript{*} 440 put it up put up with it (i.e. the disgrace), accept. Metaphorically sheathing a weapon.

\textsuperscript{*} 441 forfend forbid

\textsuperscript{*} 442 be ... you be the instigator of any dishonor to you

\textsuperscript{*} 443 undertake vouch

\textsuperscript{*} 445 fury not dissembled speaks unhidden anger

\textsuperscript{*} 557 suppose supposition
Dissemble* all your griefs and discontents. You are but newly planted in your throne:
Lest then the people, and patricians too,
Upon a just survey take Titus’ part,
And so supplant uscci for ingratitudeccii.

Which Rome reposes to be a heinous sin,cciii
Yield at entreats*, and then let me alone*:
I’ll find a day to massacre them all,
And raze*cciv their faction and their family,
The cruelccv father and his trait’rousccvi sons,

To whom I suèd for my dear son’s life,
And make them know what ’tis to let a queen
Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain.—
Come, come, sweet emperor.— Come, Andronicus —
Take up this good old man*, and cheer the heart
That dies in tempest of thy angry frown.

Rise, Titus, rise: my empress hath prevailed.ccix
I thank your majesty and her, my lord:
These words, these looks, infuse new life in me.ccxi

Titus, I am incorporate* in Rome,
A Roman now adopted happily,
And must advise the emperor for his good.
This day all quarrels die*, Andronicus:
And let it be mine honor, good my lord,

* 449 won i.e. won over, persuaded
* 450 Dissemble hide, conceal
* 456 at entreats to entreaty
* 456 let me alone leave it to me
* 458 raze erase, destroy. “The Q1 spelling ‘race’ suggests both ‘raze’ and the obsolete ‘arace’, to root out” (Waith)
* 464 Take ... man raise Titus to his feet (see n. l. 433)
* 467 SD [Rises] it seems most likely that Titus would rise here as he thanks Saturninus for allowing him to do so. However, some editors since Chambers have Titus remain kneeling until the other Andronici rise at 492.
* 469 am incorporate in have been incorporated into. “See Cor. 1.1.130: in a metaphor for the Roman state, the belly calls the limbs ‘my incorporate friends,’ meaning that all are parts of an ‘invisible body’” (Hughes).
* 472 die end; possibly. Tamora’s new position, allows her to command an end, however, Maxwell suggests that rather than an announcement that the quarrels are ended, that Tamora is commanding Titus to “let them die.”
That I have reconciled your friends and you.—

For you, Prince Bassianus, I have passed
My word and promise to the emperor,
That you will be more mild and tractable.—
And fear not, lords, and you, Lavinia;
By my advice, all humbled on your knees,
You shall ask pardon of his majesty. [Marcus and Titus’s sons kneel]

We do,
And vow to heaven and to his highness
That what we did was mildly as we might,
Tend’ring our sister’s honor and our own.

That on mine honor here I do protest.

Away, and talk not: trouble us no more.

Nay, nay, sweet emperor, we must all be friends:
The tribune and his nephews kneel for grace,
I will not be denied: sweet heart, look back.

Marcus, for thy sake and thy brother’s here,
And at my lovely Tamora’s entreats,
I do remit these young men’s heinous faults.—

[Marcus and Titus’s sons] stand up

*481 SD [Marcus and Titus’s sons kneel] The verbal SD’s at 479 and 488 suggest that Marcus and Titus’s sons kneel, and then are asked to rise. Some eds. include Lavinia in this SD. Though she is included as an aim of the request at 479, Tamora only points out that Marcus and “his nephews” are kneeling at 488.

*481 SP SON None of the texts indicate a specific speaker. F’s son, most likely refers to Lucius as Rowe has suggested; as the eldest son he is the natural candidate to be spokesman for the group. Q3’s All is possible, as multiple speakers are common in Titus.

*483 mildly as we might as peacefully as we could. “see Cor. 3.2.139-141, where ‘mildly’ is used five times in this sense” (Hughes)

*484 Tend’ring regarding

*492 SD [Marcus ... stand up This stage direction was first suggested by Pope, who omits “Stand up” from the following line. In Qq, F the intention of the line is unclear: “Stand vp: Lavinia” is aligned as the beginning of the spoken line that follows, disturbing the meter of the passage. Eds. who choose to have Saturninus command the men to “Stand up,” generally give the phrase its own line, and have “Lavinia” begin a new line of text.
Lavinia, though you left me like a churl*,
I found a friend, and sure as death* I swore
I would not part a bachelor from the priest.
Come, if the emperor’s court can feast two brides,
You are my guest, Lavinia, and your friends.
This day shall be a love-day*, Tamora.

TITUS

Tomorrow, an* it please your majesty
To hunt the panther and the hart with me,
With horn and hound, we’ll give your grace bonjour*. 

SATURNINUS

Be it so, Titus, and gramercy* too.  

_Flourish. Exeunt._* ccxxiv

---

* churl peasant
* sure as death Proverbial: Tilley D136
* love-day a day set aside for settling disputes; also a day for love or making love.
* an if
* bonjour good day (French)
* gramercy thanks; from _grand merci_ (French)
* SD Exeunt F has all characters exit at this point and creates a scene break, while Qq has Aaron remain on stage and continues the action. For the argument see n. 2.1 below.
Enter Aaron alone.

AARON
Now climbeth Tamora Olympus’ top,
Safe out of fortune’s shot, and sits aloft,
Secure of thunder’s crack or lightning flash,
Advanced above pale envy’s threatening reach:
As when the golden sun salutes the morn,
And, having gilt the ocean with his beams,
Gallops the zodiac in his glistening coach
And overlooks the highest-peering hills,
So Tamora;
Upon her wit doth earthly honor wait,
And virtue stoops and trembles at her frown.
Then, Aaron, arm thy heart and fit thy thoughts
To mount aloft with thy imperial mistress,
And mount her pitch whom thou in triumph long
Hast prisoner held, fettered in amorous chains
And faster bound to Aaron’s charming eyes

* 2.[1] There is an ongoing argument between editors about this scene division. Q1 does not stop the action for a new scene between 1.1 and 2.2 (see n. l. 1.1.502). Johnson suggested that the Folio’s break here is an error, and that 2.1 should probably begin with the next scene (though Bate is the first to implement this in his text). Waith agrees that F’s break here, may simply be “paying homage to the tradition of a five-act structure,” this seems an unlikely explanation, as the following scene would create the same “five-act structure.” No previous editors consider how location would be affected if one follows Q1. If Aaron, and then especially Chiron and Demetrius remain in the same location as the whole of 1.1 near the Capitoline Hill, Aaron’s suggestion that the boys are arguing “so near the emperor’s palace” at l. 47 makes little sense. It makes more sense for the action to break as in F, and for the location to be moved to the same area where Titus and the others enter—“outside the emperor’s palace” according to Waith. In addition, Chiron and Demetrius, and possibly Aaron, would have been expected to be a part of the wedding feast that is to occur following 1.1.502. Though the boys are brash, it is highly unlikely that they would only depart the stage for 25 lines and return in a fight during the ceremonies.

* 1 Olympus Mount Olympus was the home of the Greek gods
* 3 of from
* 7 Gallops i.e., gallops through
* 8 overlooks looks down on
* 14 mount her pitch rise to the highest point of her flight (the term is from falconry)
* 16 charming bewitching; i.e. eyes that can cast a spell.
Than is Prometheus tied to Caucasus∗.  
Away with slavish weeds∗ and idleccxxxiii thoughts:  
I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold  
To wait upon this new-made empressccxxiv.  
To wait, said I? — To wanton with this queen,  
This goddess, this Semiramis∗, this nymphccxxv,  
This siren that will charm Rome’s Saturnine  
And see his shipwreckccxxvi and his commonweal’s.  
Halloccxxxvii! What storm is this?

Enter Chiron and Demetrius, braving∗.

DEMETRIUS  
Chiron, thy years want∗ccxxxviii wit, thy wit wantsccxxix edge∗  
And manners to intrude where I am graced∗  
And may, for aught thou know’stccxl, affected be∗.

CHIRON  
Demetrius, thou dost overween∗ in all,  
And so in this, to bear me down with braves.  
’Tis not the difference of a year or two  
Makes me less gracious orccxli thee more fortunate:  
I am as able and as fit as thou  
To serve, and to deserve my mistress’ grace,  
And that my sword upon thee shall approve∗,  
And plead my passions for Lavinia’s love.

* 17 Prometheus ... Caucasus Prometheus is a Titan demigod, who stole fire from Olympus and gave it to mankind. Zeus punished him by chaining him to a rock in the Caucasus.  
* 18 Away ... weeds Waith suggest that Aaron may actually discard his attire and replace it with the richly adorned attire mentioned in the next line. It seems unlikely that Aaron would be carrying such a robe through the first 20 lines, and that the lines speak of his planned changes both in appearance and “thoughts” to take advantage of his future position among the Roman royalty.  
* 22 Semiramis Assyrian queen, whose lust and beauty were as legendary as her military conquests.  
* 25 SD braving a showy defying of one another; as the boys enter, Aaron should be somewhere down stage so they do not at first notice him. See l. 30 below as well.  
* 26 want lack  
* 26 edge sharpness  
* 27 graced favored  
* 28 may ... affected be where ... I may already be loved (by Lavinia)  
* 29 overween arrogantly presume  
* 35 approve prove
AARON *ccxliicxliii
Clubs, clubs!* These lovers will not keep the peace.

DEMETRIUS
Why, boy, although our mother, unadvised,
Gave you a dancing-rapier* by your side,
Are you so desperate grown to threat your friends?
Go to: have your lath* glued within your sheath
Till you know better how to handle it.

CHIRON
Meanwhile, sir, with the little skill I have,
Full well shalt thou perceive how much I dare.

DEMETRIUS
Ay, boy, grow ye so brave? They draw.

AARON *ccxliv
Why, how now, lords?
So near the emperor’s palace* dare you ccxlv draw
And maintain such a quarrel openly?
Full well I wot* the ground of all this grudge:
I would not for a million of gold
The cause were known to them it most concerns,
Nor would your noble mother for much more
Be so dishonored in the court of Rome.
For shame, put up*.

DEMETRIUS
Not I, till I have sheathed
My rapier in his bosom and withal
Thrust these ccxlvi reproachful speeches down his throat
That he hath breathed in my dishonor here.

CHIRON
For that I am prepared and full resolved,
Foul-spoken coward, that thund’rest with thy tongue,
And with thy weapon nothing dar’st perform!

AARON
Away, I say. ccxlviii
Now, by the gods that warlike Goths adore,
This pretty ccxlix brabble* will undo us all.

---

* 37 Clubs, clubs! A call in the Elizabethan streets used to indicate a brawl, and summon the Watch to intervene. It was also used to call for apprentices to join in.
* 39 dancing-rapier an ornamental sword worn in dancing
* 41 lath a wooden stage sword
* 47 so near the palace see n. for 2.1 above
* 49 wot know
* 54 put up sheathe your swords
Why, lords, and think you not how dangerous
It is to set upon a prince’s right?
What, is Lavinia then become so loose,
Or Bassianus so degenerate,
That for her love such quarrels may be broached

Without controlment, justice, or revenge?
Young lords, beware! And should the empress know
This discord’s ground, the music would not please.

CHIRON
I care not, I knew she and all the world:
I love Lavinia more than all the world.

DEMETRIUS
Youngling, learn thou to make some meaner choice:
Lavinia is thine elder brother’s hope.

AARON
Why, are ye mad? Or know ye not in Rome
How furious and impatient they be,
And cannot brook competitors in love?

I tell you, lords, you do but plot your deaths
By this device.

CHIRON
Aaron, a thousand deaths would I propose
To achieve her whom I do love.

AARON
To achieve her how?

DEMETRIUS
Why mak’st thou it so strange?

She is a woman, therefore may be wooed:
She is a woman, therefore may be won:

---

* 64 brabble argument
* 66 set encroach
* 70 controlment restraint
* 71-2 And ... please Aaron seems to be using this suggestion that Tamora would not approve of their discords’ ground (reason, i.e. Lavinia) to get the boys attention. However, he later contradicts this suggestion when he announces that he will tell Tamora of their plan for “rape and villainy” (see 2.1.127). Ground represents a musical pun on the bass over which the melody is “raised” (Onions).
* 73 knew she if she knew
* 75 meaner lower class
* 82 propose be prepared to face
* 85 Why ... strange? Why do you seem so surprised?
* 86-87 She ... won: Proverbial: ODEP p. 911; Tilley W68; compare to I Henry VI “She’s beautiful; and therefore to be wooed/ She is a woman; therefore to be won”
She is Lavinia, therefore must be loved.

What, man, more water glideth by the mill than wots the miller of*, and easy it is of a cut loaf to steal a shive**, we know:

Though Bassianus be the emperor’s brother, better than he have worn Vulcan’s badge*.

AARON

Ay, and as good as Saturninus may.

DEMETRIUS

Then why should he despair that knows to court it* With words, fair looks and liberality?

What, hast not thou full often struck a doe and borne her cleanly* by the keeper’s nose?

AARON

Why then, it seems some certain snatch* or so would serve your turns.

CHIRON

Ay, so the turn were served.

DEMETRIUS

Aaron, thou hast hit it.

AARON

Would you had hit it too, then should not we be tired with this ado.

Why, hark ye, hark ye, and are you such fools to square for this? Would it offend you then that both should speed?

CHIRON

(5.3.78-9). and Richard III “Was ever woman in this humor wooed? Was ever woman in this humor won?”(1.2.227-228)

* 89-90 more ... of Proverbial: ODEP p. 870; Tilley W99.

* 91 shive slice

* 90-91 easy ... shive Proverbial: ODEP p. 724; Tilly T34. Since Lavinia is married and no longer a virgin, Bassianus will not know if she has sex with another. (Hughes)

* 93 Vulcan’s badge the horns of a cuckold; Ovid IV repeats Homer’s story of Vulcan being cuckolded by Venus.

* 95 court it be a suitor

* 97 struck killed

* 98 cleanly cleverly, without being caught

* 99 snatch to quickly grab or catch something; colloquially it may also refer to “a quicky.” The modern slang referring to a woman’s genitals is not found before 1904 (Rubinstein). At 100 and 102, turns and hit continue the sexual double entendre.

* 106 square quarrel, as in “square off”

* 107 speed succeed
Faith, not me.

DEMETRIUS
Nor me, so I were one.

AARON

110 For shame, be friends, and join for that you jar*: 'Tis policy* and stratagem must do That you affect*, and so must you resolve That what you cannot as you would achieve, You must perforce accomplish as you may*.

115 Take this of me: Lucrece* was not more chaste Than this Lavinia, Bassianus’s love. A speedier course than cclxviii ling’ring languishment Must we pursue, and I have found the path. My lords, a solemn* hunting is in hand:

120 There will the lovely Roman ladies troop: The forest walks are wide and spacious, And many unfrequented plots* there are Fitted by kind* for rape and villainy*. Single* you thither then this dainty doe, And strike her home by force, if not by words: This way, or not at all, stand you in hope. Come, come, our empress, with her sacred* wit To villainy and vengeance consecrate*, Will we acquaint with all that cclxix we intend,

130 And she shall file our engines* with advice

* 110 for ... jar to get what you are arguing over (Lavinia)
* 111 policy Machiavellian scheming
* 112 affect aim at
* 113-14 what ... may Proverbial: Tilley M554 “Men must do as they may, not as they would”
* 115 Lucrece a chaste wife, who is raped by Tarquin and commits suicide; Shakespeare’s Rape of Lucrece 1593/94, has strong ties with and is published in the same time period as Titus
* 119 solemn ceremonial
* 122 plots places
* 123 kind nature
* 122-23 plots ... villainy see Titus comment on the heinous nature of the woods at 4.1.59-60.
* 124 Single i.e. single out, get her alone
* 127 sacred devoted
* 128 consecrate dedicated
* 130 file our engines sharpen our stratagems (Waith), or wits (Maxwell)
That will not suffer you to square yourselves
d, But to your wishes’ height advance you both.
The emperor’s court is like the house of Fame,”
The palace full of tongues, of eyes, of ears.
The woods are ruthless, dreadful, deaf and dull:
There speak and strike, brave boys, and take your turns:
There serve your lusts, shadowed from heaven’s eye,
And revel in Lavinia’s treasury.

CHIRON
Thy counsel, lad, smells of no cowardice.

DEMETRIUS
Sit fas aut nefas*, till I find the streams
To cool this heat, a charm to calm their fits,

Per Stygia, per manes vehor*.

Exeunt

---

* 131 square yourselves quarrel with each other
* 133 house of Fame The house of rumor, portrayed in Chaucer’s House of Fame or also an allusion to Ovid XII or Virgil IV
* 140 Sit ... nefas be it right or wrong (Latin)
* 142 Per ... vehor I am born through the Stygian regions, through the shades (Latin); an adaptation or inaccurate memory of Seneca’s “Per Styga, per amnes igneos amens sequar” or “I will madly follow you through Styx and through fiery rivers” (Hippolytus, l. 1180)
Enter Titus Andronicus and his three sons, making a noise with hounds and horns, and Marcus, making a noise with hounds and horns.

TITUS

The hunt is up, the morn is bright and grey, The fields are fragrant and the woods are green: Uncouple here, and let us make a bay, And wake the emperor and his lovely bride, And rouse the prince, and ring a hunter’s peal, That all the court may echo with the noise. Sons, let it be your charge, as it is ours, To attend the emperor’s person carefully: I have been troubled in my sleep this night, But dawning day new comfort hath inspired.

Here a cry of hounds and wind horns in a peal, then enter Saturninus, Tamora, Bassianus, Lavinia, Chiron, Demetrius and their Attendants.

Many good morrows to your majesty: Madam, to you as many and as good. I promised your grace a hunter’s peal.

SATURNINUS

And you have rung it lustily, my lords, Somewhat too early for new-married ladies.

BASSIANUS

Lavinia, how say you?

---

* [2.2] The scene takes place outside or very near the emperor’s palace.

* 0 SD hounds Titus’s command to “Uncouple” or unleash the dogs, may suggest that the hounds were brought on stage, but could certainly simply be heard from offstage. Waith notes Louis Wright’s “Animal Actors on the English Stage” (PMLA, 42 (1927) 656-659) accounts for the use of animals on the Elizabethan stage.

* 1 grey it was conventional to describe the clear morning sky as grey, and it did not suggest a cloudy sky.

* 3 bay prolonged barking

* 5 hunter’s peal a horn blowing to set the hounds baying

* 10.2 SD cry barking; Hughes points to the use of cry as pack (i.e. pack of hounds), however there is no other verb describing the baying called for at lines 3-5. So the first meaning is more likely here.

* 10.2 SD wind horns. The Folio includes the direction “Wind hornes” before continuing with the direction as it is here, creating multiple calls for horns. Most editors leave out this stage direction. This could be a call for two separate occasions of horns, but seems more likely to be a duplicate sound call. See chapter on “Empirical Editing” above, for a discussion of apparent indication of theatrical provenance of such duplications.
LAVINIA
I say, no:
I have been broad awake to two hours and more.

SATURNINUS
Come on then, horse and chariots let us have,
And to our sport.— Madam, now shall ye see
Our Roman hunting.

MARCUS
I have dogs, my lord,
Will rouse the proudest panther in the chase
And climb the highest promontory top.

TITUS
And I have horse will follow where the game
Makes way and runs like swallows o’er the plain.

DEMETRIUS
Chiron, we hunt not, we, with horse nor hound,
But hope to pluck a dainty doe to ground.  

_Exeunt._
Enter Aaron alone. AARON

He that had wit would think that I had none,
To bury so much gold under a tree
And never after to inherit it.
Let him that thinks of me so abjectly
Know that this gold must coin a stratagem
Which, cunningly effected, will beget
A very excellent piece of villainy:
And so repose, sweet gold, for their unrest
That have their alms out of the empress’ chest.

Enter Tamora to the Moor.

TAMORA

My lovely Aaron, wherefore look’st thou sad?
When everything doth make a gleeful boast?
The birds chant melody on every bush,
The snake lies rollèd in the cheerful sun,
The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind
And make a checkered shadow on the ground:
Under their sweet shade, Aaron, let us sit,
And whilst the babbling echo mocks the hounds,
Replying shrilly to the well-tuned horns
As if a double hunt were heard at once,
Let us sit down and mark their yelping noise,
And after conflict such as was supposed
The wand’ring prince* and Dido once enjoyed,
When with a happy storm they were surprised

* [2.3] takes place in a clearing in the forest
* 2 an actual property tree may or may not be set on the stage
* 3 inherit get possession of, i.e. reclaim
* 4 thinks ... abjectly i.e. thinks so little of me, or thinks me low
* 9 That ... chest who find the gold that he is using from the Empress’s treasury.
* 11 boast display
* 13 snake lies this correction first made by Q3. Q1-2’s “snakes lies” is not incorrect in by Elizabethan standards, but seeing as how the singular form of the verb is not used at 12, 14 or 15; the Q3’s correction seems most practical.
* 19 double hunt compare to “As if a second chase were in the skies” (Venus, l. 696)
This was first noted by Parrot in Modern Language Review, 14 (1929) 27.
* 22 wand’ring prince Aeneas
And curtained with a counsel-keeping cave*,
We may, each wreathèd in the other’s arms,
Our pastimes done, possess a golden slumber,
Whiles hounds and horns and sweet melodious birds
Be unto us as is a nurse’s song
Of lullaby to bring her babe asleep.

AARON

Madam, though Venus govern your desires, cccii
Saturn* is dominator* over mine:
What signifies my deadly-standing *cccii eye,
My silence and my cloudy melancholy,
My fleece of woolly* hair that now uncurls
Even as an adder when she doth unroll
To do some fatal execution?
No, madam, these are no venereal* signs:
Vengeance is in my heart, death in my hand,
Blood and revenge are hammering in my head.

Hark Tamora, the empress of my soul,
Which never hopes more heaven than rests in thee,
This is the day of doom for Bassianus:
His Philomel* must lose her tongue today,
Thy sons make pillage of her chastity
And wash their hands in Bassianus’s blood.
See’st thou this letter? Take it up, I pray thee, cccv
And give the king this fatal-plotted* scroll.*
Now question me no more: cccvi we are espied.

* 23 happy fortunate
* 23-24 When ... cave in the Aeneid, iv. 160-72, after fleeing from the fall of Troy and being joined by Dido, Aeneas is out hunting with Dido. They are surprised by a sudden storm and forced to seek shelter in a cave where their love affair begins.
* 31 Saturn according to the Kalendar of Shepherds, pp 141-42, Elizabethan astrologists described Saturnine men as melancholy men who “will never forgive till they be revenged” (Waith).
* 31 dominator an astrological term used to describe the prime influence.
* 32 deadly-standing fixed with a murderous stare (Waith)
* 37 venereal of Venus, i.e. erotic or loving
* 43 Philomel Philomela: Ovid provides an account of her rape by Tereus in Metamorphoses, vi, a piece which serves as one of the major sources of the play and Lavinia’s part. See also ll. 2.4.26-7, 38-43; 4.1.47-48; 5.2.194-195.
* 47 fatal-plotted created for a deadly purpose
* 46-47 Seest ... scroll. Aaron most likely gives her a letter while saying this and telling her the plan. However, she seems to improvise and put it where Titus will find it. See ll. 296-97.
Here comes a parcel* of our hopeful booty*,
Which dreads not yet their lives’ destruction.

Enter Bassianus** and Lavinia.***

TAMORA
Ah, my sweet Moor, sweeter to me than life!****

AARON
No more, great empress: Bassianus comes.
Be cross* with him, and I’ll go fetch thy sons
To back thy quarrels****, whatso’er they be.

BASSIANUS
Whom***** have we here? Rome’s royal empress,******
Unfurnished of her****** well-beseeming troop*? Or is it Dian, habited like her*,
Who hath abandonèd her holy groves
To see the general hunting in this forest?

TAMORA
Saucy controller* of our******* private steps,
Had I the power******* that some say Dian had,
Thy temples should be planted presently*
With horns, as was Actaeon’s, and the hounds
Should drive******* upon thy******** new-transformèd limbs*,

LAVINIA
Under your patience*, gentle empress,
'Tis thought you have a goodly gift in horning*,
And to be doubted* that your Moor and you

* 49 parcel part
* 49 hopeful booty hoped for victims
* 53 cross quarrelsome
* 56 Unfurnished ... troop without her appropriate or suitable followers
* 57 Dian ... her Diana, goddess of the hunt, dressed as Tamora.
* 60 Saucy controller arrogant restrainer. “In Shakespeare’s time [‘saucy’ was] often an
epithet of more serious condemnation than at present” (Onions).
* 63 presently immediately
* 61-64 Had ... limbs Actaeon had witnessed Diana bathing, and as punishment, she
transformed him into a stag and he was hunted and killed by his own hounds.
* 66 Under your patience If you will permit me to say so
* 67 horning cuckold. Lavinia here, plays off of Tamora’s wish to have the power of
Diana, and changes the reference to stag horns at 63 to a comment on Tamora’s apparent
infidelity.
* 68 to be doubted is suspected
Are singled forth to try experiments∗cccxx:

Jove shield your husband from his hounds today —
’Tis pity they should take him for a stag.

BASSIANUS
Believe me, queen, your swarth∗cccxxi Cimmerian∗cccxxii
Doth make your honor of his body’s hue,
Spotted∗, detested and abominable.

Why are you sequestered from all your train,
Dismounted from your snow-white goodly steed,
And wandered hither to an obscure plot,
Accompanied∗∗cccxxiii with a barbarous Moor,
If foul desire had not conducted you?

LAVINIA
And being intercepted in your sport,
Great reason that my noble lord be rated∗
For sauciness.— I pray∗∗cccxxiv you let us hence,
And let her joy∗ her raven-colored love:
This valley fits the purpose passing well.

BASSIANUS
The king my brother shall have note∗∗cccxxv of this.

LAVINIA
Ay, for these slips have made him noted∗ long∗:
Good king, to be so mightily abused.

TAMORA∗∗∗cccxxvi
Why, I have patience to endure all this.∗∗∗cccxxvii

Enter Chiron and Demetrius.

---

* 69 singled forth ... experiments have come alone to “experiment,” i.e. have sex
* 69 Q1’s “thy experiments” was emended in Q2 to create metrical regularity. This occurs several more times in the next 25 lines.
* 72 swarth dark-skinned. Here again F emends Qq’s “swartie” or swarthy for metrical purposes.
* 72 Cimmerian i.e. Aaron. Homer wrote of the Cimmerians, who lived in total darkness (Odyssey XI). They were proverbially dark-skinned (Tilley C389.1).
* 74 Spotted stained, polluted, smirched by her wrong doings
* 81 rated berated, chided
* 83 joy enjoy
* 86 noted notorious
* 86 long in the time of this play, she only married Saturninus yesterday. Wain suggests that Lavinia’s statement may be taken from the chapbook story, where the Emperor suspects his queen and they have been married for several months. Maxwell points to this as an example of a double time-scheme, as in Othello.
DEMETRIUS
How now, dear sovereign and our gracious mother,

Why doth your highness look so pale and wan?

TAMORA
Have I not reason, think you, to look pale?

These two have enticed me hither to this place:

The trees, though summer, yet forlorn and lean,

O'ercome with moss and baleful mistletoe:

Here never shines the sun, here nothing breeds

Unless the nightly owl or fatal raven.

And when they showed me this abhorred pit,

They told me here, at dead time of the night,

A thousand fiends, a thousand hissing snakes,

Ten thousand swelling toads, as many urchins,

Would make such fearful and confusèd cries

As any mortal body hearing it

Should straight fall mad, or else die suddenly.

No sooner had they told this hellish tale,

But straight they told me they would bind me here

Unto the body of a dismal yew

And leave me to this miserable death.

And then they called me foul adulteress,

That ever ear did hear to such effect:

And had you not by wondrous fortune come,

This vengeance on me had they executed.

Revenge it as you love your mother's life,

O be ye not henceforth called my children.

DEMETRIUS
This is a witness that I am thy son.

CHIRON

Stab[s] him.
And this for me, struck home to show my strength. * [Stabs him and he dies.] cccxxxvi

LAVINIA
Ay, come, Semiramis*, nay, barbarous Tamora, For no name fits thy nature but thy own.

TAMORA
Give me thy poniard: you shall know, my boys
Your mother’s hand shall right your mother’s wrong.

DEMETRIUS
Stay, madam, here is more belongs to her*:
First thrash the corn, then after burn the straw*.
This minion stood upon* her chastity,

Upon her nuptial vow, her loyalty,
And with that painted hope braves your mightiness.
And shall she carry this unto her grave?

CHIRON
An if she do, I would I were an eunuch. Drag hence her husband to some secret hole

And make his dead trunk pillow to our lust*.

TAMORA
But when ye have the honey we desire,
Let not this wasp outlive us both to sting.

CHIRON
I warrant you, madam, we will make that sure.—

* 117 And ... strength the verbal SD here shows that both Chiron and Demetrius stab Bassianus.
* 118 Semiramis (see n. l. 2.1.22)
* 122 here ... her she has more than we may use or that she deserves
* 123 First ... straw the statement sounds proverbial, but there is not evidence of its previous existence. Compare to Demetrius’s proverbs in 2.1.
* 124 minion stood upon hussy made much of
* 126 painted false; the line’s meter is awkward, and others including Stanley Wells have attempted to clarify both the understanding and the meter. See t.n. for proposed emendations.
* 129-30 Drag ... lust This atrocity of raping her on Bassianus’s dead body does not occur on stage, and could point to later revision. This reference has been linked to a similar occurrence in Nashe’s The Unfortunate Traveler.
* 131 we desire the statement suggests that they all desire for her to be raped not that they all desire to rape her. F2 emended the “we” to “ye” to create a more sensible statement for the second reading mentioned above. Most editors have followed F2, though G. K. Hunter argues for the plausibility of Qq and F’s “we.”
* 132 outlive survive; Maxwell suggests that it could be an error for o’erlive.
* 133 warrant is frequently meant to be monosyllabic (Waith)
135 That nice-preservèd\textsuperscript{cccxlv} honesty\textsuperscript{*} of yours.

LAVINIA
O Tamora, thou bear’st\textsuperscript{cccxvi} a woman’s\textsuperscript{cccxvii} face—

TAMORA
I will not hear her speak, away with her!

LAVINIA
Sweet lords, entreat her hear me but a word.

DEMETRIUS\textsuperscript{cccxviii}

Listen, fair madam: let it be your glory

140 To see her tears, but be your heart to them
As unrelenting flint to drops of rain.

LAVINIA
When did the tiger’s young ones teach the dam?

O, do not learn\textsuperscript{*} her wrath: she taught it thee.

The milk thou suck’st\textsuperscript{cccxlix} from her did turn to marble:

145 Even at thy teat thou hadst thy tyranny\textsuperscript{*}.

Yet every mother breeds not sons alike:—

Do\textsuperscript{cccl} thou entreat her show a woman\textsuperscript{cccli} pity.

CHIRON
What?

Wouldst thou have me prove myself a bastard\textsuperscript{ccclii}?

LAVINIA

’Tis true, the raven doth not hatch a lark\textsuperscript{*}.

Yet have\textsuperscript{cccliv} heard\textsuperscript{ccclv} — O, could I find it\textsuperscript{*} now! —

The lion, moved\textsuperscript{ccclvi} with pity, did endure
To have his princely paws\textsuperscript{ccclvii} pared all away\textsuperscript{*}.

Some\textsuperscript{ccclviii} say that ravens foster forlorn children
The whilst their own birds\textsuperscript{*} famish in their nests:

O, be to me, though thy hard heart say no,

Nothing so kind, but something pitiful\textsuperscript{*}!

TAMORA
I know not what it\textsuperscript{*} means.— Away with her!

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{135} nice preservèd honesty fastidiously guarded chastity
  \item \textsuperscript{143} learn teach
  \item \textsuperscript{145} Even ... tyranny Proverbial: “He sucked evil from the dug” (Dent E198)
  \item \textsuperscript{150} raven ... lark Compare to the proverbs “An eagle does not hatch a dove” and “An evil bird lays an evil egg” (Tilley E2, B376).
  \item \textsuperscript{151} find it find it so
  \item \textsuperscript{152} -53 The lion ... away In Aesop’s fable, “The Lion in Love,” the lion allows his claws to be removed for love. The fable was quite well known (Tilley L316).
  \item \textsuperscript{155} birds young ones
  \item \textsuperscript{157} Nothing ... pitiful nothing so kind as the Raven, but at least somewhat pitying.
  \item \textsuperscript{158} it i.e. pity
\end{itemize}
LAVINIA
O, let me teach thee for my father’s sake,
That gave thee life when well he might have slain thee.
Be not obdurate, open thy deaf ears.

TAMORA
Hadst thou in person ne’er offended me,
Even for his sake* am I pitiless.
Remember, boys, I poured forth tears in vain
To save your brother from the sacrifice,
But fierce Andronicus would not relent.
Therefore away with her and use her as you will:
The worse to her, the better loved of me.

LAVINIA [*grabbing onto Tamora’s clothes]
O Tamora, be called a gentle queen,
And with thine own hands kill me in this place,
For ’tis not life that I have begged so long:
Poor I was slain when Bassianus died.

TAMORA
What begg’st thou then? Fond woman, let me go.

LAVINIA
’Tis present death I beg, and one thing more
That womanhood denies my tongue to tell:
O, keep me from their worse-than-killing lust,
And tumble me into some loathsome pit
Where never man’s eye may behold my body.
Do this, and be a charitable murderer.

TAMORA
So should I rob my sweet sons of their fee.
No, let them satisfy their lust on thee.

DEMETRIUS
Away for thou hast stayed us here too long.

LAVINIA
No grace? No womanhood? Ah, beastly creature.

---

* 163 Even for his sake It is precisely because of him
* 173 Fond Foolish
* 174 present immediate
* 175 denies forbids
* 180 fee reward
* 181 satisfy Maxwell points out that Q1’s “satisfiee,” a possible error for satisfice, is also plausible and an authentic sixteenth-century compound from “satisfy” and “suffice.” Though the necessity of both meanings here seems questionable, and satisfiee could, as Q2 suggests, just as easily be a misspelling of satisfie due to a common compositor error of dittography.
The blot and enemy to our general name,

CHIRON
Nay, then I’ll stop your mouth.
Bring thou her husband.
This is the hole where Aaron bid us hide him.

[Demetrius throws Bassianus’s body into the pit, he and Chiron then exeunt, dragging off Lavinia]

TAMORA
Farewell, my sons: see that you make her sure.
Ne’er let my heart know merry cheer indeed,
Till all the Andronici be made away.
Now will I hence to seek my lovely Moor,
And let my spleenful sons this trull deflower.

Exit.

Enter Aaron with two of Titus’s sons [Quintus and Martius].

AARON
Come on, my lords, the better foot before:
Straight will I bring you to the loathsome pit
Where I espied the panther fast asleep.
QUINTUS
My sight is very dull, whate’er it bodes.
MARTIUS
And mine, I promise you. Were it not for shame,
Well could I leave our sport to sleep awhile.

* 185 Confusion destruction; see also 5.2.8
* 187 stop your mouth make you stop talking. Most editors suggest that she is gagged or that her mouth is covered at this point. Waith suggests that he may stop her with a kiss, compare to “stop his mouth with a kiss” Much Ado, 2.1.322-3. Waith’s suggestion seems weakest, as a kiss may work for a moment, but seeing as how Lavinia does not speak again, the longer efficiency of the gag seems most likely. Compare to 5.1.161, 164, 167 below, when Titus commands that Demetrius and Chiron are silenced.
* 189 make her sure render her harmless; i.e. kill her. See l. 132 above.
* 192 made away i.e. killed (see also l. 210)
* 193 spleenful lustful
* 193 trull whore. Hughes points out that the absurdity of “deflowering” a “trull” seems to be lost on Tamora.
* 197 sight ... dull “Perhaps a common belief: ‘Men’s senses, sudden altering out of reason/ Doe bode ill lucke, or doe fore-show some treason’ (Thomas Andrewe, The Unmasking of a Female Machiavel (1604) sig. El V)” (Hughes).
[Martius falls into the pit.]

QUINTUS

What art thou fallen? What subtle hole is this, Whose mouth is covered with rude-growing briars Upon whose leaves are drops of new-shed blood As fresh as morning’s dew distilled on flowers? A very fatal place it seems to me.

Speak, brother, hast thou hurt thee with the fall?

MARTIUS

O brother, with the dismall’st object That ever eye with sight made heart lament!

AARON

Now will I fetch the king to find them here, That he thereby may have a likely guess

How these were they that made away his brother.

MARTIUS

Why dost not comfort me and help me out From this unhallowed and blood-stainèd hole?

QUINTUS

I am surprisèd with an uncouth fear, A chilling sweat o’erruns my trembling joints:

My heart suspects more than mine eye can see.

MARTIUS

To prove thou hast a true-divining heart, Aaron and thou look down into this den, And see a fearful sight of blood and death.

QUINTUS

Aaron is gone and my compassionate heart Will not permit mine eyes once to behold The thing whereat it trembles by surmise. O, tell me how it is, for ne’er till now Was I a child to fear I know not what.

MARTIUS

Lord Bassianus lies embrewèd here

Exit Aaron.

* 200 subtle ingeniously disguised
* 206 object sight; see also 3.1.65
* 213 surprisèd bewildered
* 213 uncouth mysterious, uncanny
* 216 true-divining heart prophetic heart; i.e. that your heart’s suspicions are right
* 221 by surmise even by imagining
* 224 embrewèd here stained here (in blood) OED imbrue, v. 2. Q1’s “bereaud in blood” has caused a number of editors to emend to either “berieved” or “berayed” (see t.n.). Though this makes sense, embrewèd, first found in Q2 requires no emendation or guess
All on a heap, like to the slaughtered lamb,
In this detested, dark, blood-drinking pit.

QUINTUS
If it be dark, how dost thou know 'tis he?

MARTIUS
Upon his bloody finger he doth wear
A precious ring, that lightens all the hole,
Which like a taper in some monument
Doth shine upon the dead man’s earthly cheeks
And shows the ragged entrails of the pit:
So pale did shine the moon on Pyramus
When he by night lay bathed in maiden blood.

O brother, help me with thy fainting hand —
If fear hath made thee faint, as me it hath —
Out of this fell devouring receptacle,
As hateful as Cocytus’ misty mouth.

QUINTUS
Reach me thy hand that I may help thee out
Or, wanting strength to do thee so much good,
I may be plucked into the swallowing womb
Of this deep pit, poor Bassianus’s grave.

[Tries to pull him up.]

I have no strength to pluck thee to the brink.

MARTIUS
Nor I no strength to climb without thy help.

QUINTUS
Thy hand once more: I will not loose again

work, and was retained by the editions that followed. Waith’s claim that it seems to be a guess like the owner of the Folger Q1, who crossed out the original reading and wrote in “heere reav’d of lyfe” is not convincing. It is highly unlikely that “embrewèd here” could be a misreading of “bereaud.” The other way around seems possible if the working manuscript was in a poor condition.

* 229 ring ... lightens certain gems were thought to generate light.

* 230 monument tomb

* 231 earthly cheeks a face that is “pale or lifeless as the earth” OED earthly, a. 3b

* 232 ragged entrails rough interior

* 233 Pyramus The lover of Thisbe, who killed himself when he found her bloody cloak and thought she had been killed by a lion; the lovers would meet at night under the moonlight Ovid, IV. See also Dream 3.1.50, for the “rude mechanicals” portrayal.

* 237 fell savage

* 238 Cocytus’ misty mouth i.e., Hell’s gate. Cocytus is a river in Epiros, thought to be the entrance to the underworld or Hades. A smoking hell-mouth was a standard property in medieval drama.

* 240 wanting lacking
Till thou art here aloft or I below.
Thou canst not come to me: I come to thee. [Tries again.]\textsuperscript{cdv}
Both fall in. \textsuperscript{cdvi}

Enter the Emperor, Aaron the Moor\textsuperscript{cdvii} [and Attendants] \textsuperscript{*cdviii}.

SATURNINUS
Along with me: I’ll see what hole is here,
And what he is that now is leapt into it.—\textsuperscript{cdix}
Say who art thou that lately didst descend
Into this gaping hollow of the earth?

MARTIUS
The unhappy son\textsuperscript{cdx} of old Andronicus,
Brought hither in a most unlucky hour
To find thy brother Bassianus dead.

SATURNINUS
My brother dead\textsuperscript{cdxi} I know thou dost but jest:
He and his lady both are at the lodge
Upon the north side of this pleasant chase.
’Tis not an hour since I left him\textsuperscript{cdxii} there.

MARTIUS
We know not where you left him\textsuperscript{cdxiii} all alive,
But, out alas,\textsuperscript{cdxiv} here have we found him dead.

Enter\textsuperscript{cdxv} Tamora [with Attendants?, Titus]\textsuperscript{cdxvi} Andronicus and Lucius.

TAMORA
Where is my lord the king?

SATURNINUS\textsuperscript{cdxvii}
Here, Tamora, though gride\textsuperscript{*cdxviii} with killing grief.

TAMORA
Where is thy brother Bassianus?

SATURNINUS
Now to the bottom dost thou search* my wound:

Poor Bassianus here lies murderèd.

TAMORA
Then all too late I bring this fatal writ*,

\textsuperscript{* 247 SD Attendants} at least two attendants are needed to help remove the dead body at
the end of the scene, and two more to guard Martius and Quintus. They may all enter
here, or some may enter with Tamora at 260. Alexander and Waith follow Capell in
having all attendant’s enter with Tamora, and none here with Saturninus. But Saturninus
command at 248, “Along with me” seems a more appropriate command for a group than
just Aaron, and the emperor is never seen without a train in the play.

\textsuperscript{* 262 gride} pierced, wounded

\textsuperscript{* 264 search} probe
The complot* of this timeless* tragedy,
And wonder greatly that man’s face can fold*
In pleasing smiles such murderous tyranny.

*She giveth Saturnine a letter.*

SATURNINUS reads the letter.

“An if we miss to meet him handsomely”
Sweet huntsman — Bassianus ’tis we mean —
Do thou so much as dig the grave for him:
Thou know’st our meaning. Look for thy reward Among the nettles at the elder tree

Which overshades the mouth of that same pit
Where we decreed to bury Bassianus.
Do this, and purchase* us thy lasting friends.”
O Tamora, was ever heard the like?
This is the pit and this the elder tree.—

Look, sirs, if you can find the huntsman out
That should have* murdered Bassianus here.

AARON

My gracious lord, here is the bag of gold.

SATURNINUS

Two of thy whelps, fell curs of bloody kind*,
Have here bereft my brother of his life.—

Sirs, drag them from the pit unto the prison:

TAMORA

What, cdxxvii are they in this pit? O wondrous thing!
How easily murder is discoverèd*. cdxxix

TITUS

* 266 writ document (the “fatal plot scroll” given to Tamora by Aaron at 2.3.47.)
* 267 complot conspiracy
* 267 timeless untimely (Waith); not subject to the passage of time (Hughes OED Timeless a 2)
* 268 fold hide; usually the opposite is used in speaking of opening up or being truthful. See Hamlet 1.12 “Stand and unfold yourself.” Bate point out the typical Shakespearian irony in having Tamora (the chief “folder”) speak this line.
* 270 handsomely conveniently
* 277 purchase win
* 281 should have were to have
* 283 kind nature
* 289 How ... discoverèd Proverbial: “Murder will out” (ODEP, p. 551; Tilley M1315)
High emperor, upon my feeble knee
I beg this boon with tears not lightly shed,
That this fell fault of my accursèd sons—
Accursèd if the faults be proved in them—
SATURNINUS
If it be proved you see it is apparent.

Who found this letter? Tamora, was it you?
TAMORA
Andronicus himself did take it up.
TITUS
I did, my lord. Yet let me be their bail,
For by my father’s reverend tomb I vow
They shall be ready at your highness’ will
To answer their suspicion with their lives.
SATURNINUS
Thou shalt not bail them: see thou follow me.—
Some bring the murdered body, some the murderers:
Let them not speak a word, the guilt is plain:
For, by my soul, were there worse end than death,

That end upon them should be executed.
TAMORA [Aside to Titus.]
Andronicus, I will entreat the king:
Fear not thy sons, they shall do well enough.
TITUS
Come, Lucius, come. Stay not to talk with them.

* 293 faults Theobald’s emendation to “fault” is grammatically logical. But Elizabethans did not share the need for grammatical agreement. However, it is possible that Shakespeare’s “faults” was meant to agree with “them” and not with the “fell fault” of the previous line.
* 294 apparent obvious
* 296-297 here we see that Tamora has changed Aaron’s original plan for her to give Saturninus the letter. see 2.3.46-7.
* 298 reverend Maxwell does claim that F4’s emendation from reverent is unnecessary as the two forms were used interchangeably
* 300 their suspicion the suspicion of them
* 301 bail them get them released under supervision; i.e. bail them out
* 307 Fear not fear not for
Enter the Empress’ sons [Demetrius and Chiron] with Lavinia, her hands cut off and her tongue cut out, and ravished.

DEMETRIUS
So, now go tell, an if thy tongue can speak,
Who ’twas that cut thy tongue and ravished thee.

CHIRON
Write down thy mind, bewray* thy meaning so,
An if thy stumps will let thee, play the scribe.

DEMETRIUS
See how with signs and tokens she can scrawl.*

CHIRON
Go home, call for sweet* water, wash thy hands.

DEMETRIUS
She hath no tongue to call, nor hands to wash,
And so let’s leave her to her silent walks.

CHIRON
An ’twere my cause*, I should go hang myself.

DEMETRIUS
If thou hadst hands to help thee knit the cord.

Exeunt [Chiron and Demetrius].

Wind horns.*

Enter Marcus from hunting to Lavinia.

MARCUS

* [2.4] takes place on the edge of the forest.
* 0 SD portrayals of Lavinia’s wounds vary from the grotesque to the artistic.
* 3 bewray reveal; see also 5.1.28
* 5 scrawl write (Onions), gesticulate (Waith). Most editors comment that Q1’s “scrowl,” of which scrawl is a variant, my be making an allusion to scroll. Waith notes that the first instance of scroll as a verb, meaning “to write down” is 1606 according to the OED.
* 6 sweet perfumed
* 9 cause case, condition
* 10.1 SD Wind horns of offstage horns indicate that the hunt is still in progress.
* 11-57 Marcus’s following speech has caused mixed reactions from readers through the years. Most who find it lacking a Shakespearean quality, point to its length and its lack of connection with the events and situation at hand (Lavinia would surely be bleeding to death during this section). However, it is not at all uncommon for Shakespeare to require his audiences to accept breaks from the reality of his drama. As Hughes has pointed out, “the spirit of the speech is poetic rather than dramatic... [and] anticipates the baroque
Who is this? My niece that flies away so fast!—
Cousin*, a word: where is your husband—
If I do dream, would all my wealth would wake me*
If I do wake, some planet strike me down*
That I may slumber in* eternal sleep.

Speak, gentle niece, what stern ungentle hands
Hath* lopped and hewed and made thy body bare
Of her two branches, those sweet ornaments,
Whose circling shadows kings have sought to sleep in,

And might not gain so great a happiness
As half* thy love? Why dost not speak to me?
Alas, a crimson river of warm blood,
Like to a bubbling fountain stirred with wind,

Coming and going with thy honey breath.

But sure some Tereus* hath deflow’red thee
And, lest thou shouldst detect him, cut thy tongue.
Ah, now thou turn’st away thy face for shame,
And notwithstanding all this loss of blood,

As from a conduit* with three* issuing spouts,
Yet do thy cheeks look red as Titan’s* face
Blushing* to be encountered with a cloud.

Shall I speak for thee? Shall I say ’tis so?
O, that I knew thy heart, and knew the beast,

That I might rail at him, to ease my mind.
Sorrow conceal’d*, like an oven stopped,

*tirade, in which the depth of the speaker’s passion is to be measured by the length of his speech and the complexity of its figures.” Waith and Bradbrook have both pointed out that the Shakespeare is indebted to Ovid here.

* 12 Cousin i.e. Niece; “cousin” was commonly used to refer to almost any close relation.
* 13 would ... me i.e. I would give all that I own to be awakened from this nightmare.
* 14 planet strike me down evil planet exert its influence on me; planets were often considered to have “supposed influence or quality in affecting persons, events, and natural phenomena. Hence in later use: a controlling or fateful power, usually of an occult nature.” (OED planet n., 1b).
* 26 Tereus Tereus cut out Philomela’s tongue to try to keep her from identifying him as her rapist. See also, note on 2.3.43.
* 27 detect expose.
* 30 conduit fountain
* 31 Titan’s The sun’s; see also 1.1.228
* 36-37 Sorry ... is Proverbial: (Tilley F266; Dent p. 187). Baldwin and Waith find a parallel in the use of this proverb to describe “concealed sorrow” in Shakespeare’s Venus
Fair Philomela, but lost her tongue,
And in a tedious sampler sewed her mind.  

But, lovely niece, that mean is cut from thee:
A craftier Tereus hast thou met withal,
And he hath cut those pretty fingers off,
That could have better sewed than Philomel.

O, had the monster seen those lily hands
Tremble like aspen leaves upon a lute
And make the silken strings delight to kiss them,
He would not then have touched them for his life.
Or had he heard the heavenly harmony
Which that sweet tongue hath made,

He would have dropped his knife and fell asleep,
As Cerberus at the Thracian poet’s feet.
Come, let us go, and make thy father blind,
For such a sight will blind a father’s eye.
One hour’s storm will drown the fragrant meads:

What will whole months of tears thy father’s eyes?
Do not draw back, for we will mourn with thee.
O, could our mourning ease thy misery!

Exeunt.
Enter the Judges* and Senatorscdlxii with Titus’s two sons [Martius and Quintus]cdlxiii bound, passing oncdlxiv the stagecdlxv to the place of execution, and Titus going before, pleading.

TITUS
Hear me, grave fathers! Noble tribunes, stay!
For pity of mine age, whose youth was spent
In dangerous wars whilst you securely slept,
For all my blood in Rome’scdlxvi great quarrel shed,
For all the frosty nights that I have watched,
And for these bitter tears which now you see
Filling the aged wrinkles in my cheeks,
Be pitiful to my condemnèd sons,
Whose souls iscdlxvii not corrupted as ’tis thought.

For two and twenty sons* I never wept,
Because they died in honor’s lofty bed.

Andronicus lieth down and the Judgescdlxviii pass by him. cdmlxix

For these two, cdlx× tribunes, in the dust I write
My heart’s deep languor* and my soul’s sad tearscdlxii:
Let my tears stanch*cdlxii the earth’s dry appetite,
My sons’ sweet blood will make it shame* and blush. 15

Exeunt*. cdlxiii [Titus remains]cdlxiv

O earth, I will befriend thee more with rain
That shall distill from these two ancient ruins*cdlxv

---

* 3.[1] on a street in Rome
* 0.1 SD Judges tribunes; see line 1.
* 10 two and twenty sons Compare to 1.1.196, where Titus refers to his 21 dead sons. If Mutius is added the new total of 22 is correct, but as others have pointed out, it seems contradictory to Titus earlier statements for him to include the son he killed among those who “died in honor’s lofty bed.” If Waith is correct, Shakespeare originally planned to follow the chapbook narrative which accounted for 22 of Titus’s 25 sons having died in battle. When Shakespeare “added” Mutius in revision, he forgot to change this occurrence to 21 sons as he previously did in Act I.
* 13 languor grief
* 14 stanch satisfy
* 15 shame be ashamed
* 15.1 SD Exeunt. Some editors join this SD with the one that occurs at line 11. However, I agree with Waith that the five lines between allows sufficient time for them to “pass by him” on their way to an exit.
Than youthful April shall with all his showers fall; 20
In summer’s drought I’ll drop upon thee still:
In winter with warm tears I’ll melt the snow
And keep eternal springtime on thy face,
So thou refuse to drink my dear sons’ blood.

Enter Lucius, with his weapon drawn.

O reverend tribunes! O gentle, aged men!
Unbind my sons, reverse the doom of death,
And let me say, that never wept before,
My tears are now prevailing orators.

LUCIUS
O noble father, you lament in vain:
The tribunes hear you not, no man is by,
And you recount your sorrows to a stone.

TITUS
Ah, Lucius, for thy brothers let me plead.
Grave tribunes, once more I entreat of you—

LUCIUS
My gracious lord, no tribune hears you speak.

TITUS
Why, ’tis no matter, man: if they did hear,
They would not mark me, or if they did mark,
They would not pity me.

Therefore I tell my sorrows bootless to the stones,
Who, though they cannot answer my distress,
Yet in some sort they are better than the tribunes
For that they will not intercept my tale:

When I do weep, they humbly at my feet
Receive my tears and seem to weep with me,
And were they but attirèd in grave weeds,

* 17 ruins many modern editors follow Hamner in emending to “urns.” Though this emendation make sense, ruins does too and is therefore retained.
* 19 still continually; see also 3.2.30, 45; 4.1.100; 5.3.42
* 22 So as long as
* 24 doom sentence
* 26 orators advocates, as in a court of law
* 36 bootless in vain: Maxwell suggest that Q1’s half-line is a false start, meant to be cut by Shakespeare, but included accidentally. F cuts 35, and makes it the half line, and begins a new start here. For variants between Q1, Q2, Q3 and F see t.n.
* 39 intercept interrupt?
* 42 grave weeds sober garments
Rome could afford* no tribune\textsuperscript{cdxcvii} like to these.
A stone is as soft\textsuperscript{cdxcviii} wax,
45 Tribunes more hard than stones:\textsuperscript{cdxcix}
A stone is silent, and offendeth not—
And tribunes with their tongues doom men to death—
But wherefore stand’st thou with thy weapon drawn?
LUCIUS
To rescue my two brothers from their death,
50 For which attempt the judges have pronounced
My everlasting doom of banishment.
TITUS\textsuperscript{d′}
O happy man, they have befriended thee.
Why, foolish Lucius, dost thou not perceive
That Rome is but a wilderness of tigers?
55 Tigers must prey, and Rome affords* no prey
But me and\textsuperscript{di} mine: how happy art thou, then,
From these devourers to be banishèd—
But who comes with our brother Marcus here?

\textit{Enter Marcus and\textsuperscript{dii} Lavinia.}

MARCUS
Titus, prepare thy noble\textsuperscript{diii} eyes to weep,
60 Or if not so, thy noble heart to break:
I bring consuming sorrow to thine age.
TITUS
Will it consume me? Let me see it then.
MARCUS
This was thy daughter.
TITUS
Why, Marcus, so she is.
LUCIUS\textsuperscript{div}
65 Ay\textsuperscript{dv} me, this object kills me.*
TITUS
Faint-hearted boy, arise and look upon her.—\textsuperscript{dvi}
Speak, Lavinia, what accursèd hand
Hath made thee handless in thy father’s sight?
What fool hath added water to the sea?*

* 43 afford provide, offer up
* 53 Titus must rise at some point in this dialogue. As shown in the t.n. the two most popular places for this seem to be either here, or at 39.
* 55 affords see l. 43 above
* 65 Titus’s command for Lucius to “arise” on the next line suggests they Lucius may fall to his knees here.
Or brought a faggot* to bright-burningdvii Troy?
My grief was at the height before thou cam`st,
And now like Nilus it disdaineth bounds*.
Give me a sword, I`ll chop off my hands too,
For they have fought for Rome, and all in vain:

And they have nursed this woe, in feeding life,dviii
In bootless prayer have they been held up,
And they have served me to effectless* use:
Now all the service I require of them
Is that the one will help to cut the other.

'Tis well, Lavinia, that thou hast no hands,
For hands to do Rome service is but vain.

LUCIUS
Speak, gentle sister: who hath martyred*dix thee?

MARCUS
O, that delightful engine* of her thoughts
That blabbed* them with such pleasing eloquence,
Is torn from forth that pretty hollow cage
Where, like a sweet melodious bird, it sung
Sweet varieddx notes, enchanting every ear!

LUCIUS
O, say thou for her: who hath done this deed?dxi

MARCUS
O, thus I found her, straying in the park,
Seeking to hide herself, as doth the deer
That hath received some unrecuring* wound*.

TITUS
It was my dear*, and he that wounded herdxii
Hath hurt me more than had he killed me dead,
For now I stand as one upon a rock

---

* 69 What ... sea Proverbial: “To cast Water into the sea” (ODEP, p. 870; Tilley W106)
* 70 faggot a bundle of sticks bound together and used as fuel or as a torch for lighting fires.
* 72 Nilus ... bounds The river Nile was known for its annual flooding.
* 77 effectless fruitless, unproductive
* 82 martyred mutilated; see also line 108 below and 3.2.36, 5.2.180.
* 83 engine instrument; see also 5.3.86; and Venus and Adonis 367: “once more the engine of her thoughts began.”
* 84 blabbed freely spoke
* 91 unrecuring incurable; i.e. fatal
* 90-91 deer ... wound Proverbial: “As the stricken Deer withdraws himself to die” (Tilley D189).
* 92 dear a pun on Marcus’s previous proverb.
Environed with a wilderness of sea,
Who marks the waxing tide grow wave by wave,
Expecting ever when some envious surge
Will in his brinish bowels swallow him.
This way to death my wretched sons are gone:

Here stands my other son, a banished man,
And here my brother, weeping at my woes.
But that which gives my soul the greatest spurn
Is dear Lavinia, dearer than my soul.
Had I but seen thy picture in this plight,

It would have maddened me. What shall I do
Now I behold thy lively body so?
Thou hast no hands to wipe away thy tears,
Nor tongue to tell me who hath martyred thee:
Thy husband he is dead, and for his death

Perchance she weeps because they killed her husband,
Perchance because she knows them innocent.

If they did kill thy husband, then be joyful,
Because the law hath ta’en revenge on them.
No, no, they would not do so foul a deed:

Witness the sorrow that their sister makes.
Gentle Lavinia, let me kiss thy lips
Or make some signs how I may do thee ease:
Shall thy good uncle and thy brother Lucius,
And thou and I sit round about some fountain,

Looking all downwards to behold our cheeks,
How they are stained like meadows yet not dry,

* 97 Expecting ever when always waiting for the time to come when
* 97 envious malicious
* 98 his its
* 102 spurn humiliating blow
* 106 lively living
* 110 by this by this time
* 116 her husband F breaks the line after her, most likely because the compositor ran out of room on the line.
* 122 do thee ease relieve you
With miry slime left on them by a flood?
And in the fountain shall we gaze so long
Till the fresh taste be taken from that clearness,

130 And made a brine-pit with our bitter tears?
Or shall we cut away our hands like thine?
Or shall we bite our tongues and in dumb shows Pass the remainder of our hateful days?
What shall we do? Let us that have our tongues

135 Plot some device of further miseries To make us wondered at in time to come.

LUCIUS
Sweet father, cease your tears, for at your grief
See how my wretched sister sobs and weeps.

MARCUS
Patience, dear niece.— Good Titus, dry thine eyes.

TITUS
Ah, Marcus, Marcus, brother, well I wot
Thy napkin cannot drink a tear of mine,
For thou, poor man, hast drowned it with thine own.

LUCIUS
Ah, my Lavinia, I will wipe thy cheeks.

TITUS
Mark, Marcus, mark! I understand her signs:
Had she a tongue to speak, now would she say
That to her brother which I said to thee.
His napkin with his true tears all bewet
Can do no service on her sorrowful cheeks.
O, what a sympathy of woe is this:

150 As far from help as Limbo is from bliss!

Enter Aaron the Moor alone.

* 130 And made And the clear water was made into
* 132 bite our tongues bite out their tongues, to be like Lavinia. “The idea of biting rather than cutting may come from Kyd, 4.4.194” (Hughes)
* 132 dumb shows In Elizabethan drama, “a part of the play represented by action without speech” (OED); see Hamlet, 3.2.
* 140 wot know
* 141 napkin handkerchief; Hughes suggests that Marcus may offer his to Titus at this point.
* 149 sympathy of woe likeness in suffering (Onions)
* 150 Limbo region near hall, where souls of the unbaptised await the Second Coming (Roman Catholic); see n. 1.1.328.
* 150 bliss i.e. heaven
Titus Andronicus, my lord the emperor
Sends thee this word: that if thou love thy sons,
Let Marcus, Lucius, or thyself, old Titus,
Or any one of you, chop off your hand
And send it to the king: he for the same
Will send thee hither both thy sons alive —
And that shall be the ransom for their fault.

O gracious emperor! O gentle Aaron!
Did ever raven sing so like a lark
That gives sweet tidings of the sun’s uprise?
With all my heart, I’ll send the emperor my hand.
Good Aaron, wilt thou help to chop it off?

Stay, father, for that noble hand of thine
That hath thrown down so many enemies
Shall not be sent. My hand will serve the turn:
My youth can better spare my blood than you,
And therefore mine shall save my brothers’ lives.

Which of your hands hath not defended Rome,
And reared aloft the bloody battle-axe,
Writing destruction on the enemy’s castle?
O, none of both but are of high desert.
My hand hath been but idle: let it serve
To ransom my two nephews from their death,
Then have I kept it to a worthy end.

Nay, come, agree whose hand shall go along,
For fear they die before their pardon come.

My hand shall go.
By heaven, it shall not go!
Sirs, strive no more: such withered herbs as these
Are meet for plucking up, and therefore mine.

Sweet father, if I shall be thought thy son,

---

* 170 castle a medieval anachronism
* 172 my ... idle unlike Titus and Lucius, Marcus has not fought in Rome’s battles.
* 180 meet fit
Let me redeem my brothers both from death.

MARCUS
And for our father’s sake and mother’s care,
Now let me show a brother’s love to thee.

TITUS

185 Agree between you: I will spare my hand.

LUCIUS
Then I’ll go fetch an axe.

MARCUS
But I will use the axe. Exeunt [Lucius and Marcus].

TITUS

Come hither, Aaron, I’ll deceive them both:
Lend me thy hand and I will give thee mine.

AARON [Aside]

If that be called deceit, I will be honest
And never whilst I live deceive men so.
But I’ll deceive you in another sort,
And that you’ll say, ere half an hour pass.

He cuts off Titus’s hand. Enter Lucius and Marcus again.

TITUS

Now stay your strife: what shall be is dispatched.

195 Good Aaron, give his majesty my hand:
Tell him it was a hand that warded him
From thousand dangers: bid him bury it—
More hath it merited—that let it have.
As for my sons, say I account of them

200 As jewels purchased at an easy price,
And yet dear too, because I bought mine own.

AARON
I go, Andronicus, and for thy hand
Look by and by to have thy sons with thee.—

* 181 shall am to
* 193 SD He ... hand “Juggling tricks” were often used on the Elizabethan stage to create the appearance of limbs/heads being severed. See Louis B. Wright, “Juggling Tricks and Conjury on the English Stage before 1642,” Modern Philology, 24 (1926-7), 269-84. Waith has pointed out that it must be Titus’s left hand as indicated by 3.2.7, where Titus mentions his right hand is still intact.
* 196 warded guarded, protected
* 198 that i.e. the proper burial
* 201 dear expensive
Their heads I mean. O, how this villainy

Doth fat\(^\text{∗}\) me with the very thoughts of it!\(^{\text{d}x\text{li}}\)

Let fools do good and fair men call for grace.

Aaron will have his soul black like his face.

TITUS

O, here I lift this one hand up to heaven
And bow this feeble ruin\(^{\text{d}x\text{lii}}\) to the earth.

If any power pities wretched tears,

To that I call!— What, wilt\(^{\text{d}x\text{liii}}\) thou kneel with me?\(^\text{∗}\)

Do then, dear heart, for heaven shall hear our prayers,

Or with our sighs we’ll breathe the welkin dim*,

And stain the sun with fog, as sometime clouds*

When they do hug him in their melting bosoms.

MARCUS

O brother, speak with possibilities\(^{\text{d}x\text{lv}}\),

And do not break into these deep extremes.

TITUS

Is not my sorrow\(^{\text{d}x\text{lv}}\) deep, having no bottom?

Then be my passions\(^{\text{d}x\text{lvii}}\) bottomless with them*.

MARCUS

But yet let reason govern thy lament.

TITUS

If there were reason for these miseries*,

---

* 203 Look by and by Expect soon
* 205 fat fatten by feeding, i.e. delight; see also Tro. 2.2.48-9 “would they but fat their thoughts/ With this cramm’d reason” (Hughes)
* 205 Waith adds and SD having Aaron laugh and move aside, and sites 5.1.112-13, as providing evidence of this SD. But Aaron’s claim that after fooling Titus, he “drew [him]self apart /And almost broke [his] heart with extreme laughter” could just as easily refer to an action that occurs after he exits at 207. Also, extreme laughter, in my opinion, would suggest a little more than a slight laughing to himself in an aside.
* 209 ruin here referring to his mutilated body.
* 211 Both Titus and Lavinia most likely kneel here, though some have Titus kneel at 208.
* 213 breath ... dim make the welkin (sky) cloudy with our breath
* 214 sometime clouds occasional clouds do
* 216 speak ... possibilities i.e. speak of realistic, possible things, things governed by reason l. 220
* 219 passions passionate outbursts
* 218-19 Is ... them the grammatical disagreement seen here was acceptable by Elizabethan audiences. Some though have tried to make these lines more agreeable by emending “Is” to “Are” and “sorrow” to “sorrows.” See t.n. 218, 219.
* 221 reason ... miseries if these atrocities that caused my “woes” were logical or rational
Then into limits could I bind my woes:
When heaven doth weep, doth not the earth o’erflow?*
If the winds rage, doth not the sea wax mad,

225 Threat’ning the welkin with his big-swoll’n face?  
And wilt thou have a reason for this coil?*
I am the sea. Hark how her sighs do blow!*
She is the weeping welkin, I the earth:
Then must my sea be movèd with her sighs,

230 Then must my earth with her continual tears
Become a deluge overflowed and drowned,
For why my bowels cannot hide her woes,
But like a drunkard must I vomit them.
Then give me leave, for losers will have leave

235 To ease their stomachs with their bitter tongues*.  
Enter a Messenger with two heads and a hand*.  

MESSENGER
Worthy Andronicus, ill art thou repaid
For that good hand thou sent’st the emperor.
Here are the heads of thy two noble sons,
And here’s thy hand, in scorn to thee sent back:

240 Thy griefs, their sports, thy resolution mocked,
That woe is me to think upon thy woes
More than remembrance of my father’s death.  

MARCUS
Now let hot Etna cool in Sicily,  

* 223 o’erflow become flooded  
* 226 coil turmoil  
* 232 For why because  
* 232 bowels the bowels were “considered the seat of compassion” (Waith)  
* 235 stomachs resentments (the stomach was said to breed resentment)  
* 234-5 Then ... tongues Proverbial: “Give losers leave to speak” (Tilley LA58; ODEP p. 485)  
* 235 SD At 5.1.114-17 Aaron claims to have witnessed the scene of the messenger returning with the heads. Maxwell suggested that a director may have Aaron here peeping from behind something, and visible to the crowd. But again, we must wonder how truthful Aaron’s boasts are, and need not necessarily take him at his word.  
* 240 griefs, their sports i.e. the Emperor and his court find entertainment in your sorrow (See 5.1.118-120 for Aaron’s description of the Empress reaction.)  
* 241 That So that  
* 243 Etna Sicilian volcano. Marcus now sees no reason to react “within reason” to these wrongs
And be my heart an ever-burning hell!

These miseries are more than may be borne. To weep with them that weep doth ease some deal*, But sorrow flouted at* is double death.

LUCIUS

Ah, that this sight should make so deep a wound, And yet detested life not shrink thereat!

That ever death should let life bear his name*, Where life hath no more interest but to breathe!  

MARCUS

Alas, poor heart, that kiss is comfortless
As frozen water to a starvèd* snake.

TITUS

When will this fearful slumber* have an end?  

MARCUS

Now farewell flattery*, die Andronicus: Thou dost not slumber. See thy two sons' heads, Thy warlike hand, thy mangled daughter here, Thy other banished son with this dear* sight
Struck pale and bloodless, and thy brother, I,

Even like a stony image, cold and numb. Ah, now no more will I control* thy* gries: Rend off thy silver hair, thy other hand
Gnawing with thy teeth, and be this dismal sight
The closing up of our most wretched eyes.

Now is a time to storm. Why art thou still?  

TITUS

Ha, ha, ha!  

MARCUS

Why dost thou laugh? It fits not with this hour.  

TITUS

Why? I have not another tear to shed: Besides, this sorrow is an enemy

And would usurp upon my wat’ry* eyes

* 246 To weep ... weep Compare to Romans 12:15 “weep with them that weep” (Waith)
* 246 some deal somewhat
* 247 flouted at mocked
* 249 shrink slip away; i.e. end
* 250 bear his name i.e. be called “life”
* 253 starvèd numb with cold
* 254 fearful slumber nightmare
* 258 dear grievous
* 261 control restrain
And make them blind with tributary tears*. 
Then which way shall I find Revenge’s cave? 
For these two heads do seem to speak to me 
And threat me* I shall never come to bliss 
Till all these mischiefs be returned again*
Even in their throats that have dlxiv committed them. 
Come, let me see what task I have to do,dlxvi
You heavy* people, circle me about,dlxvi
That I may turn me to each one of you 
And swear unto my soul to right your wrongs. 
The vow is made,dlxvii Come, brother, take a head, 
And in this hand the other will I dlxx bear. 
And Lavinia, thou shalt be employed in these things: 
Bear thou my hand, sweet wench, between thy teethdlxxiii. 
As for thee, boy, go get thee from my sight:
Thou art an exile, and thou must not stay: 
Hie to the Goths and raise an army there, 
And if you love me, as I think you do, 
Let’s kiss and part, for we have much to do. Exeunt. Lucius remains. dlxxvi

LUCIUS
Farewell Andronicus, my noble father, 
The woefull’st man that ever lived in Rome. 
Farewell, proud Rome, till Lucius come again, 
He loves his pledges* dearer than his life.

* 271 tributary tears tears paid in tribute to sorrow  
* 274 threat me warn me that  
* 275 mischiefs ... again wrongs are revenged  
* 278 heavy sorrowful  
* 283 And ... things The irregular meter has caused all editors problems with this line, whether using this ending from F or Qq’s “these Armes.” Waith notes this problem at length. He notes that Lettsom’s conjecture of “this,” has been followed by a number of editors after Hudson, who also dropped “And” from the beginning of the line. Waith follows Lettsom, because it requires the least “alteration by the compositer.” W. A. Wright (Cam.) conjectured that the original manuscript line ended after “employed,” that someone had written “armes” over “teeth” from the line below, as a possible alternative to “a ludicrous piece of business,” but failed to cross out “teeth”; and “that the Q1 compositor, taking ‘Armes’ for part of l. 283, filled in the gap with ‘in these.’” Bolton, adds to Wright that the original manuscript may have also ended the line with “this,” and that the compositor, misreading “Armes” changed the ending to “these.” While Wright and Bolton’s arguments are plausible, they rely on far too many conjectured occurrences than I am willing to accept as fact. (see full collations in t.n.).  
* 293 loves ... pledges loves his promises (i.e. the vows of revenge) (OED pledge n, 2a); according to most editors, pledges is taken to refer to sureties, or those left behind in bail
Farewell, Lavinia, my noble sister,
O, would thou wert as thou tofore° hast been!
But now nor Lucius nor Lavinia lives
But in oblivion and hateful griefs.
If Lucius live, he will requite your wrongs
And make proud Saturnine and his empress\textsuperscript{dlxxix}
Beg at the gates, like\textsuperscript{dlxxx} Tarquin and his queen°.
Now will I to the Goths and raise a power\textsuperscript{dlxxxi},
To be revenged on Rome and Saturnine. \textit{Exit Lucius.}

\textsuperscript{°}295 tofore heretofore, formerly

\textsuperscript{°}300 Beg ... queen Tarquinius Superbus, the last king of Rome, was expelled along with his family after his son Sextus raped Lucrece.
A banquet

Enter [Titus] Andronicus, Marcus, Lavinia and the Boy [Young Lucius]

TITUS

So, so, now sit, and look you eat no more
Than will preserve just so much strength in us
As will revenge these bitter woes of ours.
Marcus, unknit that sorrow-wreathen knot:

Thy niece and I, poor creatures, want our hands
And cannot passionate our tenfold grief
With folded arms. This poor right hand of mine
Is left to tyrannize upon my breast,
Who, when my heart, all mad with misery,
Beats in this hollow prison of my flesh,
Then thus I thump it down."

Thou map of woe, that thus dost talk in signs,
When thy poor heart beats with outrageous beating,
Thou canst not strike it thus to make it still.
Wound it with sighing*, girl, kill it with groans,
Or get some little knife between thy teeth
And just against thy heart make thou a hole,
That all the tears that thy poor eyes let fall
May run into that sink*, and soaking in

Drown the lamenting fool* in sea-salt tears.

MARCUS

* [3.2] This scene first appears in F. The location is in Titus’s house, with a table set for the “banquet.”
* 0 SD banquet here the meaning indicates a table set for a normal meal, while later in 5.2 the term refers to a larger feast.
* 4 unknit ... knot unfold your arms (folded arms were a sign of melancholy)
* 5 want lack
* 6 passionate express through movement
* 8 tyrannize upon i.e. by beating on
* 7-11 This ... down. here Titus expresses the rising of grief from his stomach to his throat which he must beat down. Compare to Lear’s description of “hysterica passio” (2.4.57).
* 12 map image
* 15 Wound ... sighing it was believed that every sigh drew a drop of blood from the heart.
* 19 sink receptacle i.e. the whole created by the knife
* 20 fool used here as an affectionate term
Fie, brother, fie! Teach her not thus to lay
Such violent hands upon her tender life.

TITUS

How now? Has sorrow made thee dote already?
Why, Marcus, no man should be mad but I.

What violent hands can she lay on her life?

Ah, wherefore dost thou urge the name of hands?

To bid Aeneas tell the tale twice o’er
How Troy was burnt and he made miserable?

O, handle not the theme, to talk of hands,

Lest we remember still that we have none.
Fie, fie, how frantically I square my talk,
As if we should forget we had no hands.
If Marcus did not name the word of hands.
Come, let’s fall to, and, gentle girl, eat this.

Here is no drink! Hark, Marcus, what she says:
I can interpret all her martyred signs —
She says she drinks no other drink but tears,
Brewed with her sorrow, meshed upon her cheeks. —
Speechless complainer, I will learn thy thought.

In thy dumb action will I be as perfect
As begging hermits in their holy prayers:
Thou shalt not sigh, nor hold thy stumps to heaven,
Nor wink, nor nod, nor kneel, nor make a sign,
But I of these will wrest an alphabet

And by still practice learn to know thy meaning.

YOUNG LUCIUS

Good grandsire, leave these bitter deep laments:
Make my aunt merry with some pleasing tale.

MARCUS

Alas, the tender boy, in passion moved,
Doth weep to see his grandsire’s heaviness.

* 23 dote forget; usually associated with the decline in mental ability that comes with age, though here sorrow is the cause
* 27-28 To bid ... miserable this is an allusion to the Aeneid, ii. 2. Dido asks Aeneas to tell his story from the beginning, and he relies that the retelling brings him grief
* 29 handle a possible pun on hands
* 31 square shape
* 36 I can ... signs I will learn to interpret her signs, though she is mutilated.
* 40 dumb action silent, pantomimed gesture
* 40 perfect i.e. in understanding you
* 45 still constant
* 48 passion sorrow
TITUS
50 Peace, tender sapling, thou art made of tears,
And tears will quickly melt thy life away.

Marcus strikes the dish with a knife.

What dost thou strike at, Marcus, with thy knife?

MARCUS
At that that I have killed, my lord: a fly.

TITUS
Out on thee, murderer! Thou kill’st my heart:

Mine eyes are cloyed with view of tyranny:
A deed of death done on the innocent
Becomes not Titus’s brother. Get thee gone:
I see thou art not for my company.

MARCUS
Alas, my lord, I have but killed a fly.

TITUS
"But" How if that fly had a father and mother?
How would he hang his slender gilded wings,
And buzz lamenting doings in the air!
Poor harmless fly,
That with his pretty buzzing melody

Come here to make us merry, and thou hast killed him.

MARCUS
Pardon me, sir, it was a black ill-favored fly,
Like to the empress’ Moor: therefore I killed him.

TITUS
O, O, O!
Then pardon me for reprehending thee,

For thou hast done a charitable deed.
Give me thy knife, I will insult on him,
Flattering myself as if it were the Moor.

* 49 heaviness sadness
* 55 cloyed satiated, overfilled
* 60 father and mother some editors have made the argument that mother must have been a printer’s or compositor’s change, and assume Shakespeare intended to write “father, brother” as a logical connection between Titus and his brother Marcus (see n. in Hudson’s edition).
* 62 lamenting doings may refer to sad stories, lamentations; the unclear meaning has led to a number of emendations (see t.n.)
* 66 ill-favored ugly
* 71 insult on exult over
Come hither purposely to poison me.—

There’s for thyself, and that’s for Tamora.

Ah, sirrah! Yet, I think, we are not brought so low
But that between us we can kill a fly
That comes in likeness of a coal-black Moor.

Alas, poor man! Grief has so wrought on him
He takes false shadows for true substances.

Come, take away. Lavinia, go with me:
I’ll to thy closet, and go read with thee
Sad stories chancèd in the times of old.
Come, boy, and go with me: thy sight is young,

And thou shalt read when mine begin to dazzle.

Exeunt.

* 74 Titus most likely strikes the fly with the knife at least twice.
* 80 shadows ... substances Proverbial: (ODEP p. 110; Tilley S951)
* 81 take away clear the table
* 82 closet private room
* 85 mine i.e. my eyes
* 85 dazzle blur
Enter Young Lucius and Lavinia running after him, and the Boy flies from her, with his books under his arm.
Enter Titus and Marcus.

YOUNG LUCIUS
Help, grandsire, help! My aunt Lavinia
Follows me everywhere, I know not why.
Good uncle Marcus, see how swift she comes.
Alas, sweet aunt, I know not what you mean.

MARCUS
Stand by me, Lucius: do not fear thy aunt.

TITUS
She loves thee, boy, too well to do thee harm.

YOUNG LUCIUS
Ay, when my father was in Rome she did.

MARCUS
What means my niece Lavinia by these signs?

TITUS
Fear not, Lucius — somewhat doth she mean:
See, Lucius, see how much she makes of thee:
Somewhither would she have thee go with her.
Ah, boy, Cornelia never with more care
Read to her sons than she hath read to thee
Sweet poetry and Tully’s Orator.

Canst thou not guess wherefore she plies thee thus?

YOUNG LUCIUS
My lord, I know not, I, nor can I guess,
Unless some fit or frenzy do possess her, 
For I have heard my grandsire say full oft 
Extremity of griefs\textsuperscript{dcxxx} would make men mad, 

\textbf{20} And I have read that Hecuba of Troy\textsuperscript{*} 
Ran mad through\textsuperscript{dcxxi} sorrow: that made me to fear, 
Although, my lord, I know my noble aunt 
Loves me as dear as e’er my mother did, 
And would not, but in fury\textsuperscript{*}, fright my youth, 

\textbf{25} Which made me down to throw my books and fly, 
Causeless perhaps. But pardon me, sweet aunt: 
And, madam, if my uncle Marcus go, 
I will most willingly attend your ladyship. 

\textbf{MARCUS} 
Lucius, I will.\textsuperscript{dcxxxii} 

\textbf{TITUS} 

\textbf{30} How now, Lavinia?— Marcus, what means this?\textsuperscript{*} 
Some book there is that she desires to see. 
Which is it, girl, of these?— Open them, boy.— 
But\textsuperscript{dcxxii} thou art deeper read\textsuperscript{*}, and better skilled: 
Come, and take choice of all my library, 

\textbf{35} And so beguile thy sorrow till the heavens 
Reveal the damned contriver of this deed. 
What book?\textsuperscript{*}\textsuperscript{dcxxxiii} 
Why lifts she up her arms in sequence\textsuperscript{*} thus? 

\textbf{MARCUS} 
I think she means that there was\textsuperscript{dcxxxiv} more than one 

\textbf{40} Confederate in the fact\textsuperscript{*}. Ay, more there was, 
Or else to heaven she heaves them for\textsuperscript{dcxxxv} revenge. 

\textbf{TITUS} 
Lucius, what book is that she tosseth\textsuperscript{*} so?

\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{20 Hecuba of Troy} After taking her revenge on Polymestor, Hecuba went mad; see n. 1.1.137-39. 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{24 but in fury} except in madness 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{30 Lavinia is probably going through the books that Lucius has let fall at some point in this scene. see t.n.} 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{33 deeper read} i.e. than Young Lucius, a school boy 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{37 What book?} F introduced this line, and some consider that it must be an error caused by an eye skip down to line 42. However, it is not completely out of the question for Shakespeare’s characters to repeat questions or statements. Titus asks again what book she is looking for and she must grab one at some point in the next 5 lines. 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{38 in sequence} one after the other 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{40 fact} crime 
\textsuperscript{*} \textbf{42 tosseth} Lavinia is trying to turn the pages
YOUNG LUCIUS
Grandsire, 'tis Ovid’s *Metamorphosi*:
My mother gave it me.

MARCUS
45 For love of her that’s gone,
Perhaps she culled it from among the rest.

TITUS
Soft, so busily she turns the leaves! Help her
What would she find? Lavinia, shall I read?
This is the tragic tale of Philomel,

50 And treats of Tereus’ treason and his rape —
And rape, I fear, was root of thine annoy.

MARCUS
See, brother, see: note how she quotes the leaves.

TITUS
Lavinia, wert thou thus surprised, sweet girl,
Ravished and wronged as Philomela was,

55 Forced in the ruthless, vast and gloomy woods?
See, see!
Ay, such a place there is, where we did hunt —
O, had we never, never hunted there! —
Patterned by that the poet here describes,

60 By nature made for murders and for rapes.

MARCUS
O, why should nature build so foul a den,
Unless the gods delight in tragedies?

TITUS
Give signs, sweet girl — for here are none but friends —
What Roman lord it was durst do the deed.

65 Or slunk not Saturnine, as Tarquin erst,

* 47 Help her Dyce suggested that it was meant to be a stage direction, but this need not be the case.
* 49-50 Philomel ... Tereus see n. l. 2.3.43
* 52 annoy injury
* 52 quotes scans
* 55 vast waste, desolate
* 55 ruthless ... woods compare this description to Aaron’s at 2.1.135
* 59 Patterned by on the pattern of
* 59 poet ... describes i.e. the place in *Metamorphoses* where Philomela is raped is “deep hidden in the ancient woods” (vi., 520). However the further descriptions given by Titus of the woods as “ruthless, vast and gloomy” is not offered by Ovid or Golding at any point.
* 65 Tarquin seen. l. 2.1.115
That left the camp to sin in Lucrece’ bed?
MARCUS
Sit down, sweet niece: brother, sit down by me. 
Apollo, Pallas, Jove or Mercury*
Inspire me, that I may this treason find.

My lord, look here: look here, Lavinia.

He writes his name with his staff, and guides it with feet and mouth 
This sandy plot is plain*: guide, if thou canst,
This after me*. I here have writ my name*
Without the help of any hand at all.
Cursed be that heart that forced us to that shift*.
Write thou, good niece, and here display at last
What God will have discovered for revenge*.
Heaven guide thy pen to print thy sorrows plain,
That we may know the traitors and the truth!

She takes the staff in her mouth, and guides it with her stumps, and writes.

O, do ye read, my lord, what she hath writ?
"Stuprum*, Chiron, Demetrius."*

---

* 65 erst once
* 68 Apollo ... Mercury Greco-Roman deities. Apollo, the god of prophesy and oracles; Pallas Athene (or Minerva), the goddess of wisdom, law and order; Jove (or Jupiter), the supreme father of the gods, with the punishment of crime; and Mercury, the messenger-god or agent of Jove.
* 71 plain flat
* 72 after me as I do
* 72 This ... name this line as it appears in Qq and F is irregular, so editors have usually emended the line by adding one word to it. I follow Walker here by adding “here.” see t.n. for other editors’ emendations. Waith’s suggestions that a pause can occur after “me” and create the missing syllable, a suggestion he also makes for the short line at 4.2.136.
* 74 shift stratagem, the way she must now write for lack of hands
* 76 What ... revenge what god wished for us to find out so that we can have revenge
* 80 Stuprum rape
* 79-80 Q3 first assigns these lines to Titus, to correct Q1’s obvious mistake in assigning them to Marcus and then repeating the SP at l. 81. While l. 80 is perfectly fine in Titus’s hands, the use of “my lord” in reference to Marcus is troublesome, as Titus does not address Marcus in this way throughout the play (Maxwell, Waith). Maxwell, and most eds. since, leave l. 79 to Marcus, and only giving l. 80 to Titus. Capell removes Titus and
MARCUS
What, what? The lustful sons of Tamora
Performers of this heinous, bloody deed?

TITUS
Magni\(^{dc\text{lii}}\) dominator poli,
Tam lentus audis scelera, tam lentus vides?*

MARCUS
85 O, calm thee, gentle lord, although I know
There is enough written upon this earth
To stir a mutiny in the mildest thoughts
And arm the minds of infants to exclaims*. My lord, kneel down with me: Lavinia, kneel:
And kneel, sweet boy, the Roman Hector’s hope*\(^{dc\text{lix}}\) \(^{dc\text{lix}}\),
And swear with me — as, with the woeful fere*
And father of that chaste dishonored dame,
Lord Junius Brutus* swore\(^{dc\text{xii}}\) for Lucrece’ rape —
That we will prosecute by good advice*

MARCUS
90 Mortal revenge upon these traitorous Goths,
And see their blood, or die with this reproach* \(^{dc\text{xii}}\).

TITUS
’Tis sure enough, an you knew how.
But if you hunt these bear-whelps, then beware:
The dam will wake, and, if\(^{dc\text{liii}}\) she wind* you\(^{dc\text{liv}}\) once\(^{dc\text{lvi}}\)
She’s with the lion deeply still* in league,
And lulls him whilst she playeth on her back,
And when he sleeps will she do what she list*.
You are a young huntsman, Marcus: let it\(^{dc\text{lvii}}\) alone,

Marcus completely and assigns ll.79-80 to Young Lucius. Marcus’s response at l. 81 does not make sense if he speaks ll.79-80.

* 83-84 Magni ... vides? “Ruler of the great heavens, are you so slow to hear crimes, and so slow to see?” (Latin); see Seneca’s Hippolytus, 671-2. Earlier, at 2.1.142, Demetrius announced the intended rape of Lavinia by quoting from Hippolytus as well.

* 88 exclaims outcries
* 90 Roman Hector’s hope Lucius is his only hope, his champion, just as Hector was the champion of Troy.
* 91 fere husband
* 93 Junius Brutus led the rebellion which drove the Tarquins out of Rome, after Lucrece’s rape.
* 94 by good advice with a careful plan
* 96 reproach dishonor
* 99 wind smells
* 100 still always
* 102 list wishes, likes
And come I will go get a leaf of brass
And with a gad of steel will write these words,
And lay it by. The angry northern wind
Will blow these sands, like Sibyl’s leaves abroad,
And where’s your lesson, then? Boy, what say you?

YOUNG LUCIUS
I say, my lord, that if I were a man,
Their mother’s bedchamber should not be safe
For these bad bondmen to the yoke of Rome.

MARCUS
Ay, that’s my boy. Thy father hath full oft
For his ungrateful country done the like.

YOUNG LUCIUS
And, uncle, so will I, an if I live.

TITUS
Come, go with me into mine armory:
Lucius, I’ll fit thee, and withal my boy
Shall carry from me to the empress’ sons
Presents that I intend to send them both.
Come, come, thou’lt do thy message, wilt thou not?

YOUNG LUCIUS

Ay, with my dagger in their bosoms, grandsire.

TITUS
No, boy, not so: I’ll teach thee another course.
Lavinia, come: Marcus, look to my house:
Lucius and I’ll go brave it at the court.
Ay, marry, will we, sir, and we’ll be waited on.

Exeunt. [Marcus remains]

MARCUS
O heavens, can you hear a good man groan,
And not relent or not compassion him?
Marcus, attend him in his ecstasy
That hath more scars of sorrow in his heart

* 104 leaf sheet (for engraving)
* 105 gad sharp pointed spike
* 107 Sibyl's leaves Sibyl was said to write prophecies on leaves that sometimes blew away before they could be read (see Virgil VI. 74-5).
* 116 fit thee furnish you with all you need
* 116 withal furthermore
* 123 brave it defiantly swagger, show ourselves. Compare to “court it,” at 2.1.95
* 124 marry indeed (originally an oath on the Virgin Mary)
* 124 waited on heeded, served
* 126 compassion have compassion for
* 127 ecstasy fit of madness
Than foemen's marks upon his battered shield,
But yet so just that he will not revenge.
Revenge, the heavens*, for old Andronicus!

* 131 Revenge, the heavens may the heavens take revenge.
Enter Aaron, Chiron and Demetrius at one door, and at another door Young Lucius and another [Attendant], with a bundle of weapons and verses writ upon them

CHIRON
Demetrius, here’s the son of Lucius:
He hath some message to deliver us.

AARON
Ay, some mad message from his mad grandfather.

YOUNG LUCIUS
My lords, with all the humbleness I may,
And pray the Roman gods confound* you both.

[Aside]

DEMETRIUS
Gramercy*, lovely Lucius. What’s the news?

[Young Lucius]

[That you are both deciphered*, that’s the news,] For villains marked with rape. — May it please you,

My grandsire, well advised*, hath sent by me
The goodliest weapons of his armory
To gratify* your honorable youth,
The hope of Rome, for so he bade me say,
And so I do, and with his gifts present
Your lordships, that, whenever you have need,
You may be armèd and appointed* well.
And so I leave you both— like bloody villains.

[Exeunt Young Lucius and Attendant]

DEMETRIUS
What’s here? A scroll, and written round about?
Let’s see:

“Integer vitae, scelerisque purus,”

* [4.2] The location is in the emperor’s palace.
* 0.2 another [Attendant] Eds. since Capell agree that “another” must refer to an attendant who is carrying the weapons and not one of Titus’s kinsmen, since Lucius is the only spokesman.
* 6 confound destroy
* 7 Gramercy thanks; a corruption of the French grand merci (many thanks)
* 8 deciphered detected; i.e. as the rapists of Lavinia
* 10 well advised upon reflection (suggesting he is in his right mind); Dover Wilson suggests this is to contradict Aaron’s “mad grandfather” at l. 3.
* 12 gratify show gratitude to
* 16 appointed equipped
Non eget Mauri Jaculis, nec arcu.

CHIRON
O, 'tis a verse in Horace, I know it well:
I read it in the grammar long ago.

AARON
Ay, just a verse in Horace, right, you have it.—

Now, what a thing it is to be an ass!

[Aside]

Here’s no sound jest! The old man hath found their guilt,
And sends them weapons wrapped about with lines
That wound beyond their feeling to the quick.
But were our witty empress well afoot

She would applaud Andronicus’ conceit:
But let her rest in her unrest awhile.—
And now, young lords, was’t not a happy star
Led us to Rome, strangers, and more than so,
Captives, to be advanced to this height?

It did me good before the palace gate
To brave the tribune in his brother’s hearing.

DEMETRIUS
But me more good to see so great a lord
Basely insinuate and send us gifts.

AARON
Had he not reason, Lord Demetrius?

Did you not use his daughter very friendly?

DEMETRIUS
I would we had a thousand Roman dames
At such a bay, by turn to serve our lust.

* 20-21 “Integer ... arcu” (Latin) “The man of upright life and free from crime does not need the javelins or bows of the Moor” (Horace, Odes, 1.22.1-2); “Mauris iaculus” in modern editions of Horace, but “Mauri” in Lily’s Brevissima Institutio (H6), the grammar referred to at 1. 23, which Shakespeare surely knew (J. W. Binns. Shakespeare Survey 35 (1982) 119-128).

* 24 just precisely

* 26 no sound jest no laughing matter, possibly ironical (Maxwell, Waith)

* 28 beyond ... feeling they do not feel the injury; i.e. Chiron and Demetrius have missed the point of the lines.

* 29 witty quick-witted

* 29 afoot up and about. Tamora is pregnant and about to give birth.

* 30 conceit device, idea

* 31 rest ... unrest compare to Kyd, 3.8.29 “Thus therefore will I rest me in unrest” (Hughes)

* 36 brave insult; referring to an event that occurred off stage before this scene.

* 38 insinuate look for favor, ingrati ate himself
CHIRON
A charitable wish and full of love.

AARON
Here lacks but your\textsuperscript{deci} mother for to say “Amen.”

CHIRON
And that would she for twenty thousand more\textsuperscript{*}.

DEMETRIUS
Come, let us go; and pray to all the gods
For our belovèd mother in her pains\textsuperscript{*}\textsuperscript{dcci}.

AARON\textsuperscript{[Aside]*}\textsuperscript{dceiii}
Pray to the devils: the gods have given us over.

Flourish.\textsuperscript{dceiv}

DEMETRIUS
Why do the emperor’s trumpets flourish thus?

CHIRON
Belike\textsuperscript{*} for joy the emperor hath a son.

DEMETRIUS
Soft, who comes here?

Enter Nurse with a blackamoor child.\textsuperscript{dcev}

NURSE
Good\textsuperscript{dcevi} morrow, lords.
O, tell me, did you see Aaron the Moor\textsuperscript{*}\textsuperscript{dcevii}?

AARON\textsuperscript{dceviii}
Well, more\textsuperscript{*} or less, or ne’er a whit at all:

Here Aaron is, and what with Aaron now?

NURSE\textsuperscript{dceix}

---

\textsuperscript{*} 42 At ... bay so brought to bay (i.e. that we could hunt with baying, recalling to the hunting metaphors from 2.1)
\textsuperscript{*} 45 more i.e. more Roman Dames
\textsuperscript{*} 47 in her pains in labor
\textsuperscript{*} 48 SD /Aside/ Maxwell suggests that Aaron may speak directly to Chiron and Demetrius, but I agree with Johnson that the aside is more likely. As Waith suggests, Aaron has a tendency of “mocking the Empress’s sons.” In addition, Aaron does not inform them that he has figured out that they have been found out and thus the gods have “given over” or abandoned them; as dense as the boys are, such a claim would likely have caused at least a question from them.
\textsuperscript{*} 50 Belike It is likely
\textsuperscript{*} 54 more Aaron’s pun on “Moore”; Hughes suggests less convincingly that “whit” is a pun on white.
O gentle Aaron, we are all undone.
Now help, or woe betide thee evermore!

AARON
Why, what a caterwauling dost thou keep!
What dost thou wrap and fumble in thine arms?

NURSE
O, that which I would hide from heaven’s eye,
Our empress’ shame and stately Rome’s disgrace!
She is delivered, lords, she is delivered.

AARON
To whom?
NURSE
I mean, she is brought abed.

AARON
Well, God give her good rest! What hath he sent her?

NURSE
A devil.

AARON
Why, then she is the devil’s dam: a joyful issue.

NURSE
A joyless, dismal, black, and sorrowful issue:
Here is the babe, as loathsome as a toad:

AARON
Amongst the fair-faced breeders of our clime.
The empress sends it thee, thy stamp, thy seal,
And bids thee christen it with thy dagger’s point.

AARON
Out, you whore! Is black so base a hue?—
Sweet blowse, you are a beauteous blossom, sure.

DEMETRIUS
Villain, what hast thou done?

AARON
That which thou canst not undo.

* 64 abed she has given birth
* 67 issue outcome
* 68 issue offspring
* 69 loathsome as a toad Proverbial: (Tilley, T361)
* 70 fair-faced Wilson’s emendation is based on the OED interpretation of Q1’s “fairefast,” though this is the only instance of this spelling. As Waith notes, Q3 and F’s “fairest” makes less sense here (see t.n.).
* 73 Out, you replaces Qq’s “Zounds ye” in an apparent emendation related to censorship.
* 74 blowse red-faced wench or beggar wench. Using the term towards his son must be meant to be ironic.
CHIRON
Thou hast undone our mother.

[AARON]

[Villain, I have done* thy mother.] decxviii

DEMETRIUS
And therein, hellish dog, thou hast undone. dccxix

80 Woe to her chance*, and damned her loathed choice,
Accursed the offspring of so foul a fiend. dccxx

CHIRON
It shall not live.

AARON
It shall not die.

NURSE
Aaron, it must: the mother wills it so.

AARON
85 What, must it, nurse? Then let no man but I
Do execution on my flesh and blood.

DEMETRIUS
I'll broach* the tadpole on my rapier’s point.
Nurse, give it me: my sword shall soon dispatch it.

AARON*
Sooner this sword shall plough thy bowels up. dccxi

90 Stay, murderous villains!* decxii Will you kill your brother?
Now, by the burning tapers of the sky,
That shone so brightly when this boy was got*,
He dies upon my scimitar*’s sharp point
That touches this my first-born son and heir.

95 I tell you, younglings, not Enceladus*
With all his threatening band of Typhon*’s brood,
Nor great Alcides* dccxiii, nor the god of war,

* 78 done had sexual intercourse with; a play on “undone” l. 77
* 80 chance luck
* 87 broach impale
* 89 Most likely, as Waith suggests Aaron grabs the child before beginning the following lines; also, most editors have Aaron draw his sword at this point, but Hughes points out that it “could be effective if he cowed the Goths without having to draw.” (see t.n. for alternatives)
* 92 got begotten
* 93 scimitar a saber with a curved blade, usually associated with the Arabs and Turks.
* 95 Enceladus One of the giants who followed Typhon into battle against the Olympians.
* 96 Typhon a giant, hundred-headed monster; the father of monsters. He led the war against the Olympians.
Shall seize this prey out of his father’s hands.

What, what, ye sanguine\(^\text{99}\), shallow-hearted\(^\text{99}\) boys\(^\text{dcxxiv}\)

Ye white-limed\(^\text{100}\) walls, ye ale-house painted signs\(^*\)!

Coal-black is better than another hue

In that it scorns to bear another hue\(^*\),

For all the water in the ocean\(^*\)

Can never turn the swan’s black legs to white,

Although she lave\(^*\) them hourly in the flood\(^*\).

Tell the empress from me, I am of age

To keep mine own, excuse it how she can.

DEMETRIUS

Wilt thou betray thy noble mistress thus?

AARON

My mistress is my mistress, this myself,

The vigor\(^\text{110}\) and the picture of my youth:

This before all the world do I prefer,

This maugre\(^*\) all the world will I keep safe,

Or some of you shall smoke\(^*\) for it in Rome.

DEMETRIUS

By this our mother is forever\(^\text{114}\) shamed.

CHIRON

Rome will despise her for this foul escape\(^*\).

NURSE

\(^*\) 97 Alcides Hercules (i.e. grandson of Acaeus); he helped to defeat the giants.

\(^*\) 99 sanguine red-faced (i.e. blushing)

\(^*\) 99 shallow-hearted cowardly

\(^*\) 100 white-limed white washed; possibly alluding to Matthew 23:27, “whited sepulchres” i.e. hypocrites. Wilson also points to Piers Plowman in which hypocrisy is referred to as “a wal whit-lymed.”

\(^*\) 100 ale-house painted signs “i.e. crude representations of men” (Waith)

\(^*\) 101-102 Coal-black ... another hue Proverbial: (ODEP, p. 65; Tilley B436)

\(^*\) 103 ocean pronounced as trisyllabic here.

\(^*\) 105 lave wash

\(^*\) 103-105 For ... flood Proverbial: compare to “To wash an Ethiop white” (ODEP, p. 868; Tilley E186) (Waith).

\(^*\) 110 vigor figure according to Wells and Waith’s arguments that “vigor” was a Middle English variant of figure; only Wells emends to “figure” in his text; R. V. Holdsworth argues successfully that “vigour” as a spelling for “figure” is not used after the 14th century, and the echo in Marston’s Antonio’s Revenge “vigor of my youth” (1600, 3.1.44) clearly means “vigour” as the Ghost “urges revenge” (Holdsworth 44-45).

\(^*\) 112 maugre in spite of

\(^*\) 114 smoke suffer (like one burned at the stake) Waith

\(^*\) 115 escape escapade
The emperor, in his rage, will doom her death.

CHIRON
I blush to think upon this ignominy\textsuperscript{dcxxviii}.

AARON
Why, there’s the privilege your beauty bears:
Fie, treacherous hue, that will betray with blushing

120 The close enacts and counsels of the heart\textsuperscript{dcxxix}.
Here’s a young lad framed of another leer\textsuperscript{*}:
Look how the black slave smiles upon the father,
As who should say “Old lad, I am thine own.”
He is your brother, lords, sensibly fed

125 Of\textsuperscript{*} that self-blood\textsuperscript{*} that first gave life to you,
And from that\textsuperscript{dcxxx} womb where you imprisoned were
He is enfranchised and come to light.
Nay, he is your brother by the surer side\textsuperscript{*},
Although my seal be stampèd in his face\textsuperscript{*}.

NURSE
Aaron, what shall I say unto the empress?

DEMETRIUS
Advise thee, Aaron, what is to be done,
And we will all subscribe\textsuperscript{*} to thy advice.
Save thou the child, so we may all be safe.

AARON
Then sit we down, and let us all consult.

130 My son and I will have the wind of you\textsuperscript{*}.
Keep there: now talk at pleasure of your safety.\textsuperscript{dcxxxi}

DEMETRIUS

\textsuperscript{*} 118-20 privilege ... heart i.e. your light skin has the privilege of blushing and therefore betraying the your “close enacts” or secret purposes of your heart (ironic).

\textsuperscript{*} 121 leer complexion

\textsuperscript{*} 124-5 sensibly fed/ Of noticeably bred from (Hughes); or possibly made capable of sensation by (Waith).

\textsuperscript{*} 125 self-blood same blood

\textsuperscript{*} 128 he is ... surer side Proverbial: you can be sure he is your brother, because you can always be sure of the mother (and not the father) (ODEP, p. 546; Tilley M1205).

\textsuperscript{*} 129 my ... face i.e. his color proves that I am the father

\textsuperscript{*} 132 subscribe assent

\textsuperscript{*} 135 have wind of you be a safe distance from you so that we may see you should you make a move; Waith and others refer to the hunting image that indicates a hunter sitting downwind of his prey to avoid being detected, however the reverse is true here. Aaron and the son are the possible prey, and if the prey is downwind of the hunter it can “smell him out” before he is attacked.

\textsuperscript{*} 136 the characters most likely sit at this point (see t.n.)
How many women saw this child of his?

AARON

Why, so, brave lords, when we join in league
I am a lamb: but if you brave the Moor,

140

The chafèd boar, the mountain lioness,
The ocean swells not as Aaron storms.—
But say again, how many saw the child?

NURSE

Cornelia the midwife, * and myself,
And none else but the delivered empress.

AARON

145

The empress, the midwife, and yourself:
Two may keep counsel when the third's away.
Go to the empress, tell her this I said.

Weke, weke! So cries a pig preparèd to th'spit.

DEMETRIUS

What mean'st thou, Aaron? Wherefore didst thou this?

AARON

150

O Lord, sir, 'tis a deed of policy:
Shall she live to betray this guilt of ours,
A long-tongued babbling gossip? No, lords, no:
And now be it known to you my full intent.
Not far, one Muly lives, my countryman:

155

His wife but yesternight was brought to bed:
His child is like to her, fair as you are.
Go pack with him, and give the mother gold,
And tell them both the circumstance of all,
And how by this their child shall be advanced,

160

And be receivèd for the emperor's heir,
And substituted in the place of mine,
To calm this tempest whirling in the court,
And let the emperor dandle him for his own.

---

* 140 chafèd enraged
* 143 Cornelia the midwife, I follow Qq’s punctuation here which indicates that Cornelia is the midwife; F’s “Cornelia, the midwife,” indicates two separate people. Aaron indicates that only one more murder need occur to assure the safety of their secret at ll. 169-70.
* 146 Two away Proverbial: (ODEP, p. 417; Tilley T642.1)
* 154 Muly lives “Muly” was a common Moorish name in Elizabethan literature and this emendation from Qq and F’s “Muliteus” was first suggested by Steevens. Maxwell has suggested however, that while this makes sense, the classical Muliteus is not completely out of place.
* 157 pack conspire
Hark ye, lords, ye see I have given her physic.
165 And you must needs bestow* her funeral:
The fields are near and you are gallant grooms*.
This done, see that you take no longer days,
But send the midwife presently* to me.
The midwife and the nurse well made away,
170 Then let the ladies tattle what they please.

CHIRON
Aaron, I see thou wilt not trust the air
With secrets.
DEMETRIUS
For this care of Tamora,
Herself and hers are highly bound to thee.

AARON
175 Now to the Goths, as swift as swallow flies,
There to dispose this treasure in mine arms,
And secretly to greet the empress’ friends.
Come on, you thick-lipped slave, I’ll bear you hence,
For it is you that puts us to our shifts*:
180 I’ll make you feed on berries and on roots,
And feed on curds and whey, and suck the goat,
And cabin* in a cave, and bring you up
To be a warrior and command a camp.  

Exeunt [Demetrius and Chiron with the body]
Enter Titus, Old Marcus, Young Lucius and other Gentlemen [Publius, Sempronius, Caius] with bows and Titus bears the arrows with letters on the ends of them.

TITUS
Come, Marcus, come, kinsmen: this is the way. Sir Boy, let me see your archery. Look ye draw home enough, and 'tis there straight. *Terras Astraea reliquit: be you remembered*,

5 Marcus, she’s gone, she’s fled.— Sirs, take you to your tools. You, cousins, shall go sound the ocean, And cast your nets:
Haply you may find her in the sea. Yet there’s as little justice as at land.

10 No, Publius and Sempronius, you must do it, 'Tis you must dig with mattock and with spade, And pierce the inmost center of the earth. Then, when you come to Pluto’s region,
I pray you deliver him this petition.

15 Tell him, it is for justice and for aid, And that it comes from old Andronicus, Shaken with sorrows in ungrateful Rome.— Ah, Rome! Well, well, I made thee miserable What time I threw the people’s suffrages

20 On him that thus doth tyrannize o’er me.— Go, get you gone, and pray be careful all, And leave you not a man-of-war unsearched: This wicked emperor may have shipped her hence, And, kinsmen, then we may go pipe for justice.

* [4.3] location is a public place near the palace.
* 3 draw home draw your bows to their fullest extent (i.e. for maximum power)
* 4 *Terras Astraea reliquit* Astraæa (the goddess of justice) has left the earth (Latin) Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, i. 150.
* 4 be you remembered remember
* 8 Haply perhaps
* 4-8 These lines in Qq, F offer no clear possibility for regular blank verse. Eds. have differed greatly in their attempts to create the closest possible thing. I have followed the RSC’s approach. See the t.n. for a complete listing of the numerous forms these lines have taken.
* 9 there’s (in the sea) there is
* 13 Pluto’s reign i.e. the Underworld, which was ruled by the god Pluto
* 19 What time i.e. when
MARCUS [Aside]*dcclxiii

25 O Publius, is not this a heavy case,
To see thy noble uncle* thus*dcclxiv* distract*?
PUBLIUS [Aside to others?]dcclxv
Therefore, my lords, it highly us concerns
By day*dcclxvii* and night t’attend him carefully
And feed his humor* kindly as we may,

30 Till time beget some careful remedy.

MARCUS [Aside]*dcclxix
Kinsmen, his sorrows are past remedy.
Join with the Goths and with revengeful war
Take wreak* on Rome for this ingratitude,
And vengeance on the traitor Saturnine.

TITUS

35 Publius, how now? How now, my masters?
What, have you met with her*?*
PUBLIUS
No, my good lord, but Pluto sends you word
If you will have Revenge from hell, you shall.
Marry, for Justice, she is so employed,
He thinks, with Jove in heaven or somewhere else,
So that perforce you must needs stay a time.

TITUS
He doth me wrong to feed me with delays.
I'll dive into the burning lake below
And pull her out of Acheron* by the heels.

* 24 pipe whistle (i.e. look in vain)
* 25 SD [Aside] this discussion, ll. 25-34, must happen out of Titus’s hearing or as he is distracted or walks aside
* 26 uncle this could suggest that Publius is Marcus’s son (Hughes), though I do find it strange that this relationship is never mentioned elsewhere.
* 26 distract distraught, mad
* 29 feed his humor humor him, play along
* 30 careful showing care or concern (Witherspoon, Waith); or costing trouble, laborious (Wilson, Riverside)
* 33 wreak revenge
* 36 her i.e. Astraea
* 35-6 Titus is somehow convinced that the others have already left and returned. Depending on the nature of his “distraction” during the previous lines (see l.25n above), this can either be played as pure “madness” or as a hint that Titus has been unaware of their presence over the last 9 lines.
* 43-44 burning lake ... Acheron Phlegethon and Pyriphlegethon are the burning rivers of the Underworld. Shakespeare uses Acheron (a non burning river of the Underworld),
Marcus, we are but shrubs, no cedars we*,
No big-boned men framed of the Cyclops’ size*,
But metal, Marcus, steel to the very back*,
Yet wrung with wrongs more than our backs can bear.
And sith* there’s no justice in earth nor hell,
We will solicit heaven and move the gods
To send down Justice for to wreak our wrongs. declxxiv
Come, to this gear*. You are a good archer, Marcus:

“He gives them the arrows.”

“Ad Jovem,” that’s for you; here, “Ad Apollinem*;
“Ad Martem”*, that’s for myself:

Here, boy, “to Pallas”; here, “to Mercury”:
“To Saturn,” Caius, not to Saturnine.
You were as good to shoot against the wind.
To it, boy! Marcus, loose when I bid.
Of* my word, I have written to effect:

There’s not a god left unsolicited.

MARCUS [Aside to others]
Kinsmen, shoot all your shafts into the court:
We will afflict the emperor in his pride.

TITUS
Now, masters, draw.

O, well said*, Lucius.

Good boy, in Virgo’s* lap! Give it Pallas*.

and seems to make a typical Renaissance mistake of referring to the multiple rivers of Hades as a single burning lake. (see Milton, Paradise Lost 1, 210, where he refers to Satan “chained on the burning lake” of Hell)
* 45 shrubs ... we the opposite is proverbial: “High cedars fall when low shrubs remain” (Tilley C208; ODEP, p. 112;
* 46 Cyclops’ size i.e. giant; the Cyclops was a mythical one-eyed giant; see Odyssey, ix
* 47 steel ... back Proverbial: (ODEP, p. 773; Tilley S842)
* 49 sith since
* 52 to this gear about this business
* 53-54 “Ad Jovem” ... “Ad Apollinem” ... “Ad Martem” To Jove ...To Apollo ... To Mars (Latin); see l. 4.1.68n
* 57 were as good to might as well (as appeal to Saturninus)
* 58 loose release the bowstrings (i.e. shoot)
* 59 Of on
* 63 The actors would shoot their arrows here. Hughes suggests that on the Elizabethan stage the arrows were “shot right out of the yard, to the peril of passersby.” However, I’m not sure we should believe that such carelessness was in play.
* 64 said done
* 65 Virgo the constellation of the Virgin i.e. Astraea
MARCUS
My lord, I aim\textsuperscript{dcclxxxi} a mile beyond the moon:
Your letter is with Jupiter\textsuperscript{dcclxxii} by this.

TITUS
Ha, ha!\textsuperscript{dcclxxxiii}
Publius, Publius, what hast thou done?\textsuperscript{9dcclxxxiv}

70 See, see, thou hast shot off one of Taurus\textsuperscript{*} horns.
MARCUS
This was the sport, my lord: when Publius shot,
The bull, being galled, gave Aries\textsuperscript{*} such a knock
That down fell both the ram’s horns in the court,
And who should find them but the empress' villain\textsuperscript{*}!

75 She laughed and told the Moor he should not choose
But give them to his master for a present.
TITUS
Why, there it goes: God give his\textsuperscript{dcclxxxv} lordship joy!

Enter the Clown\textsuperscript{*} with a basket and two pigeons in it.

News\textsuperscript{dcclxxxvi}, news from heaven! Marcus, the post is come.—\textsuperscript{dcclxxxvii}
Sirrah,\textsuperscript{dcclxxxviii} what tidings? Have you any letters?

80 Shall I have justice? What says Jupiter?
CLOWN
Ho, the gibbet-maker!\textsuperscript{*dcclxxxix} He says that he hath taken them\textsuperscript{*} down again, for the
man must not be hanged till the next week.
TITUS
But what says Jupiter, I ask thee?
CLOWN
Alas, sir, I know not Jupiter\textsuperscript{*dcxxc}. I never drank with him in all my life.\textsuperscript{dcxxci}
TITUS
85 Why, villain, art not thou\textsuperscript{dcxxcii} the carrier\textsuperscript{*}?

\textsuperscript{* 65 Pallas} Athene, a goddess also associated with virginity
\textsuperscript{* 70 Taurus} constellation of the Bull
\textsuperscript{* 72 Aries} constellation of the Ram
\textsuperscript{* 74 villain} servant, but with a play on the modern meaning; i.e. Aaron
\textsuperscript{* 77 SD Clown} the word was used to mean both a rustic and the actor who played low-comedic parts (Waith)
\textsuperscript{* 81 gibbet-maker} the Clown is apparently not familiar with Jupiter. On first hearing the
name, he seems to mistake it for “Gibbeter” and later “Jubiter” (l. 84). A gibbet was
synonymous with gallows.
\textsuperscript{* 81 them} the gallows
\textsuperscript{* 84 Jubiter} The Clown is still trying to make sense of this “new” name and
mispronounces Jupiter here.
CLOWN
Ay, of my pigeons, sir, nothing else.

TITUS
Why*, didst thou not come from heaven?

CLOWN
From heaven? Alas, sir, I never came there: God forbid I should be so bold to press to heaven in my young days. Why, I am going with my pigeons to the tribunal plebs* to take up a matter of brawl betwixt my uncle and one of the imperial’s men.

MARCUS
Why, sir, that is as fit as can be to serve for your oration*, and let him deliver the pigeons to the emperor from you.

TITUS
Tell me, can you deliver an oration to the emperor with a grace?

CLOWN
Nay, truly, sir, I could never say grace in all my life.

TITUS
Sirrah, come hither: make no more ado, But give your pigeons to the emperor.
By me thou shalt have justice at his hands.
Hold, hold — meanwhile here’s money for thy charges.

Sirrah, can you with a grace deliver a supplication? Then here is a supplication for you, and when you come to him, at the first approach you must kneel, then kiss his foot, then deliver up your pigeons, and

---

* 85 carrier messenger, postman
* 87 Why What
* 90 tribunal plebs a mispronunciation of tribuni plebis, the protectors of the citizens. He is planning on using the pigeons as a bribe (Hughes).
* 90 take up consider, settle
* 92 oration petition
* 92-102 These lines may be indicative of a “second thought.” Bate argues ll. 92-95 “are detachable, whereas [96-102] flow forward into the subsequent writing business” (Bate 102). Wilson argues that this keeps Marcus from being the one who comes up with the idea to send the clown to his death, “since a suggestion by Marcus thus becomes a sudden idea of Titus” (143). Wells and Taylor add that “Marcus nowhere else speaks prose, and that the Clown’s replies to the repeated question are contradictory” (212). Bate offers the “alternative” possibility that “there shouldn’t be a cut at all. The Clown takes some persuading” (102-103), as the scene is full of contradictory and sometime absurd speeches that could represent Titus’s apparent growing madness and to the Clown’s foolish and unlearned nature.
then look for your reward. I’ll be at hand, sir: see you do it bravely.

CLOWN

I warrant you, sir, let me alone.

TITUS

Sirrah, hast thou a knife? Come, let me see it.—

Here, Marcus, fold it in the oration—

For thou must take it like an humble suppliant.

And when thou hast given it the emperor,

Knock at my door, and tell me what he says.

CLOWN

God be with you, sir. I will.

TITUS

Come, Marcus, let us go.— Publius, follow me.

Exit.

Come, Marcus, let us go.— Publius, follow me.

Exeunt.

* 109 For ... suppliant the line’s meaning is obscure. “thou” could be directed at Marcus, but is most likely the clown (Titus’s usually uses “you” to address Marcus); “it” may refer to the knife or the oration; Waith and others suggest the confusion may be caused here by an incomplete revision that originated in Q.
Enter Emperor and Empress and her two sons [and Attendants]. The Emperor brings the arrows in his hand that Titus shot at him.

SATURNINUS
Why, lords, what wrongs are these? Was ever seen an emperor in Rome thus overborne,
Troubled, confronted thus, and for the extent of equal justice, used in such contempt?
My lords, you know, as know the mighty gods,
However these disturbers of our peace Buzz in the people’s ears, there nought hath passed
But even with law against the willful sons
Of old Andronicus. And what an if
His sorrows have so overwhelmed his wits,
Shall we be thus afflicted in his wreaks,
His fits, his frenzy, and his bitterness?
And now he writes to heaven for his redress.
See, here’s “To Jove,” and this “To Mercury,”
This “To Apollo,” this “To the god of war”:
Sweet scrolls to fly about the streets of Rome!
What’s this but libeling against the senate
And blazoning our injustice everywhere?
A goodly humor, is it not, my lords?
As who would say, in Rome no justice were.
But if I live, his feignèd ecstasies
Shall be no shelter to these outrages,
But he and his shall know that justice lives
In Saturninus’s health, whom, if she sleep,
He’ll so awake as she in fury shall
Cut off the proud’st conspirator that lives.

TAMORA
My gracious lord, my lovely Saturnine,
Lord of my life, commander of my thoughts,
Calm thee and bear the faults of Titus’s age,
Th’effects of sorrow for his valiant sons
Whose loss hath pierced him deep and scarred his heart;
And rather comfort his distressèd plight
Than prosecute the meanest or the best∗
For these contempts.— Why, thus it shall become
Aside
High-witted Tamora to gloze withal.
But, Titus, I have touched thee to the quick,
Thy life-blood out if Aaron now be wise,
Then is all safe, the anchor’s in the port.—

Enter Clown

How now, good fellow, wouldst thou speak with us?

CLOWN
Yea, forsooth, an your mistership be imperial∗.

TAMORA
Empress I am, but yonder sits the emperor.

CLOWN
’Tis he. God and Saint Stephen give you good e’en. I have brought you a letter and a couple of pigeons here.

He [Saturninus] reads the letter.

SATURNINUS
Go, take him away and hang him presently.

CLOWN
How much money must I have?∗

* 25 He’ll so awake Titus will so arouse
* 25 as she sleeping Justice (conj. Rowe, whose emendations of “he” to “she” are followed here). The other possible meaning is Saturninus, and eds. who read it thus keep “he.” (see t.n.)
* 33 meanest or the best Titus or any of his mean (lower ranked) supporters
* 35 High-witted clever
* 35 gloze use fair words
* 37 Thy life blood out i.e. once you are bleeding, dead
* 40 imperial i.e. the empress; apparently the Clown’s feminine form for “Emperal” (Waith)
* 42 good e’en good evening
TAMORA
Come, sirrah, you must be hanged.

CLOWN
Hanged? By'r lady, then I have brought up a neck to a fair end.

SATURNINUS
Despiteful and intolerable wrongs!
Shall I endure this monstrous villainy?
I know from whence this same device proceeds.
May this be borne as if his trait’rous sons,
That died by law for murder of our brother,
Have by my means been butchered wrongfully?

Go, drag the villain hither by the hair:

Nor age nor honor shall shape privilege.

For this proud mock I’ll be thy slaughterman,
Sly frantic wretch that holp’st to make me great
In hope thyself should govern Rome and me.

Enter [a Messenger,] Emillius

What news with thee, Emillius?

EMILLIUS
Arm my lords! Rome never had more cause:
The Goths have gathered head, and with a power
Of high-resolvèd men bent to the spoil,
They hither march amain, under conduct,
Of Lucius, son to old Andronicus,
Who threats, in course of this revenge, to do
As much as ever Coriolanus did.

SATURNINUS Is warlike Lucius general of the Goths?
These tidings nip me and I hang the head

* 55 shape privilege provide special treatment or exemption (i.e. from his wrath)
* 56 slaughterman executioner
* 57 holp’st helped
* 61 gathered head raised an army
* 61 power force
* 62 bent to the spoil intent upon plunder, destruction
* 63 amain at full force; without delay
* 63 conduct leadership
* 66 Coriolanus Caius Marcius, the hero of Shakespeare’s Coriolanus (1607-8); a Roman general who was banished from Rome, and so lead a rebellion against Rome by forming an army of Rome’s enemies the Volscians.
As flowers with frost or grass beat down with storms.

Ay, now begins our sorrows to approach:
'Tis he the common people love so much.
Myself hath often heard them say,
When I have walked like a private man,
That Lucius's banishment was wrongfully*,

And they have wished that Lucius were their emperor.

TAMORA
Why should you fear? Is not our city strong?

SATURNINUS
Ay, but the citizens favor Lucius,
And will revolt from me to succor him.

TAMORA
King, be thy thoughts imperious, like thy name.

Is the sun dimmed, that gnats do fly in it?
The eagle suffers little birds to sing,
And is not careful* what they mean thereby,
Knowing that with the shadow of his wings
He can at pleasure stint their melody.*

Even so mayst thou the giddy men of Rome.
Then cheer thy spirit, for know thou, emperor,
I will enchant the old Andronicus
With words more sweet and yet more dangerous
Than baits to fish or honey-stalks* to sheep,

When as the one is wounded with the bait,
The other rotted* with delicious food.

SATURNINUS
But he will not entreat his son for us.

TAMORA
If Tamora entreat him, then he will,
For I can smooth* and fill his aged ear
With golden promises that, were his heart
Almost impregnable, his old ears deaf,

* 74 wrongfully i.e. wrongfully done
* 82 is not careful does not care
* 84 stint stop
* 85 giddy foolish
* 89 honey-stalks stalks of clover; clover is notoriously tempting for sheep, but too much of it made them sick or rotted them. "Honeysuckle’ was anciently a name for red clover, and is still in Warickshire” (Onions). The OED notes that Shakespeare is the only author who used the term.
* 91 rotted “Rot” is a liver disease of sheep.
* 94 smooth flatter
Yet should both ear and heart obey my tongue.
Go thou before to be our ambassador:  
Say that the emperor requests a parley

Of warlike Lucius, and appoint the meeting
Even at his father’s house, the old Andronicus.

SATURNINUS
Emillius, do this message honorably:
And if he stand in hostage for his safety,
Bid him demand what pledge will please him best.

EMILLIUS
Your bidding shall I do effectually.  
Exit.

TAMORA
Now will I to that old Andronicus,
And temper him with all the art I have,
To pluck proud Lucius from the warlike Goths.
And now, sweet emperor, be blithe again,

And bury all thy fear in my devices.

SATURNINUS
Then go successantly, and plead him.

Exeunt.

* 103 stand in insist on a
* 107 temper work on, i.e. coax
* 108 pluck pull away; i.e. call back
* 109 blithe happy, carefree
* 111 successantly in succession (Wilson); Capell emended to “incessantly” or immediately, and Waith agrees, noting that incessament in French is used in the same sense. The OED records this as the only occurrence of the word.
Flourish.

Enter Lucius with an army of Goths with Drum and Soldiers.

LUCIUS

Approved warriors and my faithful friends,
I have receivèd letters from great Rome
Which signifiès what hate they bear their emperor,
And how desirous of our sight they are.

Therefore, great lords, be, as your titles witness,
Imperious and impatient of your wrongs,
And wherein Rome hath done you any scathe
Let him make treble satisfaction.

[1] GOTH

Brave slip sprung from the great Andronicus,
Whose name was once our terror, now our comfort,
Whose high exploits and honorable deeds
Ingrateful Rome requites with foul contempt,
Be bold in us. We’ll follow where thou lead’st,
Like stinging bees in hottest summer’s day
Led by their master to the flowered fields,
And be avenged on cursèd Tamora.

[ALL GOTHS]
And as he saith, so say we all with him.

LUCIUS
I humbly thank him, and I thank you all—
But who comes here, led by a lusty* Goth?

*Enter a Goth, leading of Aaron with his child in his arms.*

[2] GOTH*dccclxxvi

Renownèd* dccclxxvii Lucius, from our troops I strayed
To gaze upon a ruinous monastery*,
And as I earnestly* did fix mine eye
Upon the wasted* building, suddenly* dccclxxviii
I heard a child cry underneath a wall.

I made unto the noise, when soon I heard
The crying babe controlled* with this discourse:
“Peace, tawny slave*, half me and half thy dam* dccclxxix!
Did not thy hue bewray* whose brat thou art,
Had nature lent thee but thy mother’s look,
Villain, thou mightst have been an emperor.
But where the bull and cow are both milk-white,
They never do beget a coal-black calf.
Peace, villain, peace!” — even thus he rates* the babe —
“For I must bear thee to a trusty Goth
Who, when he knows thou art the empress’ babe,
Will hold thee dearly for thy mother’s sake.”

With this, my* weapon drawn* dccclxxxi, I rushed upon him,

* 17 SP [ALL GOTHIS] F2’s Omn., suggests a correction to an obvious error in the previous texts, and makes logical sense considering the context.
* 19 lusty vigorous, joyful (Hughes)
* 20 SP [2] GOTH the speaker of these lines must be the Goth who has just entered with Aaron. All future conjectures for lines from the Goths are anyone’s guess (see l. 9 n).
* 21 ruinous monastery as Hughes points out, the “Gothic tourist has been gazing upon an anachronism.”
* 22 earnestly attentively
* 23 wasted ruined
* 26 controlled quieted
* 27 tawny slave black slave; ironically here and throughout the speech (dam, brat, villain), Aaron uses negative/abusive terms to address his son in a playful manner. They should not be taken literally.
* 27 dam mother; the term was usually used for animals, and an insult when spoken of human beings.
* 28 bewray reveal
* 33 rates chides
Surprised him suddenly, and brought him hither
To use as you think needful of the man∗.

LUCIUS

40 O worthy Goth, this is the incarnate devil
That robbed Andronicus of his good hand;
This is the pearl that pleased your empress’ eye,
And here’s the base fruit of his burning lust.—
Say, wall-eyed slave, whither wouldst thou convey

45 This growing image of thy fiend-like face?
Why dost not speak? What, deaf? Not a word?
A halter, soldiers! Hang him on this tree∗,
And by his side his fruit of bastardy.

AARON

Touch not the boy, he is of royal blood.

LUCIUS

50 Too like the sire for ever being good.
First hang the child, that he may see it sprawl∗:
A sight to vex the father’s soul withal.

AARON

Get me a ladder. Lucius, save the child, And bear it from me to the empress.

55 If thou do this, I’ll show thee wondrous things
That highly may advantage thee to hear.
If thou wilt not, befall what may befall,
I’ll speak no more but “Vengeance rot you all!”

LUCIUS

Say on, and if it please me which thou speak’st,

60 Thy child shall live and I will see it nourished∗.

* 39 use ... man to do with him as you see fit
* 44 wall-eyed with fiercely glaring eyes (OED Wall-eyed 2); (see King John 4.3.49 “wall-eyed wrath”). However Lucius could also be using the term derogatorily to refer to the “excessive proportion of the white of the eye” as in horses (OED Wall-eyed a Ia, 1b)
* 47 this tree an actual property tree or an existing column on the stage could serve for the tree.
* 51 sprawl twitch in the agony of death
* 53 Get ... ladder. Most editors emend, assigning this line to Lucius, who has just ordered the hanging. However, the original texts could be correct and simply another example of Aaron’s bravado. A third possibility would be that Aaron is telling Lucius “hurt me and not the child.”
* 53 It is unclear when the ladder is brought on stage and when Aaron climbs it (see t.n.). We do know that he is up on the ladder because Lucius demands that he be brought down (see 5.1.145).
* 60 nourished cared for
AARON
And if it please thee? Why, assure thee, Lucius,
'Twill vex thy soul to hear what I shall speak,
For I must talk of murders, rapes and massacres,
Acts of black night, abominable deeds,
Complots\footnote{Complots} of mischief, treason\footnote{treason}, villainies
Ruthful\footnote{Ruthful} to hear yet piteously\footnote{piteously} performed:
And this shall all be buried by\footnote{my death} my death
Unless thou swear to me my child shall live.

LUCIUS
Tell on\footnote{Tell on} thy mind, I say thy child shall live.\footnote{Tell on}

AARON
Swear that he shall and then I will begin.

LUCIUS
Who should I swear by? Thou believest no god:\footnote{That granted, how canst thou believe an oath?}

AARON
What if I do not? — As indeed I do not —
Yet for I know thou art religious

LUCIUS
Even by my god I swear to\footnote{I will} thee I will.

AARON
First know thou I begot him on the empress.\footnote{First know thou I begot him on the empress}

LUCIUS
O most insatiate, luxurious\footnote{luxurious} woman!

\footnote{Complots} conspiracies
\footnote{Ruthful} lamentable
\footnote{piteously} so as to arouse pity
\footnote{Tell on} speak
\footnote{popish} another typical anachronism
\footnote{bauble} stick carried by a court fool (it usually had a head on it)
\footnote{luxurious} lecherous
AARON
Tut, Lucius, this was but a deed of charity
90 To* that which thou shalt hear of me anon.
'Twas her two sons that murdered Bassianus,
They cut thy sister’s tongue and ravished her
And cut her hands off and trimmed her as thou saw’st.

LUCIUS
O detestable villain! Call’st thou that trimming?

AARON
Why, she was washed and cut and trimmed, and ’twas
Trim sport for them that had the doing of it.

LUCIUS
O barbarous, beastly villains like thyself!

AARON
Indeed, I was their tutor to instruct them.
That coddling spirit had they from their mother,
100 As sure a card as ever won the set**:
That bloody mind, I think, they learned of me,
As true a dog as ever fought at head*. 
Well, let my deeds be witness of my worth.
I trained thy brethren to that guileful hole

LUCIUS
Where the dead corpse of Bassianus lay:
I wrote the letter that thy father found,
And hid the gold within the letter mentioned,
Confederate with the queen and her two sons:
And what not done, that thou hast cause to rue

AARON
I played the cheater for thy father’s hand,
And when I had it, drew myself apart
And almost broke my heart with extreme laughter:
I pried me through the crevice of a wall

* 90 To compared to
* 96 Trim fine; punning on “trimmed” from the line before.
* 99 coddling probably a pun on “cod” or “testicle,” referring to the boys’ lust (this is the only recording of the word used in this sense). The nineteenth century meaning “to hoax” seems very unlikely.
* 100 As ... set Proverbial: (ODEP, p. 789; Tilley C74)
* 100 set game
* 102 As ... head the best fighting bulldogs attacked the bull’s head
* 104 trained lured
* 111 cheater Kittredge offers two possibilities. The first retains our modern sense of a cheat. While the second suggests the possibility of reference to the escheater, or officer responsible for the king’s escheats (estates forfeited to the crown).
When, for his hand, he had his two sons’ heads,
Beheld his tears and laughed so heartily
That both mine eyes were rainy like to his.
And when I told the empress of this sport,
She swoonèd almost at my pleasing tale
And for my tidings gave me twenty kisses.

[1] GOTH
What, canst thou say all this and never blush?
AARON
Ay, like a black dog, as the saying is.*
LUCIUS
Art thou not sorry for these heinous deeds?
AARON
Ay, that I had not done a thousand more.

Even now I curse the day — and yet I think
Few come within the compass of my curse —
Wherein I did not some notorious ill,*
As kill a man or else devise his death,
Ravish a maid or plot the way to do it,

Accuse some innocent and forswear myself,
Set deadly enmity between two friends,
Make poor men’s cattle break their necks,
Set fire on barns and haystacks in the night
And bid the owners quench them with their tears.

Oft have I digged up dead men from their graves
And set them upright at their dear friends’ door,
Even when their sorrows almost was forgot,
And on their skins, as on the bark of trees,
Have with my knife carvèd in Roman letters,

“Let not your sorrow die, though I am dead.”
Tut,* I have done a thousand dreadful things
As willingly as one would kill a fly,
And nothing grieves me heartily indeed
But that I cannot do ten thousand more.

LUCIUS

* 114 pried me spied
* 121-22 blush ... dog Proverbial: “To blush like a black dog” (ODEP, p. 71; Tilley D507)
* 127-40 Aaron’s “list of evils” is notoriously similar to Barabas’s boasting in Marlowe’s The Jew of Malta (2.3.176-202).
* 133 haystacks Maxwell retains Q1’s “haystacks” and argues that it was a dialectal variant, but as Waith points out, this variant is not recorded before 1750.
* 141 Tut, first entered in Q2, is more characteristic of Aaron than Q1’s “But.” In the Peacham MS, “Tut” is used.
Bring down the devil, for he must not die. So sweet a death as hanging presently.

AARON
If there be devils, would I were a devil,
To live and burn in everlasting fire,
So I might have your company in hell,

But to torment you with my bitter tongue.

LUCIUS
Sirs, stop his mouth and let him speak no more.

Enter Emilius.

[A] GOTH
My lord, there is a messenger from Rome
Desires to be admitted to your presence.

LUCIUS
Let him come near.

Welcome, Emilius; what’s the news from Rome?

EMILLIUS
Lord Lucius, and you princes of the Goths,
The Roman emperor greets you all by me,
And for he understands you are in arms,
He craves a parley* at your father’s house,

Willing you to demand your hostages,
And they shall be immediately delivered.

[1] GOTH
What says our general?

LUCIUS
Emilius, let the emperor give his pledges
Unto my father and my uncle Marcus,

And we will come. March away.

* 159 parley a meeting of opposing sides, under the safety of a truce
Enter Tamora and her two sons disguised.

TAMORA
Thus, in this strange and sad habiliment, I will encounter with Andronicus, And say I am Revenge, sent from below To join with him and right his heinous wrongs:

Knock at his study, where they say he keeps*, To ruminate strange plots of dire revenge: Tell him Revenge is come to join with him And work confusion on his enemies.

They knock and Titus opens his study door.*

TITUS, cmxxviii
Who doth molest my contemplation? Is it your trick to make me ope the door, That so my sad decrees* may fly away And all my study be to no effect? You are deceived, for what I mean to do See here in bloody lines* I have set down, And what is written shall be executed.

TAMORA
Titus, I am come to talk with thee.

TITUS
No, not a word. How can I grace my talk, Wanting* a hand to give it action?
Thou hast the odds of* me, therefore no more.

TAMORA

20 If thou didst know me, thou would’st talk with me. cmxxxi

TITUS

I am not mad, I know thee well enough:
Witness this wretched stump, witness these cmxxxi crimson lines*, cmxxxi
Witness these trenches* made by grief and care,
Witness the tiring day and heavy night,

25 Witness all sorrow, that I know thee well
For our proud empress, mighty Tamora.
Is not thy coming for my other hand?

TAMORA

Know, thou cmxxxiv sad man, I am not Tamora:
She is thy enemy and I thy friend.

30 I am Revenge, sent from th’infernal cmxxv kingdom
To ease the gnawing vulture* of thy cmxxvi mind
By working wreakful* vengeance on thy cmxxvii foes.
Come down and welcome me to this world’s light,
Confer with me of murder and of death:

35 There’s not a hollow cave or lurking place,
No vast obscurity* or misty vale
Where bloody murder or detested rape
Can couch* for fear, but I will find them out cmxxviii,
And in their ears tell them my dreadful name,

40 Revenge, which makes the foul offenders cmxxix quake.

TITUS

Art thou Revenge? And art thou sent to me
To be a torment to mine cmxl enemies?

TAMORA

* 18 Wanting lacking
* 18 give it action “to accompany my talk with appropriate gestures” (Waith). Hughes points to the consistency of F’s line here with the theme of “mutilation as inhibiting the expression of action.” See also B. L. Joseph’s, Elizabethan Acting (Oxford, 1951), pp. 34-59, for the importance of gesture to oratory
* 19 odds of advantage over; i.e. two hands over his one.
* 22 crimson lines the lines he has written in blood.
* 23 trenches wrinkles in his face, that he associates with his sadness and worry. (See Sonnets 2.1-2)
* 31 gnawing vulture an allusion to Prometheus, who was eaten by vultures while chained to the rock. (seen. l. 2.1.17)
* 32 wreakful revengeful
* 36 obscurity i.e. dark place
* 38 couch lie hidden
I am: therefore come down and welcome me.

TITUS

Do me some service ere I come to thee.

45
Lo by thy side where Rape and Murder stands:
Now give some surance* that thou art Revenge:
Stab them or tear them on thy chariot-wheels,
And then I’ll come and be thy wagoner*,
And whirl along with thee about the globes,

50
Provide thee two proper palfreys*, as black as jet*,
To hale thy vehemt wagon swift away,
And find out murder in their guilty caves,
And when thy car is loaden with their heads,
I will dismount and by the wagon wheel

55
Trot like a servile footman all day long,
Even from Hyperion’s rising in the east
Until his very downfall in the sea.
And day by day I’ll do this heavy task,
So thou destroy Rapine* and Murder there.

TAMORA

60
These are my ministers, and come with me.

TITUS

Are these thy ministers? What are they called*?

TAMORA

Rape and Murder, therefore callèd so,
’Cause they take vengeance of such kind of men.

TITUS

Good Lord, how like the empress’ sons they are,

65
And you the empress!* But we worldly men

---

* 46 surance assurance, proof (Shakespeare’s only use of this form of the word)
* 48 wagoner chariot driver
* 50 proper palfreys fine horses
* 50 jet a black stone
* 51 hale pull
* 53 car chariot
* 56 Hyperion father of the sun god, here used to represent the sun
* 59 Rapine Rape
* 61 What ... called? The question here is improbable, as Titus has already identified them at l. 59 as Rape and Murder; Maxwell posits that 44-59 may have been added after the fact, and that Shakespeare again may have forgotten to revise the appropriate sections completely.
* 63 take vengeance of exact retribution from
* 64-5 Good ... you the empress? Shakespeare lets the audience know here that Titus recognizes them and is not fooled by their disguises.
Have miserable, mad, mistaking eyes.
O sweet Revenge, now do I come to thee,
And if one arm’s embracement will content thee,
I will embrace thee in it by and by.  

[Exit aloft or within]

TAMORA

This closing with him fits his lunacy:
Whate’er I forge to feed his brainsick fits,
Do you uphold and maintain in your speeches,
For now he firmly takes me for Revenge,
And, being credulous in this mad thought,
I’ll make him send for Lucius his son,
And whilst I at a banquet hold him sure,
I’ll find some cunning practice out of hand
To scatter and disperse the giddy Goths,
Or at the least make them his enemies.

See, here he comes, and I must ply my theme.

[Enter Titus, on main stage]

TITUS

Long have I been forlorn, and all for thee.
Welcome, dread Fury, to my woeful house:
Rapine and Murder, you are welcome too.
How like the empress and her sons you are!

Well are you fitted, had you but a Moor:
Could not all hell afford you such a devil?
For well I wot the empress never wags
But in her company there is a Moor,
And, would you represent our queen aright
It were convenient you had such a devil.
But welcome as you are. What shall we do?

---

* 65 worldly mortal, of this world
* 70-80 It is apparent that Titus’s must be offstage at this point, and that Tamora thinks he must be out of earshot. This is often used to support the upper stage theories.
* 70 closing agreeing
* 70 forge invent
* 77 practice stratagem
* 77 out of hand on the spur of the moment
* 82 Fury serpent-haired goddesses of Greek mythology who punished criminals, especially those who murdered kin.
* 85 Well ... fitted i.e. you are furnished just like the Queen
* 87 wags moves about
* 90 convenient would be fulfilling if you had
TAMORA
What wouldst thou have us do, Andronicus?

DEMETRIUS
Show me a murderer, I’ll deal with him.

CHIRON
Show me a villain that hath done a rape,
And I am sent to be revenged on him.

95 TAMORA
Show me a thousand that have done thee wrong,
And I’ll be revengèd on them all.

TITUS
Look round about the wicked streets of Rome,
And when thou find’st a man that’s like thyself,

100 Good Murder, stab him: he’s a murderer.—
Go thou with him, and when it is thy hap
To find another that is like to thee,
Good Rapine, stab him: he is a ravisher.—
Go thou with them, and in the emperor’s court

105 There is a queen, attended by a Moor —
Well mayst thou know her by thy own proportion,
For up and down she doth resemble thee —
I pray thee do on them some violent death:
They have been violent to me and mine.

TAMORA
Well hast thou lessoned us: this shall we do.

But would it please thee, good Andronicus,
To send for Lucius, thy thrice-valiant son,
Who leads towards Rome a band of warlike Goths,
And bid him come and banquet at thy house?

110 When he is here, even at thy solemn feast,
I will bring in the empress and her sons,
The emperor himself and all thy foes,
And at thy mercy shall they stoop and kneel,
And on them shalt thou ease thy angry heart.

115 What says Andronicus to this device?

TITUS
Marcus, my brother! ’Tis sad Titus calls.

Enter Marcus.

Go, gentle Marcus, to thy nephew Lucius —

* 101 hap luck, fortune
* 107 up and down head to toe, altogether
* 115 solemn ceremonious
Thou shalt inquire him out among the Goths —
Bid him repair to me and bring with him
Some of the chiefest princes of the Goths.
Bid him encamp his soldiers where they are:
Tell him the emperor and the empress too
Feasts at my house, and he shall feast with them.
This do thou for my love, and so let him,
As he regards his aged father’s life.

MARCUS
This will I do, and soon return again.  

[Exit.]^cmlxxi

TAMORA
Now will I hence about thy business,
And take my ministers along with me.

TITUS
Nay, nay, let Rape and Murder stay with me,
Or else I’ll call my brother back again,
And cleave to no revenge but Lucius.

[Aside]  

TAMORA
What say you, boys? Will you bide with him
While I go tell my lord the emperor
How I have governed our determined jest?

Yield to his humor, smooth and speak him fair,
And tarry with him till I turn again.

TITUS  

I know them all, though they suppose me mad,
And will o’erreach them in their own devices:
A pair of cursèd hell-hounds and their dam!

DEMETRIUS
Madam, depart at pleasure, leave us here.

TAMORA
Farewell, Andronicus: Revenge now goes
To lay a complot to betray thy foes.

TITUS
I know thou dost, and, sweet Revenge, farewell.

CHIRON
Tell us, old man, how shall we be employed?

TITUS
Tu, I have work enough for you to do.—
Publius, come hither.— Caius and Valentine!

* 124 repair come back
* 136 cleave ... Lucius put all of my faith in Lucius (and none in you)
* 139 governed ... jest managed the jest we planned
* 140 smooth and fair flatter and humor him
* 141 turn return
[Enter Publius, Caius and Valentine.]

PUBLIUS
What is your will?

TITUS
Know you these two?

PUBLIUS
The empress’ sons, I take them: Chiron, Demetrius.

TITUS
Fie, Publius, fie, thou art too much deceived: The one is Murder, Rape is the other’s name, And therefore bind them, gentle Publius. Caius and Valentine, lay hands on them. Oft have you heard me wish for such an hour,

155
And now I find it: therefore bind them sure*, And stop their mouths, if they begin to cry*. [Exit]

CHIRON
Villains, forbear! We are the empress’ sons. PUBLIUS
And therefore do we what we are commanded. Stop close their mouths, let them not speak a word.

160
Is he sure bound? Look that you bind them fast.

Enter Titus Andronicus with a knife, and Lavinia with a basin.

TITUS
Come, come, Lavinia: look, thy foes are bound. Sirs, stop their mouths*, let them not speak to me, But let them hear what fearful words I utter. O villains, Chiron and Demetrius,

165
Here stands the spring whom you have stained with mud, This goodly summer with your winter mixed.

* 154 take them i.e. take them to be
* 160 sure securely
* 161 cry i.e. cry out
* 161 And ... cry. This line from Qq does not appear in F, however, a comma ends the previous line, suggesting that the line was omitted in error.
* 163 therefore for that
* 167 stop their mouths] This line suggests that the two are possibly in the process of being gagged, but must still be making noise of some sort, therefore the Oxford note is early at 163 (see t.n.), or there is an accidental repeat in the text.
* 168 fearful terrorizing
You killed her husband, and for that vile fault
Two of her brothers were condemned to death,
My hand cut off and made a merry jest,
Both her sweet hands, her tongue, and that more dear
Than hands or tongue, her spotless chastity,
Inhuman traitors, you constrained* and forced.
What would you say if I should let you speak?
Villains, for shame you could not beg for grace.
Hark, wretches, how I mean to martyr you.
This one hand yet is left to cut your throats,
Whilst that Lavinia 'tween her stumps doth hold
The basin that receives your guilty blood.
You know your mother means to feast with me,
And calls herself Revenge and thinks me mad:
Hark, villains, I will grind your bones to dust
And with your blood and it I'll make a paste,
And of the paste a coffin* I will rear
And make two pasties* of your shameful heads,
And bid that strumpet, your unhallowed dam,
Like to the earth swallow her own increase*.
This is the feast that I have bid her to,
And this the banquet she shall surfeit on:
For worse than Philomel you used my daughter,
And worse than Progne I will be revenged*.
And now prepare your throats. Lavinia, come,
Receive the blood, and when that they are dead,
Let me go grind their bones to powder small
And with this hateful liquor temper it*
And in that paste let their vile heads be baked.
Come, come, be everyone officious*
To make this banquet, which I wish might prove

* 177 constrained took by force, violated (OED, v. 5b)
* 188 coffin pie-crust
* 189 pasties pies. Waith points out that the details given by Titus, are not far off from Elizabethan standards. There are numerous recipes for baking calves’ heads in pastry “coffins”
* 191 Like ... increase swallow up her offspring as the earth does the dead. Compare to Rom. 2.3.9-10: “The earth that’s nature’s mother is her tomb;/ What is her burying grave, that is her womb.” (Hughes)
* 192-195 feast ... revenged Progne, or Procne, was the wife of Tereus, her sisters rapist. Progne served her husband his own children as revenge for her sister. Seen. l. 2.3.43
* 199 with ... it moisten it with the blood
* 201 officious busy
More stern and bloody than the Centaurs’ feast∗.

So, now bring them in, for I’ll play the cook,

And see them ready gainst their mother comes∗.

He cuts their throats."

Exeunt [with the bodies].

---

∗203 Centaurs’ feast The wedding feast of Hippodamia and Pirithous, which ended in a bloody battle between human and Centaur guests. Again the story is most likely taken form Ovid’s Metamorphoses xii. 210 ff.

∗205 gainst ... comes in expectation or by the time of Tamora’s arrival.
Enter Lucius, Marcus and the Goths [with Aaron prisoner and one carrying the child].

LUCIUS
Uncle Marcus, since 'tis my father's mind
That I repair to Rome, I am content.

[1] GOTH
And ours with thine, befall what fortune will.

LUCIUS
Good uncle, take you in this barbarous Moor,
This ravenous tiger, this accursèd devil:
Let him receive no sustenance, fetter him
Till he be brought unto the empress' face
For testimony of her foul proceedings.
And see the ambush of our friends be strong:
I fear the emperor means no good to us.

AARON
Some devil whisper curses in my ear,
And prompt me, that my tongue may utter forth
The venomous malice of my swelling heart.

LUCIUS
Away, inhuman dog, unhallowed slave!—

Sirs, help our uncle to convey him in.

Flourish. [Exeunt some Goths with Aaron.]
The trumpets show the emperor is at hand.

*Sound trumpets.*

*Enter Emperor and Empress, with Tribunes and others [including Emillius]*.

SATURNINUS

What, hath the firmament more suns than one?

LUCIUS

What boots it thee to call thyself a sun?

MARCUS

Rome’s emperor, and nephew, break the parley:

These quarrels must be quietly debated.

The feast is ready which the careful Titus

Hath ordainèd to an honorable end,

For peace, for love, for league and good to Rome:

Please you, therefore, draw nigh, and take your places.

SATURNINUS

Marcus, we will.

*Hautboys. A table brought in.*

*Enter Titus like a cook, placing the meat on the table, and Lavinia with a veil over her face [and Young Lucius].*

TITUS

Welcome, my gracious lord.— Welcome, dread queen.—

Rolle, sees F’s two stage directions as a superfluous duplicate stage direction, and omits the second.

* 16.2 SD [including Emillius] Eds. agree that this is the only clear point at which Emillius, who speaks at l. 137, would enter the scene.

* 18 What ... thee what do you gain; Lucius uses less respectful “thee” instead of “you” at this point.

* 19 break the parley begin discussing terms, under a truce (OED v 24); or interrupt the discourse, i.e. stop quarreling (Waith)

* 21 careful sorrowful. Waith uses “care-full” to attempt to dissociate with the modern meaning.

* 23 league alliance

* 25.1 SD A table brought in. F’s inclusion of this stage direction could help to give us an idea of the actual Renaissance staging. It is well accepted that F is most likely the best reflection of “playhouse practice” (see, “Empirical Editing” chapter).

* 25.3 SD [and Young Lucius] Bate just has Young Lucius enter at this point, while other editors have found it necessary to include “others” to allow for the other Andronici to enter the banquet at this point. However, their presence is not necessary.
Welcome, ye warlike Goths.— Welcome, Lucius.—
And welcome, all: although the cheer* be poor,
’Twill fill your stomachs. Please you eat of it.

SATURNINUS

Why art thou thus attired, Andronicus?

TITUS
Because I would be sure to have all well
To entertain your highness and your empress.

TAMORA
We are beholding to you, good Andronicus.

TITUS [Aside?]
An if your highness knew my heart, you were.—

My lord the emperor, resolve me this:
Was it well done of rash Virginius
To slay his daughter with his own right hand,
Because she was enforced, stained and deflow’red?

SATURNINUS
It was, Andronicus.

TITUS
Your reason, mighty lord?

SATURNINUS
Because the girl should not survive her shame,
And by her presence still renew his sorrows.

TITUS
A reason mighty, strong and effectual:
A pattern, precedent and lively warrant

For me, most wretched, to perform the like.
Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee,
And with thy shame thy father’s sorrow die!

SATURNINUS
What hast done? Unnatural and unkind!

TITUS

* 28 cheer hospitality, i.e. food (Waith)
* 35 resolve answer
* 36-38 Virginius ... deflow’red In Florus’s version of the story, Virginius, a centurion, slays in daughter in plain sight, after she was raped and “deflow’red” by Appius Claudius. Norgaard first pointed out that the more popular Livy version was not used here (see Lloyd’s, The Pilgrimage of Princes, (1573) for another example of this version).
* 41 Because in order that (Maxwell; OED B2)
* 43 effectual i.e. produces the desired effect
* 44 lively vivid
* 48 unkind wicked, vile
Killed her for whom my tears have made me blind.

I am as woeful as Virginius was,
And have a thousand times more cause than he
To do this outrage: and it now is done.

SATURNINUS

What, was she ravished? Tell who did the deed.

TITUS

Will’t please you eat? Will’t please your highness feed?

TAMORA

Why hast thou slain thine only daughter?

TITUS

Not I, ’twas Chiron and Demetrius:
They ravished her and cut away her tongue,
And they, ’twas they, that did her all this wrong.

SATURNINUS

Go fetch them hither to us presently.

TITUS

Why, there they are both, baked in that pie,
Whereof their mother daintily hath fed,
Eating the flesh that she herself hath bred.
’Tis true, ’tis true, witness my knife’s sharp point.

SATURNINUS

Die, frantic wretch, for this accursèd deed!

LUCIUS

Can the son’s eye behold his father bleed?
There’s meed for meed, death for a deadly deed.

MARCUS

You sad-faced men, people and sons of Rome,
By uproars severed, like a flight of fowl
Scatterèd by winds and high tempestuous gusts,
O, let me teach you how to knit again
This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf,
These broken limbs again into one body.

[A] GOTH

* 66 meed for meed measure for measure
* 66 There seems to be an insufficient break in the dialogue here before Marcus addresses the “sad-faced men.” Most eds. suggest Marcus’s offer to “cast us down” l. 132 is evidence that Marcus and Lucius, and sometimes others, have moved to a higher place (the upper stage), and have them do so here amongst “a great tumult” (Capell). See also 5.3.132n. The other “actions” that have been added to this scene in vary greatly in each edition and performance. (See t.n.)
* 71 corn ... sheaf corn (grain), was often bound together into a bundle after reaping.
* 73 SP [A] GOTH F’s emendation of Qq’s “Romane Lord,” was an attempt to repair an obvious error here. Capell emended further by allowing Marcus to continue with these
Let Rome herself be bane unto herself,
And she whom mighty kingdoms curtsy to,
Like a forlorn and desperate castaway,
Do shameful execution on herself.
But if my frosty signs and chaps of age,
Grave witnesses of true experience,
Cannot induce you to attend my words,
Speak, Rome’s dear friend, as erst our ancestor,
When with his solemn tongue he did discourse
To lovesick Dido’s sad attending ear
The story of that baleful burning night
When subtle Greeks surprised King Priam’s Troy.
Tell us what Sinon hath bewitched our ears,
Or who hath brought the fatal engine in
That gives our Troy, our Rome, the civil wound.

[MARCUS]

My heart is not compact of flint nor steel,
Nor can I utter all our bitter grief,
But floods of tears will drown my oratory
And break my very utterance, even in the time
When it should move you to attend me most,
Lending your kind hand commiseration.
Here is a captain, let him tell the tale,
Your hearts will throb and weep to hear him speak.

lines and emending “Let” to “Lest.” Sisson emended to Aemelius. There are many points in the speech that do sound Marcus-like. However, having any Roman speak at least the first four lines seems antithetical (the reason for Capell’s “Lest”). It makes more sense that the Goths who, as history directs, will remain/return to be Rome’s enemies would leave Rome to herself and let her fail on her own. Lines 80 through 88 beginning with the mention of Aeneas do however, give question to a Goth speaking. I have followed Bate (Arden3) in keeping of F’s Goth as the speaker through line 87, and have given Marcus the lines which must be his from 88-95.

*73 bane poison
*77 But if unless
*79 attend pay attention to
*80 erst once
*80 our ancestor i.e. Aeneas, who told Dido of the fall of Troy in the Aeneid.
*85 Sinon The Greek traitor who convinced the Trojans to allow the wooden horse (“the fatal engine” 1.86) into the walls.
*87 civil wound injury caused by civil war
*88 SP [MARCUS] see 5.3.73n
*88 compact composed
LUCIUS
This, noble auditory, be it known to you,
That cursèd Chiron and Demetrius were they that murdered our emperor’s brother,
And they it were that ravishèd our sister.

For their fell faults our brothers were beheaded,
Our father’s tears despised and basely cozened
Of that true hand that fought Rome’s quarrel out, And sent her enemies unto the grave.
Lastly, myself unkindly banishèd,
The gates shut on me, and turned weeping out,
To beg relief among Rome’s enemies,
Who drowned their enmity in my true tears
And oped their arms to embrace me as a friend.
And I turned forth, be it known to you,
That have preserved her welfare in my blood,
And from her bosom took the enemy’s point,
Sheathing the steel in my advent’rous body.
Alas, you know I am no vaunter, I:
My scars can witness, dumb although they are,

That my report is just and full of truth—
But soft, methinks I do digress too much,
Citing my worthless praise—O, pardon me,
For when no friends are by, men praise themselves.

MARCUS
Now is my turn to speak. Behold this child:

Of this was Tamora deliverèd,
The issue of an irreligious Moor,
The villain is alive in Titus’s house,
And as he is to witness this is true,

Now judge what cause had Titus to revenge
These wrongs unspeakable, past patience,
Or more than any living man could bear.
Now you have heard the truth, what say you, Romans?

* 100 fell cruel
* 101 basely cozened i.e. cheated in a base, or low manner.
* 102 fought ... out fought the war to its finish
* 113 vaunter braggart
* 115 report reputation; i.e. as a warrior
* 118 when ... themselves Proverbial: “He dwells far from neighbors that is fain to praise himself” (ODEP, p. 560; Tilley N117)
* 126 past patience beyond endurance; i.e. too much to take
Have we done aught amiss? Show us wherein,
And from the place where you behold us now,
The poor remainder of Andronicus will hand in hand all headlong cast us down
And on the ragged stones beat forth our brains, And make a mutual closure* of our house.

Speak, Romans, speak: and if you say we shall, Lo, hand in hand, Lucius and I will fall.

EMILLIUS
Come, come, thou reverend man of Rome, And bring our emperor gently in thy hand, Lucius, our emperor, for well I know

The common voice do cry it shall be so.

MARCUS
Lucius, all hail, Rome’s royal emperor!—
Go, go into old Titus’s sorrowful house, And hither hale* that misbelieving Moor, To be adjudged some direful slaughtering death,

As punishment for his most wicked life. [Exeunt Goths.]

[Lucius and Marcus may descend]

[ALL ROMANS]
Lucius, all hail, to Rome’s gracious governor!

LUCIUS
Thanks, gentle Romans. May I govern so To heal Rome’s harms and wipe away her woe! But, gentle people, give me aim* awhile,

* 130-133 these lines suggest that at least Lucius and Marcus are speaking these lines from “aloft.” However, their exact position is not completely clear. (See 5.3.66n.) However, the offer to “beat forth their brains” is odd here, as the action of “beating” usually suggests several blows, and Marcus could be saying they will cast themselves to the ground as opposed to continuing to stand.

* 134 mutual closure common end

* 141, 145 SP MARCUS/ [ALL ROMANS] Qq and F have Marcus repeat these shouts. While Hughes and Barnet follow this, all other editors emend at some level. I have followed Ravenscroft here by leaving Marcus the speaker of l. 141, and emended to All Romans at 145. (See t.n.)

* 143 hale drag

* 145 SD [Lucius and Marcus may descend] l. 153 shows that the men must have come down before this so they can be near enough Titus dead body to kiss it. l. 145 offers a good opportunity for this.
For nature puts me to a heavy task:

Stand all aloof, but, uncle, draw you near

To shed obsequious tears upon this trunk.—

O, take this warm kiss on thy pale, cold lips.

These sorrowful drops upon thy blood-stained face,

The last true duties of thy noble son!

MARCUS

Tear for tear, and loving kiss for kiss.

Thy brother Marcus tenders on thy lips.

O were the sum of these that I should pay

Countless and infinite, yet would I pay them.

LUCIUS

Come hither, boy, come, come, and learn of us

To melt in show’rs thy grandsire loved thee well:

Many a time he danced thee on his knee,

Sung thee asleep, his loving breast thy pillow:

Many a matter hath he told to thee,

Meet and agreeing with thine infancy:

In that respect, then, like a loving child,

Shed yet some small drops from thy tender spring

Because kind nature doth require it so.

Friends should associate friends in grief and woe.

Bid him farewell, commit him to the grave,

Do him that kindness and take leave of him.

YOUNG LUCIUS

O grandsire, grandsire, even with all my heart

Would I were dead, so you did live again.

O Lord, I cannot speak to him for weeping,

My tears will choke me if I ope my mouth.

[Enter Aaron guarded by Goths.]

ROMANS

You sad Andronici, have done with woes,

Give sentence on this execrable wretch

That hath been breeder of these dire events.

LUCIUS

Set him breast-deep in earth and famish him:

There let him stand and rave and cry for food.

* 149 aim guidance (Waith); Onions pointed out that “give me aim” is an image from archery, where the one who “gave aim” told the shooter where the arrow hit. (OED 3b)

* 150 puts me imposes on me, forces me

* 152 obsequious dutiful; i.e. as in to the rites, respect of the dead

* 179 famish starve
If anyone relieves or pities him,
For the offence he dies. This is our doom:
Some stay to see him fastened in the earth.

AARON
O\textsuperscript{mcxxiv}, why should wrath be mute and fury dumb?

\begin{align*}
185 & \quad \text{I am no baby, I, that with base prayers} \\
& \quad \text{I should repent the evils I have done:} \\
& \quad \text{Ten thousand worse than ever yet I did} \\
& \quad \text{Would I perform, if I might have my will.} \\
& \quad \text{If one good deed in all my life I did} \\
190 & \quad \text{I do repent it from my very soul.}
\end{align*}

LUCIUS
Some loving friends convey the emperor\textsuperscript{mcxxv} hence,
And give him burial in his father’s\textsuperscript{mcxxvi} grave:
My father and Lavinia shall forthwith
Be closèd in our household’s monument.

\begin{align*}
195 & \quad \text{As for that heinous\textsuperscript{mcxxvii} tiger, Tamora,} \\
& \quad \text{No funeral rite\textsuperscript{mcxxviii}, nor man in mourning\textsuperscript{mcxxix} weeds\textsuperscript{mcxxx},} \\
& \quad \text{No mournful bell shall ring her burial,} \\
& \quad \text{But throw her forth to beasts and birds of prey.\textsuperscript{mcxxxiii}} \\
& \quad \text{Her life was beast-like,\textsuperscript{mcxxxii} and devoid of pity,} \\
200 & \quad \text{And being so, shall have like want of pity.} \\
& \quad \text{See justice done on Aaron, that damned Moor,} \\
& \quad \text{From\textsuperscript{mcxxxiii} whom our heavy haps\textsuperscript{*} had their beginning:} \\
& \quad \text{Then\textsuperscript{mcxxxiv} afterwards, to order well the state,} \\
& \quad \text{That like events may ne’er it ruinate.}\textsuperscript{*}
\end{align*}

\textit{Exeunt all\textsuperscript{mcxxxviv} [with the bodies]\textsuperscript{mcxxxvi}.}

\textit{FINIS\textsuperscript{mcxxxvii}}

\textsuperscript{i} List of characters] not in Qq, F
\textsuperscript{ii} Title] The Lamentable Tragedy of Titus Andronicus. F; The most Lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus : As it was Plaide by the Right Honourable the Earle of Darbie, Earle of Pembrooke, and Earle of Sussex their Seruants. Q1; The most lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus. As it hath sundry times beene playde by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke, the Earle of Darbie, the Earle of Sussex, and the Lorde Chamberlaine theyr Seruants. Q2; The most lamentable Romaine

\textsuperscript{*} 192 father’s Neither Qq or F indicate the position of the apostrophe here, but the distinction cannot be heard in the theater any way. The choice is between his father’s tomb or the tomb of his fathers’ ancestors.

\textsuperscript{*} 202 haps mishaps, unfortunate events

\textsuperscript{*} 200-204 so ... ruinate. Q2’s emendation of l. 200 (see collations), and the addition of 201-204 suggest that the final leaf of Q1 being used by the compositor was damaged.
Tragedie of Titus Andronicus: As it was plaid by the right honorable the Earle of Darbie, Earle of Pembroke, and Earle of Sussex their Servants. Q3.

1.1 ] F Actus Primus. Scœna Prima.; no act, scene numbers in Qq

iii 1.1.0.1 SD Flourish. Enter] F; Enter Qq; The Tomb of the Andronici appearing; Rolfe

iv 1.1.0.1 SD Tribunes] Q1; Tribunes [including MARCUS ANDRONICUS] Bate; Tribunes among them MARCUS ANDRONICUS Riv.

v 1.1.0.1 SD then enter] Q1; then enter [below] Capell; Enter, below, from one side, Rolfe

vi 1.1.0.2 SD at the other] F; not in Qq; from the other side Rolfe

vii 1.1.02-3 SD Drum/ and Colors] F; Drums and Trumpets Q1-2; Drum and Trumpets Q3; drums and colours Bate; drums [and colours] Waith

viii 1.1.1 SP SATURNINUS and all SP’s are centered in Q 1 through 1.1.63; Waith adds SD (to his followers)

ix 1.1.5 I am his] Q1; I was the Qq

x 1.1.6 were] F; ware Qq

xi 1.1.9] Waith adds SD (to his followers)

xii 1.1.9] Q1; appears as 2 lines in F (Followers./ Fa uourers)

xiii 1.1.14 Th’imperial F; The Imperial Qq

xiv 1.1.14 seat: to virtue consecrate,] this edn.; seate to vertue, consecrate Qq; Seate to Vertue : consecrate F; seat, to virtue consecrate, Rowe 1714 (anticipated by Ravenscroft)

xv 1.1.17 SD Enter...crown.] F; Marcus Andronicus with the Crowne Qq (centered as a SP); not in Bate, Riv., Maxwell

xvi 1.1.18 SP MARCUS] is not separated from the SD in Qq, F; MARCUS ([aloft,] with the crown.) Bate; Marc. [holding the crown] Maxwell

xvii 1.1.23 Pius] Q1; Pious F

xviii 1.1.23-24 Pius, ... Rome:] Q2 (Pius, ... Rome.); Pius:, ... Rome, Q1

xix 1.1.35 field,] Q2; field, and at this day./ To the Monument of that Andronicyl Done sacrifice of expiation./ And slaine the Noblest prisoner of the Gothes. Q1

xx 1.1.36 honor’s] Q1 (honours); horror’s RSC;

xxi 1.1.40 worthily] Q1; (worthily) F

xxii 1.1.40 succeed] Q1; succeeded Capell

xxiii 1.1.46] Q1; 2 Lines in F (speakes./ To);

xxiv 1.1.46 SD [Aside ?] this edn.; not in Qq, F

xxv 1.1.47 I do] Q1; do I Rolfe

xxvi 1.1.54 fortunes] Qq; Fortunes, F; fortune’s Delius

xxvii 1.1.54 SD Exeunt [Bassianus’] Soldiers] Craig, Witherspoon (Exeunt Soldiers [Of Bassianus]); Exit Soldiers Q1-2; Exit Souldiers Q3; Exit Souldiours F; Exeunt [his] Soldiers Bate, RSC; Exeunt the Followers of Bassianus Capell; Exeunt his soldiers and his followers W08; [his followers disperse Wilson

xxviii 1.1.56] Q1; 2 lines in F (beene/ Thus)

xxix 1.1.59 SD [Exeunt Saturninus’s Soldiers] this edn.; not in Qq, F; [Exeunt his Soldiers] Bate, RSC; Exeunt the Followers of Saturninus Capell; Exeunt his soldiers and followers W08; [his followers disperse Wilson

xxx 1.1.60 W08 adds SD (To the Tribunes and Senators)
3.1.63.1 SD Flourish.] F; not in Qq
3.1.63.2 SD [Saturninus and Bassianus] RSC; not in Qq, F
3.1.63.2 Hughes adds SD [Exeunt aloft, Marcus, Tribunes and Senators.]; Rolfe has them go up into the Capitol
3.1.64 SP CAPTAIN] F (Cap.); not in Qq
3.1.64 way: F (way :); way, Qq; way! Craig; way; Rolfe; way. Waith
3.1.65 Patron] Q1; Pattern Cam (anon conj.)
3.1.68 whence] F; where Qq
3.1.69.1 SD [Martius and Mutius] Wilson, Craig; not in Qq, F; [LUCIUS and MUTIUS] Hughes
3.1.69.2 men bearing [two] coffin[s]] Hughes (Wells conj. in Re-editing Shake. p. 92); two men bearing a Coffin Qq, F
3.1.69.2-3 [Lucius and Quintus] Wilson; not in Qq, F; [QUINTUS and MARTIUS] Hughes
3.1.69.3 SD After them] F; then Qq; om. Wilson
3.1.69.3-4 men bearing [two] coffin[s]] Hughes (Wells conj. in Re-editing Shake. p. 92); two men bearing a Coffin Qq, F
3.1.69.5 SD They] F; then Qq
3.1.69.5 SD coffin[s]] Hughes (conj. Wells); Coffin Qq, F
3.1.71 mourning] Q1-2, F (Mourning); mourning Q3
1.1.70-71]F; one line Qq
1.1.72 her] F4; his Qq, F1-3
1.1.72 freight] Rowe; fraught Qq, F
1.1.76 resalute] Q1; re-salute Rolfe
1.1.77 Rome.] Rowe (conj. Ravenscroft); Rome, Qq, F
1.1.79 rites] Q3, F (Rites); rights Q1-2
1.1.86 sword— ] this edn.; sword, Qq; Sword : F
1.1.95 of mine hast thou] Q3; hast thou of mine Q1-Q2
1.1.99 manes] F3; manus Q1-F2
1.1.99 flesh] Stoll; flesh: Qq, F
1.1.100 earthly] F; earthy Qq
1.1.104 this] Q1-Q2, F; his Q3
1.1.105 Oxf. adds SD [kneeling]; Waith [kneeling with her sons]; Wells [Kneels];
RSC ↓kneels↓
1.1.109 sons] F; sonne Qq
1.1.111 triumphs, and return] Qq, F; triumphs and return, Theobald
1.1.123 the] F; their Qq
1.1.123 you] Q2; your Q1
1.1.127 T'appease] Q1; To appease Rolfe, Craig
1.1.130 SD Exeunt Sons] F (Exit Sonses); Exit Titus sonnes Qq; Exeunt Titus's sons Craig; [Exeunt Lucius, Quintus, Martius, and Mutius] Rolfe
1.1.131 Oxf adds SD [rising]; Oxf/Waith adds rising with her sons
1.1.132 ever...barbarous?] Q2; neuer...barbarous. Q1; never...barbarous! Maxwell
1.1.133 not] Q1; me F
1.1.135 looks] F; looke Qq
1.1.139 his] Q1; her Theobald
1.1.142 the] Q1; her Rowe; these (conj. Capell)
1.1.142.1 SD Enter ... again.] Qq, F; Re-enter LUCIUS, QUINTUS, MARTIUS, and MUTIUS, with their swords bloody. Rolfe
1.1.144 rites] F2; rights Q1-2; rightes Q3-F
1.1.147 naught] Wilson; nought Qq, F
1.1.150.1 SD flourish. Then sound] F.; Sound Qq
1.1.150.1 SD coffins] F; Coffin Qq
1.1.152 Rome’s] Q2; Roomes Q1
1.1.155 grudges] Q3 (grudgges), F; drugges Q1, Q2
1.1.158 SD Enter Lavinia] Qq, F (centered); at line 157 Cam 1
1.1.158 SP LAVINIA] Q3 (Lavi.); not in Q1-2
1.1.159 father,] F; father Qq
1.1.161 obsequies] Qq, F; crossed out and ‘exequies’ MS emendation Q1
1.1.162 And] Q1; [kneeling] And Bevington; kneels RSC
1.1.163 the] Q2; this Q1
1.1.165 fortune] F (Fortune); fortunes Qq
1.1.165 Rome’s] Q2 (Romes); Roomes Q1
1.1.166 reserved] Q1; preserv’d Hanmer
1.1.166] Q1; two lines in F (Rome./ That)
1.1.169 praise.] Q1; praise. [Lavinia rises.] Bevington
1.1.169.1 SD [Enter Marcus, below] Bate; not in Qq, F; Enter Marcus. Ravenscroft;
Enter, below, Marcus Andronicus and Tribunes; re-enter Saturninus and Bassianus,
attended Dyce; Marcus Andronicus speaks from above where he is accompanied by Saturninus, Bassianus, other Tribunes, etc. Bevington; Enter above MARCUS
ANDRONICUS, SATURNINUS, BASSIANUS, and others Wilson (based on the SD from
F at 235); [Enter Tribunes and MARCUS, carrying a white robe] Hughes (after Dyce);
Enter MARCUS ANDRONICUS and Tribunes; re-enter SATURNINUS, BASSIANUS,
and others. Maxwell (after Dyce)
1.1.172] Q1; two lines in F (Tribune./ Noble)
1.1.175 alike] Q1 ; all alike F
1.1.185 late-deceased] Theobald; late deceased Qq, F
1.1.187 Rome.] Q2; Roome. Q1; Rome. [Offers robe] Bate; Rome. A white cloak is
brought to Titus Bevington
1.1.190 What, should] Theobald (What! should); VVhat should Q1; What should
Q2-Q3, F
1.1.190 don] Q1-Q2, Q3-F (d’on)
1.1.190 you?] Q1, F3; you, Q2-Q3, F
1.1.191 today] Q1 (to daie), Q2-F (to day)
1.1.193 abroad] Q1; a broach F3
1.1.193 all?] Pope; all. Qq, F
1.1.194 Rome] Q2; Roome Q1
1.1.202 Hughes adds SD [Enter SATURNINUS aloft]
1.1.203, 205 Bate adds SD [aloft]
1.1.208 wert] Q3; were Q1, Q2
1.1.213 Hughes adds SD [Enter BASSIANUS aloft]
1.1.214 Bate adds SD [aloft]
1.1.216 friends] Q1, F3; friend Q2-3; Friend? F; Friend F2
1.1.219 noble} F; people’s Qq (peoples)
1.1.221 you] Q2; yee Q1; ye Wilson
1.1.221 Andronicus?] Q2: Andronicus. Q1
1.1.222 Bate adds SD [aloft]
1.1.225 suit] Rowe; sute Qq, F3; sure F, F2
1.1.226 your] Q2; our Q1, RSC
1.1.229 Titan’s] Q2 (Tytans); Tytus Q1
1.1.232 sort] Q2; Q1 (the ‘rt’ are partially obscured)
1.1.233 Patricians] Q2; Q1 (the ‘Pat’ obscured)
1.1.234 Lord] Q2; Q1 (the ‘Lor’ obscured)
1.1.235 And] Q2; Q1 (obsured)
1.1.235.1 SD A long flourish till they come down] F; not in Qq; A long flourish till
[Saturninus and Bassianus] come down Hughes
1.1.244 Pantheon F2 (Panthæon); Pathan Q1-2; Pathan Q3, F
1.1.252 imperial] Q3 ; imperious Q1, Q2
1.1.254 my] F; thy Qq
1.1.254 Bate adds the SD [Titus’s sword and prisoners are handed over to
Saturninus]; Presents his captives to the Emperor, Ravenscroft; Lays tributes at
Saturninus’s feet, Bevington; Titus’s sword, chariot (?), and prisoners are given to
Saturninus
1.1.260 Johnson adds SD [to Tamora]; not in Qq, F
1.1.260 you Q1; your F
1.1.261 for you] Q1; for you F
1.1.263 SD [Aside] Capell; Aside? RSC; not in Qq, F
1.1.263 goodly] Q1-Q2, F; gooly Q3
1.1.263 trust me, of] Rowe; trust me of Qq, F; trust me: of Witherspoon, Craig; trust
me! Of Wilson; trust me; of Rolfe
1.1.265 Rowe (1709) adds SD [to Tamora]
1.1.266 chance] Q2; change Q1
1.1.266 Q1; 2 lines in F (warre/ Hath)
1.1.268-9 way, ... discontent] Q3; waie ... discontent. Q1; way. ... discontent, Q2
1.1.271 you] Q1; your F
1.1.271 than] Q1; then Q3, F
1.1.272 this?] F; this. Qq
1.1.277 SD [Flourish. Begins to exit.] this edn.; not in Qq, F; [Sound drums and
trumpets./ Tamora, Chiron, Demetrius, and Aaron are released. Bate; Flourish.
Saturninus addresses Tamora. Capell; *Flourish*. Saturninus courts Tamora in dumb show. Dyce (following SD of Rowe at 278), Rolfe; *Flourish*. Exeunt Saturninus, Tamora, Demetrius, Chiron, and Aaron the Moor. Oxf (which accordingly cuts 286-87 and moves 291 to follow 301 SD); Sound music; prisoners released RSC; *Flourish*. W08

1.278 SD [seizing Lavinia] Rowe; not in Qq, F; Bassianus Seizes Lavinia from the Emperor, Ravenscroft; *Seizes Lavinia* RSC

1.282 cuique F2; cuiqum Q1-Q2; cuiquam Q3, F

1.284 Bate adds SD [joining Bassianus]

1.291 SD Exeunt Bassianus, Lavinia, Lucius, Marcus, Martius, and Quintus] this edn.; not in Qq, F; [Exeunt Bassianus, Lavinia, Marcus, Martius, Quintus] RSC;

[Bassianus, Marcus and Titus’s sons bear Lavinia out of one door.] Bate; *Exeunt Marcus, Lucius, Mutius, Bassianus and followers with Lavinia*, Ravenscroft; *Exit [Bassianus], bearing off Lavinia; Marcus and Titus’s sons, guarding them; Mutius last*. Capell (after 289); *Exeunt Bassianus and Marcus with Lavinia* (after 289) and *Exeunt Lucius, Quintus, and Martius* (at 291) Malone (after Rowe); *[Exit Bassianus with Lavinia]* (after 289) and *[Exeunt Quintus and Martius]* (at 291) Hughes (locations of Exits after Rowe at 289, and Malone at 291); *MARCUS, BASSIANUS and the brothers LUCIUS, QUINTUS and MARTIUS form a bodyguard for LAVINIA, as they leave the square* Wilson

1.292 SD [Exeunt Saturninus and Goths] RSC; [Saturninus does not follow, but exits at another door with Tamora, her two sons and Aaron the Moor.] Bate; *Exeunt Emp &c.*, Ravenscroft; *During the fray, exeunt Saturninus, Tamora, Chiron, Demetrius, and Aaron* (after 296) Cam 1863-6, GLOBE 1864; (Bate notes most editions follow Cam in placing the exit ‘During the fray’ after 296); *SATURNINUS beckons TAMORA aside and they go up into the Capitol with AARON and her sons* Wilson; not in Qq, F, Rolfe

1.294-5] divided thus by Pope; 1 line Qq, F

1.295 Hughes adds SD [Strikes him]; Capell assaulting him; Wilson [they fight]; Rolfe [Stabbing Mutius.

1.296 SD He kills him] Q3, F (He kills him); not in Q1, Q2; [Dies] Capell; [falling Wilson

1.297 SD [returning]] Bate; *Re-enter Lucius* Capell, Craig (after SD at 192); *Enter Lucius* W08; *LUCIUS returns* Wilson; not in Qq, F

1.303 lawful promised] Q1; lawful-promis’d W. S. Walker

1.303.1 SD [Exit] Capell; *Exit with Mutius body Oxf.*; not in Qq, F

1.303.2 SD sons] Q1 (sonnes); sons Chiron and Demetrius W08

1.303 SD Enter ... Moor.] Q1; om. Rolfe (and all eds who do not add the exit above for Sat and Goths)

1.304 SP SATURNINUS] Q1-2 (Emperour.), Q3 (Emperour.), F (Empe.)

1.309 Was none] Q1; Was there none els F2

1.312, 318 hands.— ... Rome.—] this edn.; hands. ... Rome. Qq, F; (this emendation indicates that Titus’s thoughts occur during Saturninus’s lines, and supports my suggestions for Titus’s lines as Asides at 313 and 319.

1.313, 319 SD [Aside] this edn.

1.313 monstrous,] Q1; monstrous! Maxwell, Rolfe, Witherspoon

1.321 Phoebe] F2; *Thebe* Qq, F
1.1.322 gallant’st] Q2; gallanst Q1, Maxwell (gallan’st)
1.1.325 empress] Q2, F (Empresse); Emperesse Q1, Q3
1.1.338 queen, Pantheon. Lords] Pope; Queene/ Panthean Lords, F; Queene: Panthean
Lords Q1-2; Queene, Panthean Lords, Q3; Panthean Lords F4; queen, the Panthean
Lords (Walker); queen, Pantheon. Lords] Pope
1.1.342 SD [Titus remains.] ] RSC; not in Qq, F; [except Titus] Bate; Manet Titus
Theobald; but Titus. Craig; all but Titus Maxwell
1.1.345 SD Enter Marcus and Titus’s Sons [Lucius, Quintus and Martius] Rowe;
Enter Marcus and Titus’s sonnes Qq, F; Enter Marcus and Titus’s [three remaining]
Sons. Bate; Enter Marcus, Lucius, Martius, Quintus, Mutius born in Dead: Ravenscroft;
Enter Marcus and Titus’s sons...carrying Mutius body Oxf.; Re-enter MARCUS,
LUCIUS, QUINTUS, and MARTIUS Capell;
1.1.346 see! O] Q3; see: O Q1-Q2; see, O Rolfe, Maxwell, Wilson, Waith
1.1.349 these.] Q1; these F
1.1.349 confed’rates] F; confederates Qq
1.1.353 Mutius] Q3; Mucius Q1-2
1.1.355 hundred] Q1 (hundreth)
1.1.363 SP TITUS 2 SONS SPEAK] Qq, F (Titus two Sonnes speakes (centered); 2 &
3 SONS Bate; QUINTUS Ravenscroft, Rowe; QUINT. MART Capell, Rolfe, Wilson,
Craig; Mart. Ard 3/ Maxwell (conj Bolton)
1.1.365 SP TITUS SON SPEAKS] Qq, F (Titus sonne speaks (centered)); 2 SON
Bate; MARTIUS Capell; QUIN. Rowe, Rolfe
1.1.365 vouch] Q1; vouch’d F
1.1.369 struck] Qq-F (stroke)
1.1.373 SP 1. SON] F; 3. Sonne. Qq; LUC. Rowe; QUI. Capell, Maxwell; MART.
Malone, Wilson, Craig, Rolfe
1.1.373 himself] F; with himselfe Qq
1.1.374 SP 2. SON] Q1; QUINTUS Ravenscroft, Rowe, Rolfe; MART. Cappell,
Maxwell
1.1.374 till] Q1; tell F
1.1.374 SD The brother and the sons kneel] Q1; Marcus, Lucius, Quintus, and
Martius kneel W08; [Marcus and the Sons of Titus kneel. Rolfe
1.1.376 SP 2. SON] Q1; LUCIUS, Ravenscroft; QUINTUS, Rowe, Rolfe; MART.
Cappell, Maxwell
1.1.378 Renownèd] Q3 (Renowned); Renowned Q1-Q2
1.1.384 Ajax] Q2 (Aiace); Ayax Q1
1.1.385 Laertes’] F; wise Laertes Qq
1.1.389 Bevington adds SD [They rise]
1.1.392 SD him] Q1; Mutius W08
1.1.395 SP and SD [MARCUS and TITUS’S SONS] (kneeling)] Bate; they all
kneele and say, Q1 (centered); They all kneele and say. Q2, Q3 (say,). F (centered); They
all [but Titus] kneel and say: MARCUS, LUCIUS, MARTIUS, QUINTUS W08; Capell
uses the SP ALL BUT TITUS; [All.] Witherspoon, Craig, Wilson; All. [Kneeling] Rolfe,
Maxwell; RSC removes the SD for kneeling, and for rising on line 396
[They rise] / Exeunt. [Titus and Marcus remain] / this edn; Exit all but Marcus and Titus.] Q1-Q2, Q3 (...Titus); Exit. F; Hughes; all but Titus and Marcus stand aside, Kittredge; om. Rowe, Maxwell, Rolfe

1.1.397 sudden] F; dririe Qq, Pope (dreary)

1.1.403 beholding] Q1; beholden Bate

1.1.404 Yes,] F; MARCUS Yes, Dyce (Malone); line not in Qq

1.1.404.1 SD Flourish.] F; not in Qq

1.1.404.2 SD others [Titus’s three sons] (after RSC); others. Qq, F; [Titus’s three sons] Bate; Lucius, Quintus, Martius, Oxf.; [Titus’s SONS] Hughes

1.1.404 SD appears in two columns in Q1, as one column and centered Q2-Q3, F; Flourish. Re-enter, from one side, SATURNINUS attended, TAMORA, DEMETRIUS, CHIRON, and AARON; from the other, BASSIANUS, LAVINIA, and others Capell

1.1.405 Bassianus] Q3; Bascianus Q1-Q2

1.1.412 true-betrothèd] Theobald; true betrothed Qq, F

1.1.414 I am] Q3; am I Q1-Q2

1.1.433 SD [Titus may kneel here] Bevington (He kneels) (at 431), Waith; Hughes [Kneels]; RSC kneels (at 431); not in Qq, F

1.1.435 Oxf (Waith 1984), W08 adds SD [to Saturninus]

1.1.441] Q1; 2 lines in F (Lord, / The)

1.1.447 Lose Q1 (Loose)

1.1.449 SD] Rowe (Aside to Saturnine); Bate notes that the line in Qq is indented possibly suggesting this aside.

1.1.454 us] Q3; you Q1

1.1.454 ingratitude] Q1-2, F; ingratude Q3

1.1.455 sin,] Rowe; sinne. Qq, F (sin ne.)

1.1.458 raze Q1 (race); race Maxwell

1.1.459 cruèl] Q1 (cruell); cruel Wilson, Craig

1.1.459 trait’rous] Q3 (trayt’rous), F (traytrous); traiterous Q1-Q2 (trayterous); traitorous Bate, Craig, RSC, W08, Hughes, Wilson, Maxwell, Rolfe

1.1.463 SD /Aloud/] Hanmer

1.1.466 SP SATURNINUS] Q1; King. Q3, F (and at 486, 490)

1.1.466] Q1; 2 lines in F (rise, / My)

1.1.467 SD /Rises/] Bevington; [rising] Waith

1.1.467-68] Q1; each is 2 lines in F (Maiestie, / And) and (lookes, / Infuse)

1.1.474 reconciled] Q3 (reconsil’d); reconciled Q1; thus reconcilèd Q2

1.1.478] Q1; 2 lines in F (Lords, / And)

1.1.481 SD [Marcus and Titus’s sons kneel] this edn; not in Qq, F; [Titus’s sons kneel] Bate; Marcus, Lavinia, and Titus sons kneel, Craig (after the collier MS); Lavinia, Lucius, Quintus, and Martius kneel, Oxf.; Marcus, Lavinia, Lucius, Quintus, and Martius kneel W08; [they kneel] Wilson (after 479)

1.1.481 SP SON] F; LUCIUS, Rowe and most subsequent eds; Q1 continues with Tamora speaking this line; Q2 indents without an SP; All Q3; MARTIUS, Ravenscroft

1.1.481-82 divided thus] F; 1 line in Qq

1.1.483 mildly] Q2; mildly Q1
1.1.485 Oxf adds the SD [kneeling] after the SP

1.1.485 I do] Q2 (I doe); doo I Q1

1.1.487] Q1; 2 lines in F (nay, / Sweet)

1.1.490] Q1; 2 lines in F (Marcus./ For)

1.1.492 SD [Marcus and Titus’s sons] stand up/ Lavinia] Pope; Stand vp: Lavinia Qq, F (as spoken line); Stand up. (They rise) Lavinia Chambers (who includes Titus as one of those that rise); Stand up./ Lavinia Rowe, Capell

1.1.494 swore] Q1; sware F

1.1.501] Q1; 2 lines in F (Hound,/ Weele)

1.1.502-2.1.0 SD Flourish. Exeunt./ [2.1] / Enter Aaron alone] Rolfe (om. alone);
Exeunt. / sound trumpets , maner Moore. Q1-Q2, Q3 (Trumpets,); Exeunt./ Actus Secunda./ Flourish. Enter Aaron alone. F; Sound trumpets. Exeunt all but Aaron./ 2.1 Waith; Sound trumpets. Exeunt all except the Moor./ [2.1], Bate; [Sound trumpets. Exeunt all but Aaron./ ACT II/ SCENE I/ AARON alone. Maxwell ; They troop out with trumpets blowing./ Aaron remains/ [2.1.] Wilson

2.[1] Rowe; Actus Secunda F; not in Qq; see explanatory note for 2.[1] in text for Johnson’s argument that F’s break is an error.

2.1.4 above] Q1; about F

2.1.4 reach:] F; reach, Qq; reach; W08; reach. Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe, Hughes

2.1.8 highest-peering] Theobald; highest piering Qq, F

2.1.8 hills.] Rolfe; hills. Qq; hills: F; hills; Craig, Maxwell

2.1.9 Tamora;] W08; Tamora. Q1-2 (centered), Q3 (Tamora centered), F (Tamora; (see W08 longer note on punctuation lines 4 and 9)

2.1.13 mount] Q1; soar W. S. Walker

2.1.18 idle] Q3; seruile Q1-2

2.1.20 empress] F (Empresse); Emperesse Qq

2.1.22 nymph] Q1 (Nymph); Queene Q3, F

2.1.24 shipwreck] Q1 (shipwracke)

2.1.25 Hallo] Bate; Hollo Qq, F; Holla F2-4; Holloa Cam, Wilson, Rolfe; Hullo Alexander

2.1.26 years want] F2; yeares wants Q1-Q2 (yeeres), Q3-F (yeres)

2.1.26 wit wants] Q2; wits wants Q1; wits want Cam (D. Wilson 1948, 68)

2.1.28 know’st] F; knowest Qq

2.1.32 or] Q1; om. Hanmer (to try and make iambic, with gracious as bisyllabic.)

2.1.37 SP AARON] F (Aron); Moore Q1-2 (throughout scene); Moore Q3

2.1.37 Dyce, Rolfe, RSC add SD [Aside]

2.1.46 Dyce, Rolfe adds SD [coming forward]; [comes forward] Wilson

2.1.47 you] Q2; yee Q1

2.1.57 these] Q3; those Q1-2

2.1.60] Q1; 2 lines in F (Coward, / That)

2.1.62] Capell adds SD beating down their swords

2.1.64 pretty] F; pettie Q1; Petty Q2; petty Q3

2.1.66 set] F; iet Qq

2.1.68 Bassianus] Q3; Bascianus Q1-Q2
2.1.72 discord’s] Q1 (discords); discord F
2.1.75] Q1; 2 lines in F (Youngling,/ Learne)
2.1.77 Why, are] Theobald; Why are Qq, F
2.1.77 Rome] F3; Rome, Qq, F-F2
2.1.83 To achieve Q1-2 (To atchiue); Q3-F (To atchieue); T’achieve Bate
2.1.84 To achieve] Q1-Q2 (To atchiue), Q3 (To atchieve), F (To atcheiue); T’achieve
Bate
2.1.84 her how?] Q1; her,how? Q3, F; her! how? Witherspoon, Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe
2.1.85 Why mak’st] Witherspoon, Wilson, Rolfe; VVhy makes Q1-Q2; Why, makes
Q3; Why,mak’st F
2.1.89 What, man,] RSC; VVhat man, Qq, F; What, man! Craig, Witherspoon,
Wilson, Maxwell, Rolfe
2.1.94 Theobald adds SD [Aside]
2.1.94 Saturninus] Q1; Saturnine Q3; Saturnius F
2.1.97 What,] Pope; What Qq, F
2.1.97 struck] Q3, F (strucke); stroke Q1; strooke Q2
2.1.107] Q1; line does not appear in F
2.1.117 than] Rowe; this Qq, F
2.1.129 with all that] Q2; withall what Q1; with all what Alexander
2.1.134 of ears] Q3; and eares Q1-2
2.1.137 lusts] F; lust Qq
2.1.137 shadowed] F (shadow’d); shadowed Qq (ie shadowèd)
2.1.140 streams] F; streame Qq
2.1.141 their] Q3; these Q1-2
2.1.142 Stygia] Q1 (Stigia); Styga F4, Rolfe
2.1.142 [2.2] scene division] Rowe; 2.1 Bate; no division in Qq, F
2.2.0.1 SD and his three sons,] Q1; and his three sons, Lucius, Quintus, Martius
W08, Hughes; with Hunters, etc., MARCUS, LUCIUS, QUINTUS, and MARTIUS
Rolfe
2.2.0.1-2 and Marcus] F; Bate inserts after ‘sons,’; not in Qq
2.2.1 morn] Q3 (morne); Moone Q1-2
2.2.10.1 SD] Q1; Wind horns added by F before following Qq’s stage direction is an
occasion of a duplicate sound call.
2.2.11 Qq, F repeats the SP for Titus here
2.2.14 lords] Q1; lord Dyce, Rolfe
2.2.18 broad awake] Q1; awake F
2.2.17-18 thus divided by F] 1 line Qq
2.2.20 Madam] Q1; [to Tamora] Madam Johnson, Rolfe
2.2.24 promontory] Q1 (promontarie); P omontary F
2.2.26 runs] Q1; runne F2, Wilson, Witherspoon, Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe
2.2.26 like] Q1; likes F
2.2.27 Capell and most eds since, Craig adds the SD [aside]; W08 (to Chiron)
[2.3] scene division Capell; 2.2 Bate; no division in Qq, F

2.3.0 SD alone.] Q1; alone [with a money-bag] Bate; alone with money Ravenscroft; alone with a bag of gold Capell, Craig; alone [with gold] Hughes; with a bag of gold Rolfe

2.3.1 SP AARON] F (Aron); (Moore.) Qq throughout the scene

2.3.9 chest.] Q1; chest. [Hides the money-bag] Bate; chest. Aaron digs a hole in the Earth with his Sword, & bury's the bag of money Ravenscroft; chest. Hides the Gold Malone, Rolfe (at line 8), RSC; Craig; chest./ He hides the gold. W08

2.3.0 SD Tamora] F; Tamora alone Qq

2.3.9.0 SD to the Moor] Q1; om. Rolfe

2.3.10] Q1; 2 lines in F (Aaron./ Wherefore)

2.3.13 snake lies] Q3 (Snake); snakes lies Q1-2; snakes lie Ravenscroft

2.3.15 checkered] F (cheker’d); checker’d Qq; chequer’d Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe; chequered RSC

2.3.17 echo] Q1 (eccho); Ecchoe Q2-Q3; Eccho F

2.3.20 yelping] F; yelloeing Qq

2.3.22 enjoyed] F (enjoy’d); inioyed Q1 (ie enjoyèd), Maxwell; enjoyed Q2-Q3

2.3.30] Q1; 2 lines in F (Madame./ Though)

2.3.32 deadly-standing] Theobald; deadlie standing Q1; deadly standing Q2-Q3, F

2.3.34 woolly] Q2 (woollie); wollie Q1

2.3.46] Bevington adds SD [Gives letter]; W08 He holds out a letter which Tamora takes. (after line 45)

2.3.47 fatal-plotted] Theobald; fatall plotted Qq, F

2.3.48 more:] Bate; more Q1, Q3; more, Q2, F; more; Maxwell

2.3.50 SD Bassianus] Q3; Bascianus Q1-Q2

2.3.50 SD Enter ... Lavinia.] Qq, F; moved after Exit at line 54 by Pope, Rolfe; RSC

adds At a distance

2.3.51] Q1; 2 lines in F (Moore:/ Sweeter)

2.3.54 quarrels] Q1; quarrell Q3-F

2.3.54 SD/Exit] Rowe; [he goes Wilson

2.3.55 Whom] F; who Q1; Who Q2-Q3

2.3.55] Q1; 2 lines in F (heere ?/ Romes)

2.3.56 her] Q1; our Q3, F

2.3.60 our] Q3; my Q1-2

2.3.61 power] Q2; powre Q1; pow’r Alexander

2.3.64 drive] Q1; dine Collier (2nd ed.)

2.3.64 thy] Q1 ; his Q3, F

2.3.69 try experiments] Q2; trie thy experimens Q1

2.3.72 swarth] F; swartie Q1-2; swarty Q3; swart Capell, Maxwell; swarthy

Bevington

2.3.72 Cimmerian F2; Cymerion Qq, F

2.3.78 Accompanied] Q3; Accompanied but Q1-2

2.3.82 I pray] Q1-F; [To Bassianus] I pray Oxf1

2.3.86 note] Pope; notice Qq, F
2.3.88, 91 SP TAMORA] F (Tamora, Tamo.); Queene Qq; but elsewhere Tamora or Tam. 
2.3.89] Q1; 2 lines in F (Souveraigne/ And); Q3 Soveraigne ...
2.3.90 doth] Q1; does Rowe, W08
2.3.92 'ticed F (tic'd); ticed Q1 (ie 'ticèd); tyced Q2-Q3
2.3.95 O'ercome] Q2-3 (Orecome), F (Ore-come); Overcome Q1
2.3.108 Lascivious] Q3; Lauicious Q1-2, (See Hughes note)
2.3.115 be ye not henceforth] Q1 (be yee not hence forth); be not henceforth Capell; be ye not henceforward Ox.: be ye not from henceforth Pope
2.3.117 SD (Stabs him.) this edn; stab him. Qq, F; [stabs Bassianus Wilson, Rolfe; He stabs Bassianus W08; [They] stab [Bassianus] Hughes (after 117)
2.3.118 Ay, come,] Hanmer, Craig; I come Qq, F; I, come Theobald; Ay come,
2.3.120 thy] Q3; the Q1-2
2.3.123 thrash] Q1; thresh Hughes, W08
2.3.123 after] Q2; alter Q1 (the ‘l’ corrected in ink to an ‘f’)
2.3.126 painted] Q1; quainte Oxf; pall’d (conj. A. Walker); fals’d (conj. T. M. Robertson)
2.3.126 bravest] Q1; she braves F2, Wilson
2.3.128] Q1; 2 lines in F (doe./ I)
2.3.131 we] Q1; ye F2
2.3.135 nice-preservèd] F; nice preserued Qq
2.3.136 bear’st] F; bearest Qq
2.3.136 woman’s] Q1 (womans); woman F
2.3.139 Oxf/W08 adds SD (to Tamora)
2.3.142 suck’st] Qq (suckst), F; suck’dst (conj. Ravenscroft), Rowe2, Rolfe, Craig, Wilson;
2.3.147 Dyce, Rolfe, Craig, Wilson, RSC add SD to Chiron
2.3.147 woman] Q2; womans Q1
2.3.148-9 divided thus] F; 1 line in Qq
2.3.150] Q1; 2 lines in F (true./ The)
2.3.151 have I] Q1; I have W08, Hughes, Wilson
2.3.151 heard] Q2; hard Q1
2.3.152 moved] F (mou’d); moued Qq (ie movèd)
2.3.153 paws] Q1; claws (Coll. M.S.), Hudson
2.3.154 Some] Q2; So me Q1
2.3.159 thee] Q1; thee: Theobald; thee! Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig, Witherspoon
2.3.160 slain thee.] F (slaine thee:); slaine thee, Qq; slain thee; Hughes
2.3.161 ears] Q3, F (eares); yeares Q1, Q2
2.3.169 [grabbing...clothes/] this ed; [clinging to Tamora] Bate; Clings to Tamora RSC; She tugs at Tamora’s garments Bevington (at 171); embracing Tamora’s knees Oxf1/ W08 (but surrounded in []); [clasps her knees] Wilson; not in Qq, F
2.3.170] Q1; 2 lines in F (Tamora./ Be)
2.3.172 Bassianus] F; Bascianus Q1-Q2; Bussianus Q3
2.3.173 then? ... woman, ...go.] F3; then ... woman ...goe? Q1-Q2; then? ... woman ...go? Q3 (goe), F, F2; then, ...woman? ... go! Bate; then, ...woman... go. Chambers (1907), Maxwell
2.3.176 their] Q2; there Q1
2.3.181 satisfy] Q2 (satisfie); satisfiee (possibly satisfice) Q1
2.3.182 Oxf adds SD [to Lavinia]
2.3.182 Away.] Q3; Away Q1-Q2; Away! Rolfe, Maxwell, Hughes, W08
2.3.182] Q1; 2 lines in F (Away./ For)
2.3.183] Q1; 2 lines in F (Garace, / No)
2.3.185 fall——] Q3; fall Q1; fall. Q2
2.3.186 mouth.—] RSC; mouth F; mouth, Qq; mouth. [Grabs her, covering her mouth.] Bate; mouth Grabs Her RSC; mouth [he gags her]. Wilson;
2.3.186-7 divided thus] F; 1 line Qq
2.3.187 Oxf adds SD [to Demetrius]
2.3.188 SD [Demetrius throws Bassianus’s body into the pit, he and Chiron then exeunt, dragging off Lavinia] Bate (after Capell, who left out the ‘off’); Exeunt F2; no SD Qq, F; Exeunt Dem. Chi. Dragging Lavinia Ravenscroft (he earlier included the SD Chir. throws the Body into the Vault, Tam. the whilst holds Lav.); Demetrius throws the body of Bassianus into the pit [and covers opening with branches]; then exeunt Chiron and Demetrius with Lavinia W08; [Chiron and Demetrius throw the body of Bassianus in the pit, and exit with Lavinia] Hughes; Demetrius heaves the corpse into a pit, thereafter covering it with branches; the two then go off dragging Lavinia between them Wilson; [Exeunt CHIRON and DEMETRIUS with LAVINIA Maxwell
2.3.193.1 SD Exit] F; not in Qq; [she goes Wilson
2.3.193.2 SD Enter] Q1; Enter from another direction Wilson; Re-enter Rolfe
2.3.193.2 SD [Quintus and Martius] Capell
2.3.194 SP AARON] F; not in Qq (implied by preceding SD).
2.3.199 SD [Martius falls into the pit.] this edn.; (Falls into the pit) Rowe; He falls into the pit Wilson
2.3.200] Q1; 2 lines in F (fallen ?/ What)
2.3.201 rude-growing] Pope; rude growing Qq; Rude growing F
2.3.203 morning’s] Q3; morning Q1-2;
2.3.206, 211, 216, 224, 226, 244, 252, 259 Bate adds SD [from below]; Collier adds [under the stage] Collier MS
2.3.206 object hurt] Q1; object Q3, F; and 2 lines in F (Brother,/ With)
2.3.208 SP AARON] Q1; AARON [aside] Johnson
2.3.210 SD Exit Aaron.] F; Exit. Q2-3; Exit. Q1 (after 209); [he goes Wilson
2.3.212 unhallowed] F (vnhallow’d); vn hollow Qq
2.3.216 true-divining] Theobald; true diuining Qq, F
2.3.219] Q1; 2 lines in F (gone, And)
2.3.222 how] Q3; who Q1, Q2
2.3.224 embrewèd here] Q2; bereaud in blood Q1; berayed in blood Cam1/ Wilson; crossed out and replaced by ‘heere reav’d of lyfe’ MS emendation in Q1; bedaub’d or bedew’d in blood (conf. Bolton)
2.3.225 the] F; a Qq
2.3.229 the] Q3; this Q1-2
2.3.231 earthly] Q3; earthy Q1-2
2.3.232 the] F; this Qq
2.3.233 Pyramus] Q2; Priamus Q1; Piramus Q3; Piramus F
cd 2.3.237 fell devouring] Q1; fell-devouring W. S. Walker
cdi 2.3.238 Cocytus’] F2 (Cocitus); Ocitus Qq, F
cdii 2.3.239 Bate adds SD [reaches into pit]; Offering to help Bevington
cdiii 2.3.242 SD [Tries to pull him up.] this edn.; [he strives Wilson
cdiv 2.3.245 more:] RSC; more, Qq, F; more Pope; more; Theobald
cdv 2.3.246 SD [Tries again.] this edn.; [he strives again Wilson
cdvi 2.3.247.1 SD Both fall in] F (Boths); Falls in Pope; He falls in. Wilson; not in Qq
cdvi 2.3.247.2 SD Enter the Emperor, Aaron the Moor] Q3 (Aron); Enter the Emperour and Aron, the Moore Q1-Q2; Enter SATURNINUS with AARON
cdvi 2.3.247.2 SD [and Attendants] RSC; with Attendants Ravenscroft, Theobald
cdx 2.3.249 it.—] Q1 (it.); it./ [Speaks into the pit] Bevington
cdx 2.3.252 son] Q2; sonnes Q1
cdx 2.3.255 dead?] F; dead, Qq; dead! Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig
cdx 2.3.258 him] Q3; them Q1-Q2
cdxii 2.3.259 him] F; them Qq
cdxiv 2.3.260 alas.] Q1; alas! Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig
cdx 2.3.260 SD Enter] Q1; Re-enter Rolfe
cdxvi 2.3.260 SD [with Attendant, Titus] Rolfe (with Attendants ; TITUS), Craig ([with Attendants], [Titus]); [Titus] Cam; [with Attendants] Hughes
cdxvii 2.3.262 SP SATURNINUS] Qq and F (King.) through the rest of the scene, except
269 in which Saturninus centered as SD in Qq, F
cdxviii 2.3.262 gride] Bate; griuèd Q1 (Hughes reads as grieved); greeu’d Q2; grieved Q3; grieu’d F; gripped Cam1 (J.C. Maxwell); gored (G. R. Proudfoot); grip’d Maxwell; gnaw’d W. S. Walker
cdxix 2.3.270 SP and SD SATURNINUS reads the letter.] Qq, F centered as an SD
cdx 2.3.273 meaning.] Rolfe; meaning; Maxwell; meaning: Pope; meaning Q1; meaning, Q2-Q3, F
cdxi 2.3.273 reward] F; reward, Q1-2; reward. Q3
cdxii 2.3.278] Qq, F repeat SP King, first om. by Theobald
cdxiii 2.3.282 AARON] Qq, F; AARON [finding the money-bag] Bate; Shewing it
Johnson; [discovers it Wilson
cdxiv 2.3.283 SD [To Titus.]] Ravenscroft, Rowe, Capell, Rolfe
3.285 SD [To attendants.] this edn

3.287 torturing] F3; tortering Qq, F-F2

3.288 What, ] Rowe (3rd); What Qq, F

3.288] Q1; 2 lines in F (pit./ Oh)

3.289 discoverèd.] Qq, F; discovered. / [Attendants pull Quintus, Martius, and Bassianus’s body from the pit] Bevington, Capell at 304, W08 at 286 (substitutes drag for pull); [they hale them forth Wilson/ ↓Attendants may pull Quintus and Martius, and Bassianus’s body from the pit↓

3.290] Bevington adds SD [kneeling]; Hughes [Kneels]

3.293 faults] Q1; fault Ravenscroft, Rowe

3.294 proved?] F (prou’d); proude, Q1; prou’d, Q2; prou’d! Q3; proved!

Wilson

3.297] Q1; 2 lines in F (Lord./ Yet)

3.298 father’s] Rowe; Fathers Qq, F; fathers’ Delius, Hughes, W08

3.298 reverend] F4; reuerent Qq, F-F3

3.306 SD [Aside to Titus.] this edn.

3.308] Bevington adds SD [rising]

3.308] Q1; 2 lines in F (come./ Stay)

3.308 SD Exeunt. ] F; not in Qq; Capell has Emperor’s party exiting at 306, then Titus and Lucius at 307; Oxf has Sat. exiting at 305; Bevington adds SD [some taking the body, some guarding the prisoners]; W08 adds SD with Martius and Quintus under guard; attendants bearing the body of Bassianus

[2.4] Dyce; 2.3 Bate; not in Qq, F

2.4.0.1 SD the Empress’ sons] Q1; om. Rolfe

2.4.0.1 SD [Demetrius and Chiron] Rolfe, RSC; Chiron and Demetrius Capell

2.4.4 thee.] Rowe (conj. Ravenscroft); thee Qq, F

2.4.5 scrawl] Q1 (scrowle); scowle F; scrowl Craig

2.4.6 Q1; 2 lines in F (home./ Call)

2.4.10 SP DEMETRIUS] Q2 (Deme.); Dmet. Q1

2.4.10.1 SD Exeunt] Q1, F; Not in Q2, Q3

2.4.10.1 SD [Chiron and Demetrius] Ravenscroft, Theobald

2.4.10.2 SD Wind horns] F; not in Qq

2.4.10.3 SD from hunting to Lavinia.] F; from hunting Qq; from hunting [Lavinia runs away] Bate; from hunting, Lavinia flees from him Bevington

2.4.11 SP MARCUS] is implied by the SD in Qq, F

2.4.11 this?...fast!—] Rolfe; this, ... fast, Q1-Q2; this ... fast? Q3; this, ... fast? F; this— ...fast? Bate; this? ... fast? Hughes W08;

2.4.12 husband—] Q1 (husband:); husband? Q3, F; husband?— Rolfe; husband?/ [Lavinia turns] Bate; He sees her injuries Bevington; He sees La. She turns away and hangs down her head Ravenscroft; [she turns her face Wilson

2.4.15 in] Q2; an Q1

2.4.17 Hath] Q1; Have Rolfe, Craig

2.4.21 half] Q1; have Theobald

2.4.21 me?] Q1; me? [Lavinia opens her mouth.] Bate
cdlviii 2.4.26 deflow‘red] Q1 (deflowred); defloured Q2-Q3, F
cdlx 2.4.27 lest] Q1; least Q2-Q3, F
cdlx 2.4.28 him] Rowe (conj. Ravenscroft); them Qq, F
cdlxi 2.4.30 three] Hanmer; their Q1, Q3, F; theyr Q2
cdlxii 2.4.32 Blushing] Q2; Bushing Q1 (the ‘l’ inserted or enhanced by pen) (Malone)
cdlxiii 2.4.33 thee? ... so?] F (second ? is inverted); thee, ... so. Q1-Q2; thee, ... so? Q3
cdlxiv 2.4.36 conceale[d] Q2; concea ed Q1 (the ‘l’ inserted or enhanced by pen) (Malone)
cdlxv 2.4.37 heart] Q1 (hart)
cdlxvi 2.4.38 Philomela] Q1; Philomella Q3; Philomela F; Philomel Wright
cdlxvii 2.4.38 she] Q3; why she Q1-2
cdlxviii 2.4.39, 43 sewed] Pope; sowed Qq, F
cdlxix 2.4.41 hast thou met withal] F; Cosen hast thou met Q1, Q2; hast thou met Q3
cdli 2.4.55 What will] Q1; What, will F
cdlii 3.1[1] Rowe; Actus Tertius. F; not in Qq
cdliii 3.1.0.1 SD Judges and Senators] Q1; [Tribunes as] Judges and [the] Senators Bate; 
Judges, Senators, and Tribunes most edns since Capell; Judges, Tribunes, and Senators
Hughes
cdliv 3.1.0.1 SD [Martius and Quintus/] Capell; [QUINTUS and MARTIUS] Hughes
cdlv 3.1.02 SD on] Q1; over Waith (conj. Wells)
cdlvi 3.1.0.2 SD the stage] Q1; om. Rolfe, Wilson
cdlvii 3.1.0.2 SD the stage] Q1; om. Rolfe, Wilson
cdlviii 3.1.4 Rome’s] Q2 (Romes); Roomes Q1
cdlix 3.1.9 is] Q1; are F2
cdlx 3.1.11 SD Judges] Q1; Judges and others W08; Judges, etc. Rolfe
cdlxi 3.1.11 SD] Q1; Rolfe, Witherspoon adds SD [and Exeunt]

dcli 3.1.12 these two.] Oxf; these Qq, F; these, these F2-F3; these, these, F4; these, good
Malone; these, O Jackson ShS; these, two RSC
cdlxii 3.1.13 tears] Q1; cares Hudson
cdlxiii 3.1.14 stanch] Q2; staunch Q1
cdlxiv 3.1.15 SD Exeunt.] F (placed after the next line, because 15 is a long line); not in
Qq; many previous editors seem to mistakenly place the exit after 16.
cdlxv 3.1.15 SD [Titus remains/] RSC ; all but Titus Capell; [Judges] Hughes; the judges
and others with prisoners W08 (after 16); [Senators, Tribunes, and the Others, with the
Prisoners] Witherspoon
cdlxvi 3.1.17 ruins] Q1; urns Hamner
cdlxvii 3.1.18 show’rs] Qq, F (showres); showers Rolfe, Craig
cdlxviii 3.1.21 on thy] Q2; out hy Q1 (upside down n)
cdlxix 3.1.22 sons’] Theobald (2nd); sonnes Qq, F; Son’s F4
cdlix 3.1.23 reverend] F3; reurent Qq, F-F2

cdxc 3.1.23 gentle, aged men] RSC; gentle aged men Qq, F; gentle-aged men W. S.
Walker; gentle-aged-men Boswell; gentle, aged men Rolfe

cdxcii 3.1.23 tribunes! ... men!] Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig; Tribunes, ... men Q1; Tribunes, ... 
men Q2; Tribunes, ... men, Q3, F; tribunes; ... men! Hughes

cdxcii 3.1.28 you not] Qq, F2-4; not F

cdxciii 3.1.34 me, or if] Q2-3; me, if Q1; me:oh if F; me; if Hughes, W08
3.1.34 did mark] Q1; did heare F
3.1.35 They...me.] F; They would not pittie me, yet pleade I must,/ And bootlesse vnto them.] Q1-2; All bootlesse vnto them. Q3
3.1.36 sorrows bootless to] Q3; sorrowes to Q1-2
3.1.44 as soft] F; soft as Qq
3.1.44-45 divided thus] F; 1 line in Qq
3.1.52 Oxf1/ W08 adds SD [rising]; at 39 Hudson; at 47 Dyce, Rolfe and Craig ([Rises); at 48 RSC
3.1.56 and] Q1; and and F
3.1.59 noble] Q3; aged Q1-2; agèd Wilson
3.1.65 Oxf1 adds SD [falling to his knees]; W08 (falling on his knees)
3.1.66 her.—] Q1 (her,), F (her.); her.—[Lucius rises] Oxf1; her./ [Lucius rises]
3.1.70 bright-burning] F3; bright burning Qq, F-2
3.1.71.75] Q1; 2 lines in F (woe./ In)
3.1.72 Sweet varied] Q1; Sweet-varied W. S. Walker
3.1.88] Q1; 2 lines in F (her./ Who)
3.1.92] Q1; 2 lines in F (Deare,/ And)
3.1.96] Q1; 2 lines in F (tide,/ Grow)
3.1.111 Ravenscroft adds SD Lav. makes signs of sorrow lifting up her eyes then hanging down her head moving her stumps.
3.1.114 gathered] Qq, F (gathered)
3.1.114 Bate; withered Qq, F (ie. witherèd)
3.1.115] Q1; 2 lines in F (her/ husband)
3.1.116 them] Q1; him Q3, F
3.1.117 W08 adds SD (to Lavinia)
3.1.122 signs] F; signe Qq
3.1.126 like] Q1, Rowe; in Q2-3, F
3.1.135 miseries] F; miserie Q1-Q2; misery Q3
3.1.138] Ravenscroft adds SD Lav. turns up her eyes & then hangs down her head as weeping
3.1.139] Ravenscroft adds SD Gives handkerchief; Wilson [proffers his handkerchief
3.1.144] Ravenscroft adds SD Lav. shakes her head & points at Mar. handkercher as refusing to have her eyes wiped; Wilson [proffers his handkerchief; she shakes her head
3.1.147 napkin] Q2 (Napkin); napking Q1
3.1.147 his true] F4; her true Qq, F-F3
3.1.151,175, 190 SP AARON] Q1 (Moore, at 190 Moore)
3.1.170 enemy’s] (conj. Capell); enemies Qq, F; enemies’ Theobald
3.1.170 castle] Q1; casque Theobald; cask Hanmer; crest Walker
3.1.179 withered] F; withred Qq; with’red Maxwell
3.1.186-87] Q1; These lines are printed as one line of verse by Malone, Waith, Hughes, Craig

3.1.187 SD *Exeunt [Lucius and Marcus]*] Theobald; *Exeunt* Qq, F; *[Lucius and Marcus hurry off]* Wilson

3.1.189 SD [Aside/] Ravenscroft, Rowe

3.1.193.1 SD hand] Q1; *left hand* Oxf1/ W08; Collier MS adds SD [with an axe]

3.1.193.2 SD again] Qq, F; *Re enter Rolfe* (at beginning of SD)

3.1.194 your] Q1; you F

3.1.195 my] Q1; me F

3.1.199 for] Q1; for for F

3.1.203 SD [Aside/] Rowe

3.1.205 W08 adds SD [Laughs as he moves to one side]

3.1.209] Ravenscroft adds SD [kneels]; W08 adds (kneeling) at the beginning of the speech at 208

3.1.211 wilt] F; wouldst Q1; would Q2-3

3.1.211 SD [To Lavinia)] Collier MS; *To Lavinia, who kneels* W08

3.1.216 possibilities] Q3; possibilitie Q1-2

3.1.218 Is ... sorrow] Q1; Are ... sorrows (Heath conj. Dyce 1866); Is ... sorrows Maxwell (after Dyce 1866)

3.1.219 passions] Q1-Q2, F; passios Q3

3.1.227 do] Q2; doth Q1

3.1.227 blow] F2; flow Qq, F

3.1.232 why my] Maxwell, Craig; why,my Qq, F; why? my Wilson

3.1.232 her] Q1; their (conj. Theobald)

3.1.235.1 SD Bate adds *[Titus and Lavinia may rise here]*; Oxf, W08 at 277

3.1.240 griefs, their sports,] F (sports:); griefe, their sports : Q1; grieve theyr sports :Q2; griefes their sports: Q3; griefs their sport Ravenscroft; grief their sports, Hughes; griefs their sports, Craig; grief’s their sport, Pope

3.1.242 SD Exit.] Q2; not in Q1; *Sets down heads and hand, exit.* Bevington; RSC place at 239, with the exit omitted

3.1.243 Ætna] Q1 (Ætna)

3.1.251] Q1; *[Lavinia kisses the heads.*] Bate; [she walks to the heads and kisses them.] G1620; *[To Lavinia, seeing her kiss the Heads of her Brothers]* Capell; *Lucius kisses one head* Ravenscroft; *Lavinia kisses him [i.e. Lucius]* Johnson; *Lavinia kisses Titus* Johnson

3.1.255 flattery] Q2-Q3, F (flatterie); flattrie Q1; flatt’ry Kittredge

3.1.257 hand] Q1; hands F

3.1.258 son] Q1; sonnes F

3.1.261 thy] Q1 (Theobald); my Q2-3, F

3.1.262 Rend] Rowe2, Wilson; Rent Qq, F

3.1.268 Why?] Bate, G. R. Proudfoot; *VW*hy Qq, F; Why, Craig, Rolfe, Maxwell

3.1.270 wat’ry] Q1 (watrie), Q2-F (watry); watery Rolfe

3.1.276 have] Q2; hath Q1

3.1.277 do.] F3; doe, Qq, F; do;/ *[He and Lavinia rise]* W08;
3.1.278 about,] Q3; about. Q1-Q2; about Hughes
3.1.280 wrongs.] F; wrongs, Qq
3.1.280 Bate adds [They make a vow.] after G1620; [They form a circle about Titus, and he pledges them.] Bevington; Marcus, Lucius, and Lavinia circle Titus. He pledges them Waith; He kneels, with MARCUS, LUCIUS, LAVINIA and the two heads round about him; then raises his hand to heaven Wilson
3.1.281 Wilson adds SD [he rises.]
3.1.282 will I] Q1; I will RSC
3.1.283 And] Q1; not in F2, Hudson
3.1.283 employed in these things:] F; imployde in these Armes Q1-2; imployd in these Armes, Q3; employ’d in this Hudson (conj. Lettsom); employed Oxf, Riv, (conj Cam)
3.1.284 between thy teeth] Q1; between thine arms Oxf
3.1.285 W08 adds SD (to Lucius)
3.1.288 if you] Q2; if yee Q1
3.1.289 SD Lucius remains] F (Manet Lucius); not in Qq; all but Lucius W08, Hughes Bevington adds [They kiss]; Wilson [they kiss; Titus departs with Marcus and Lavinia; Rolfe [Exeunt Titus, Marcus, and Lavinia
3.1.292 Rome, ... again,] F; Rome ... againe, Qq; Rome! ... again, Rowe; Rome, ...
again; Maxwell; Rome, ... again. RSC
3.1.293 loves] Q1; leaves Rowe, Wilson; loans (conj. Ridley)
3.1.299 empress] Q2 (Empresse); Emperesse Q1
3.1.300 like] Q1; likes F
3.1.301 power] Q2; powre Q1; pow’r Kittredge
3.2] F; scene not in Qq; numbered 3.2 by Capell
3.2.0.1 SD banquet] F2; Bnaket F; Witherspoon, Rolfe adds SD [set out]
3.2.0.2 SD [Titus] Rowe
3.2.0.2 SD [Young Lucius] Rowe, Theobald; (Lucius’s son) W08; [YOUNG LUCIUS, with Servants] Hughes
3.2.1 SP TITUS] Rowe; An. F (throughout the scene and nowhere else in the text)
3.2.3 Oxf adds SD [They sit]
3.2.7 folded] F (foulded)
3.2.9 Who] F; And Rowe
3.12] Johnson, Rolfe add SD [to Lavinia]
3.13 with outrageous] F2; without ragious F
3.14 still.] Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe; still? F1-F2; still: F3-F4
3.2.23 now?] RSC; now! F
3.2.26 hands?] this edn.; hands, F
3.2.35 no drink!] Rolfe, Waith; no drinke? F; no drink. Craig; to drink T. W. Craik
3.2.38 Brewed] F (Breu’d)
3.2.38 meshed] F (mesh’d), Maxwell; mashed Dyce2; Craig (mash’d), Waith and Bate (note that ‘mashed’ is part of the brewing process, previously noted by Craig)
3.2.39 complainer, I] Capell; complayne, I F (uncorr.); complaynet, I F (miscorr.); complaint, O I F2-F4; complainant, I Collier MS; *(see Hinman vol. I, 289-90 ala Hughes)

3.2.46 SP YOUNG LUCIUS] Theobald; Boy. F

3.2.46 SD Wilson adds [sobs]

3.2.50 sapling,] F; sapling! W08; Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe

3.2.52 thy knife] F2; knife F

3.2.53 fly] F2; Flys F

3.2.54 thee,] F3; the F1-2

3.2.55 are cloyed] F2; cloi’d F

3.2.57 brother] F (brother)

3.2.60] Bate adds a hard break here; 1 line in F

3.2.60 ‘But?’] Maxwell; But? F; But Rolfe

3.2.60 How if] F3; How : if F-F2; How, if Craig; how, if Rolfe

3.2.60 a father and mother?] F; a father and a mother? Craig; father, brother? Hudson (conj. Ritson)

3.2.62 doing] F; dolings Theobald; dronings Hudson; dotings Walker; dirges Oxf

3.2.65] Capell; 2 lines in F (merry./ And)

3.2.66] Pope; 2 lines in F (sir./ It)

3.2.72 myself] F2; my selfes F

3.2.73 Benvington adds SD [takes knife and strikes]; W08 after ‘thyself’, at 74 (striking the fly); Wilson [he strikes at it

3.2.74 Tamara] F (Tamira)

3.2.74-75] Capell; 1 line in F; Steevens (1778) combined line 75 with 76.

3.2.79 SD [Aside] this edn.

3.2.86 begin] F; begins Rowe (3rd)

4.[1] ] Rowe; Actus Quartus. F; not in Qq

4.1.0.1 Young Lucius] F; Lucius sonne Q1-2, Q3 (Lucius); Lucius’s son [YOUNG LUCIUS] Bate

4.1.0.2 arm.] Q1; arm. [He drops his books.] Bate; Oxf1/W08 adds this SD at line 4

4.1.0.3 Enter] Q1; [Then] Enter Rolfe, Craig

4.1.1 SP YOUNG LUCIUS] Rolfe; Boy. F; Puer. Qq (throughout)

4.1.5 thy] F; thine Qq

4.1.9 not] F; her not Qq

4.1.11 Somewhither] Capell, Maxwell; Some whither Q1; Some whether Q2, Q3, F

4.1.12 Ah] Q3; A Q1-2

4.1.10-15] Qq, F; assigned to Marcus by Husdon or Maxwell (after W. S. Walker); Capell, Rolfe, Craig, and Waith assign only line 15 to Marcus

4.1.19 griefs] Q3 (griefes); greues Q1-Q2

4.1.21 through] Q3; for Q1-2

4.1.29 Malone (after Capell) adds SD [Lavinia turns over the books]; Witherspoon, Rolfe [Lavinia turns over with her stumps the books which Lucius has let fall]; Malone [Lavinia with her stumps turns over the books which Lucius has let fall; W08 [Lavinia turns over the books which Lucius has let fall]
4.1.33 But] Q1; [to Lavinia] Hughes
4.1.37 What book?] F; not in Qq
4.1.39 was] Q3; were Q1-2
4.1.41 for] Q1; to F
4.1.43 Metamorphosis] Qq, F; Metamorphoses Pope, Rolfe
4.1.46 Perhaps] Qq; Perhaps F
4.1.47 so] Q1; see how Rowe
4.1.47 leaves! Help her] Craig (her.); leaues,/ Help her, Qq, F (Helpe); leaves! Helps her. (ie. SD) RSC, conj. Dyce; leaves!/ Help her: Maxwell; leaves! [Helping her Craig, Rolfe; leaves!/ Help her:/ Capell
4.1.51 thine] Q2; thy Q1
4.1.52 quotes] Q2; coats Q1
4.1.53 girl,] Q3 (girle,); gyrle? Q1-Q2
4.1.54 Philomela] Q2; Philomela Q1
4.1.56 Bate adds SD [Lavinia nods] after G1620
4.1.56-57 see! Ay] Pope; 1 line in Qq, F (see, I)
4.1.63 SP TITUS] Qq; Ti. F (appears in line with speech text)
4.1.65 slunk] F; slonke Qq
4.1.65 ers] Q1; ersts F
4.1.67 Bevington adds SD They sit.
4.1.70 SD He ... mouth] Q1; Collier, Craig, Wilson, Maxwell place at line 72 after ‘me.’; Rolfe after 73
4.1.72 I here have] (Walker); I haue Qq, F; See, I have Keightley; when I have Rolfe
4.1.74 that shift] F; this shift Qq
4.1.79 SP TITUS] Q3; Q1-2 continue with 79-80 assigned to Marcus, and repeat SP Marcus at 81; Ravenscroft, Ard2/Maxwell have Marcus speak 79 and Titus 80; Capell assigns 79-80 to Boy.
4.1.79 ye] Q1 (yee); you Craig
4.1.79 writ?] Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig; writ, Qq; writes? F
4.1.83 Magni] Q1; Magne Theobald
4.1.90 hope] Q2; h op Q1 (slipped to edge with the h broken so appears as l op)
4.1.90] Collier adds SD [they kneel]
4.1.93 swore] F3 (sware); sweare Qq, F-F2; Maxwell keeps “sware”
4.1.96 Bevington adds SD They rise
4.1.99 wake, and, if] RSC; wake and if] Q1; wake, and if] Q2-3, F; wake; and if
4.1.99 you] Q2; yee Q1
4.1.98-99 beware:/ ... once] Bate; beware,/ ... once, Qq; beware/ ... once, F; beware:/ ... once; W08; beware/ ... once. Hughes; beware/ ... once, Rolfe; beware:/ ... once:
4.1.103 Marcus: let it] Q3 (Marcus, let it); Marcus, let Q1-2
4.1.103-104 alone,/ And come.] RSC; alone,/ And come Qq; alone :/ And come, F;
alone;/ And come, Maxwell, W08, Hughes; alone;/ And, come, Rolfe, Craig; alone./ And
come, Bate

4.1.106 northern] Q3; northen Q1-Q2

4.1.108 your] Q3; our Q1; you Q2

4.1.111 bad] Q2; base Q1

4.1.116 thee, and withal my boy] Q1; thee, and withall, my boy Q3, F; thee; and
withal, my boy, Capell; thee; and withal my boy Rolfe

4.1.117 Shall] Q1; Shalt Capell

4.1.119 thy] Q2; my Q1 (Rowe)

4.1.124 SD [Marcus remains] RSC; [all but Marcus] Capell; Titus, Lavinia, and
Boy W08; [he goes; Lavinia and young Lucius follow Wilson; Titus, Lavinia, and young
Lucius Rolfe

4.1.125 good man] Q1 (goodman), Q2-3; good man F

4.1.131 the] Q1; ye Craig, Rolfe (conj. Johnson)

4.2.0.1 another door] Q2; the other Q1; Rolfe replaces both ‘door’s with side

4.2.0.2 [Attendant] Rolfe

4.2.6, 8, 17 SD [Aside] Capell

4.2.7 Gramercy] Q3 (Gramercie); Gramercie Q1-2

4.2.8 [YOUNG...news.] Qq (Puer... newes,); not in F, which mistakenly has
Demetrius speak 10-18

4.2.17.2 SD [Exeunt Young Lucius and Attendant] RSC; [Exeunt Boy with
Attendant] Capell; Exit Q3, F

4.2.18 about?] Q3; about, Q1-2; about; Maxwell

4.2.19 SD [Reads] Capell

4.2.21 egit] Q1; egit F

4.2.21 Mauri] Q1; maury Q3, F

4.2.21 Jaculus] RSC; iaculis Qq, F

4.2.21 arcu] Q1, F2; arcus Q2-3, F

4.2.20-21] line breaks by Theobald; 1 line in Qq; 2 lines of prose in F ‘ar-/cus.’

4.2.24 SP AARON] Qq, F (Moore.)

4.2.24 Ay, just:] Qq-F (I iust,)

4.2.25 SD [Aside] Johnson

4.2.27 them] Q1; the Q3, F

4.2.32 Collier adds SD to them

4.2.44 your] Q1; you F

4.2.46 Wilson adds SD [they make to go

4.2.48.1 SD [Aside] Johnson; Maxwell says this is unnecessary
4.2.48.2 SD *Flourish*] F; Trumpets sound Qq; *Flourish [within]* Craig; [*he stands aside. Trumpets sound Wilson; [*Trumpets sound within Rolfe]*

4.2.51 Wilson adds SD *which seeing the young men she hastily covers with her cloak; Rolfe adds in her arms*

4.2.52 Good] Q3; God Q1, Q2

4.2.52-53 divided thus] F; one line in Qq

4.2.54 Wilson adds SD [*steps forward*

4.2.56 Wilson adds SD [*weeps]*

4.2.59 thine] Q2; thy Q1

4.2.62 she is] Q1; she’s Craig

4.2.65] Q1; 2 lines in F (rest./ What)

4.2.66-67] Q1; A devil ... dam;/ A joyful issue. Hanmer

4.2.68 Wilson adds SD [*shows them the child*

4.2.70 fair-faced] Cam1/ Wilson (following OED); fairefast Q1, Q2; fairest Q3, F

4.2.73 Out, you] F (Out you); Zounds ye Qq

4.2.74 Oxf1/ W08 adds SD [*to the baby*

4.2.78 Qq; line and SP not in F

4.2.79 undone.] Q3 (vdone,) ; undone her, Q1, Q2

4.2.80-81 choice,/ ... fiend.] Q1; choice!/ ... fiend! Maxwell, Rolfe, Craig; choice;/...

fiend. Hughes

4.2.89 Capell adds SD *Draws his sword and takes the child; Ravenscroft Aron takes the child from the woman;* W08 (taking the child and drawing his sword) after SP; Craig, Rolfe [*takes the child from the nurse, and draws*]; Hughes suggests that Aaron take the child somewhere between ll. 86 and 88

4.2.90 Stay, ... villains!] Maxwell, Rolfe, Craig; Stay ... villaines Q1; Stay ... villaines, Q2, Q3, F; Stay, ... villains, Bate; Stay, ... villains; W08, Hughes

4.2.97 Alcides] Q2; Alciades Q1

4.2.99 boys!] Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig; boies, Q1-Q2; boyes, Q3; Boyes, F

4.2.100 white-limed] Q1 (whitelimde); white limbde Q2-Q3; white-limb’d F; white-lim’d F3

4.2.110 vigor] Q1; figure Oxf

4.2.114 forever] Q1 (for euer); Craig, Wilson, Maxwell, Rolfe keep “for ever”

4.2.117 ignominy] F; ignomie Qq

4.2.120 the heart] Q3; thy hart Q1-Q2

4.2.126 that] Q3; your Q1-Q2

4.2.136] Rowe adds SD *they sit after line; Bate adds they sit after “there:”;*

Ravenscroft *All sit down up on the ground, and the Moor at a distance with his sword between*

4.2.137, 142 Waith adds SD *to the Nurse*

4.2.138 we join] Q1; we all ioyne F2; we are join’d (conj. Ard2/ Maxwell); we do

join Oxf

4.2.141 ocean swells] Q1; ocean, swells Bate

4.2.141 as] Qq; at F

4.2.143 Cornelia the] Q1; *Cornelia, the Q3, F*
4.2.144 none] F; no one Qq
4.2.147 SD He kills her.] Q1; He kills her. [she cries out.] Collier MS
4.2.148 Weke, weke] Q1 (VVeeke, weeke); Weeke, week Q3; ‘Wheak, wheak!’
Maxwell (N.E.D.), Wilson

4.2.148 Bate adds SD [All stand up]; Ravenscroft Aron Stabs the Woman, she dyes, they all stand up

4.2.148] Qq, F; divided into two lines by Cam (weke’/ So)
4.2.149] Q1; 2 lines in F (Aaron ?/ Wherefore)
4.2.151 ours,] Maxwell, Rolfe, Craig; ours? Qq; our’s: F
4.2.154 one Muly lives,] (conj. Steevens); one Muliteus Qq, F; one Muliteus lives,
Rowe; one Muli lives, Rolfe, Craig, Witherspoon

4.2.164 ye see] Q3; you see Q1, Q2
4.2.164 Johnson adds SD Pointing to the Nurse; W08 places this SD after “lords,”; Wilson [points to the body

4.2.171 trust] Qq; trust F
4.2.171-2 divided thus] Theobald; 1 line in Qq, F
4.2.174 SD [Demetrius and Chiron with the body] RSC; Chiron and Demetrius, with the Nurse’s body Capell; Chiron and Demetrius carrying off the Nurse’s body W08; [Demetrius and Chiron, bearing off the Nurse’s body] Rolfe, Craig; [Chiron and Demetrius with the dead Nurse] Hughes; [they bear off the Nurse Wilson

4.2.181 feed] Q1; fat (Cartwright); feast Hanmer, Rolfe
4.3 [3.] Capell
4.3.0.1 SD [Publius, Sempronius, Caius] RSC; [Caius and Sempronius] (Cam); [Publius, Sempronius and Caius] Craig; Bevington adds Marcus’ son after Publius (Bate adds kinsmen of the Andronici after PUBLIUS); W08 has Marcus, with his son Publius...
gentlemen (Sempronius, Caius)
4.3.0.2 SD ends] Q1; end F
4.3.1 come, kinsmen: RSC; come; kinsmen, Maxwell, Craig, Wilson, Bate, Hughes; come;—kinsmen, Rolfe; come, kinsmen Q1-2; come, kinsmen Q3, F
4.3.2 let] Q1; now let F2
4.3.4-5 remembered,/ Marcus,] RSC; remembered Marcus, Qq, F
4.3.8 Haply] F; happlie Q1-2; happlie Q3
4.3.8 find] Q3 (finde); catch Q1, Q2
4.3.7-8] Maxwell; 1 line in Qq, F
4.3.4-8] RSC; Marcus,/ tools,/ ocean,/ nets;/ sea; Maxwell; relequit,/ fled/shall/nets/sea Capell; relequit/ fled./ cousins;/ nets;/ sea, Hughes; relequit/ fled.—/ shall/ nets;/ sea Rolfe; Marcus,/ tooles,/ Ocean;/ sea, Q1; Marcus,/ tooles,/ Ocean;/ sea, Q2-Q3; Marcus,/ tooles;/ Ocean;/ Sea, F
4.3.14 SD [gives them a letter?] this edn.
4.3.25 SD [Aside] this edn.
4.3.26 thus] Q1, Q3, F; this Q2
4.3.27 SD [Aside to others] this edn
4.3.27 lords] Q1 (Lords); lord F2
4.3.28 day] Q2; die Q1 (the ‘a’ not printed, or printed lightly) (Malone)
4.3.30 careful] Q1; cureful conj. Schmidt; easeful W. S. Walker
4.3.31 SD [Aside/] this edn.
4.3.32 Join] Q2; But/ Joine Q1 (‘But’ appears as catchword on previous page); But [let us live in hope that Lucius will] Bate (‘let us’ conj. Maxwell, suggesting missing line or lines is indicated by Q1’s catchword “But” and the lack of punctuation at the end of line 31 in Q1.)
4.3.35 is so] Q1; is now Hanmer
4.3.39 is so] Q1; is now Hanmer
4.3.48 backs] Q1; backe F
4.3.51 Justice] Q1 (Justice); justice W08, Hughes
4.3.51 wrongs.] Q1, Q2-Q3 (wrong:); Wongs F
4.3.53 Wilson adds SD according to the superscription on the letters
4.3.53 Apollinem] Rowe; Apollonem Qq; Appollonem F
4.3.56 ‘To Saturn’, Caius] Capell; To Saturnine, to Caius Qq, F
4.3.61 SD [Aside to others/] Wilson
4.3.63 Rowe adds SD They shoot; RSC adds They draw and shoot
4.3.65 divided thus] RSC; 1 line in Qq, F
4.3.66 aim] Q1; aim’d Hudson
4.3.67 Jupiter] Q2; Iubiter Q1 (at 67, 80, 83)
4.3.68 Ha, ha!] Q1 (Ha, ha,); Ha! Craig
4.3.68-9 divided thus] Rolfe; 1 line in Qq, F
4.3.77 his] Q1; your Q3, F
4.3.78 News] Rowe 1714; Clowne. Newes Q1; Titus. Newes Q2, Q3, F
4.3.78 one line in Rowe3; heauen,/ Marcus Qq, F (Marcus)
4.3.79] Q2; Q1 adds SP Titus
4.3.81 Ho, the gibbet-maker!] RSC; Ho the Gibbetmaker? Q1; Ho the Liebbetmaker? Q2; Ho the libbetmaker, Q3, F; Who? The gibbet-maker? Rowe; O! the gibbet-maker? Craig; O, the gibbet-maker! Wright/Cam2, Wilson; Ho, the gibbet-maker? Bate
4.3.84 Jupiter] Q1(Iubiter); Jupiter Q2-F (Maxwell, Bate, Hughes follows the mispronounced ‘Jupiter’ after Dover Wilson (Cam1))
4.3.84] Hanmer, Capell (1 line prose); appears as two lines of verse Q1 (Iubiter/I), Q2-F (Iupiter/I)
4.3.85 not thou] Q1; thou not W08
4.3.87 Why, didst] Q2; VWhy didst Q1, F (did’st)
4.3.88 Bate suggests after Pope that this line is verse in F and Qq (it is not necessarily so in any of the texts, as the following word of the next line is God and nearly always capitalized, and there is no room to print the word in any of the texts in the same line.); Hughes goes further to suggest that Qq continue with verse until ‘days.’ at line 89, because ‘young dayes’ is indented and could be interpreted as a line continuation
4.3.89 days. Why] F; daies:/VWhy Qq (begins a new line as if a new paragraph.)
4.3.91 imperial’s] Q2-3, F (Emperials); Emperals Q1; emperial’s Craig, Rolfe,
RSC
4.3.92 Oxf 1/ W08 / RSC add SD (to Titus)
4.3.100 Oxf 1/ W08 / RSC add SD (Writes.); Wilson [he writes);
4.3.101 deliver a] Q2; deliuer vp a Q1
4.3.100-101] Qq, F; as prose, Hamner, Rolfe
4.3.103 Bevington adds SD Gives letter
4.3.101-107 Sirrah ... TITUS] Q1; omit. by W08
4.3.107 W08 adds SD Takes knife and gives it to Marcus
4.3.109 For thou must take it] RSC; For thou hast made it Qq, F; For thou must hold it Bate (conj. T. W. Craik); For then hast made it Riv; For thou must make it (conj. Bate);
So, thou hast made it (conj. Maxwell)
4.3.109 an] Q1; a Craig
4.3.109 Bate adds SD [to the Clown]
4.3.110 it the] Q3; it to the Q1, Q2
4.3.112 SD Exit] Qq, F; om. Rolfe
4.4.1] Q1; two lines in F (Lords./ What
4.4.2 An] Q2; the ‘A’ in Q1 is smaller type, and somewhat obscured
4.4.2 in] Q1; of Craig
4.4.4 Of equal] Rolfe; Of egall Q1-Q3; Of eg all F (Maxwell, Craig, Wilson use egal; W08, Hughes use egall, from the French ‘ègal’)
4.4.5 you know, as know] Wright/Cam; you know Qq, F; you know, as do Rowe
4.4.18 injustice] F; vnjustice Qq; injustice Maxwell (in error? as his note suggests he intended to use unjustice); unjustice Wilson
4.4.19-20 lords?/ ... were.] Q1; lords—/ ... were? W08
4.4.24 whom] Q1; who Capell (retaining he...he in 24-25)
4.4.24-25 she ... she] Rowe, Maxwell; he ... he Qq, F; she ... he Wilson
4.4.30 Th’effects] Q2, Q1 (The’ffects); The effects Craig, Rolfe
4.4.34 SD Aside] F (after 35); not in Qq
4.4.35 gloze] Q1 (glose)
4.4.35 withal] Pope; with all Qq, F
4.4.37 life-blood] Q1 (life blood); life-blood’s conj. Koeppel
4.4.36-37 quick./ ... out:] Q1; quick:/ ... out, Maxwell
4.4.38 anchor’s] Q3; Anchor Q1, Q2
4.4.39 fellow, wouldst] Q2, F; fellow wouldst Q1, Q3; fellow? wouldst Wilson; fellow! wouldst Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe
4.4.40 mistership] Q2 (Mistership); Mistriship Q1; mistress-ship Johnson
4.4.42 good e’en] Q1-Q2 (Godden), Q3-F (good den)
4.4.43 SD [Saturninus] Johnson; not in Qq, F
4.4.44-45 presently ... have?] Q3; presently? ... haue. Q1-Q2
4.4.47 Hanged? By'r lady] F (Hang’d? berLady); Hangd be Lady, Q1-2; Hangd, be Lady Q3; Hang’d, by’ lady! Maxwell; Hanged, by Lady! W08; Hanges! By’r lady Craig, Rolfe

4.4.47 SD [guarded] Capell (under guard); with Attendants Hughes; guards lead them away Wilson

4.4.51 borne as if] Q1; borne, as if Q2-3; borne? As if F; borne?— as if Rolfe

4.4.51 trait’rous] F (traitrous); traitorous Q1; traiterous Q2-Q3

4.4.53 butchered] F (butcher’d); butchered Qq (ie butcherèd)

4.4.53 wrongfully?] Q3; wrongfully. Q1-2

4.4.56 slaughterman] Craig; slaughter man Qq, F

4.4.58 Enter...Emilius Wilson (Enter ÆMILLIUS, a Messenger); Enter Nuntius Emilius Q1; Enter Nuntius Emilius Q2-3, F; Enter Aemilius Theobald; Enter Messenger, Aemilius Hughes

4.4.59 What] Craig; Satur. VVhat Q1-2, F; Saturn. What Q3 (inexplicably W08, Hughes follow this redundant SP?)

4.4.60 Arm my lords] Q1; Arm, my lords! RSC; Arm, arm, my lord Ravenscroft (lords), Capell, Warburton

4.4.61 gathered] F (gather’d); gathered Qq (gatherèd)

4.4.65 this] Q1; his Rowe

4.4.67 SP SATURNINUS] Q1 (King.) also at 77, 92, 102

4.4.70 begins] Q1; begin F2 (Craig, Wilson)

4.4.76 our] F; your Qq

4.4.84 stint] Q2; slint Q1 (the ‘l’ could be a broken t)

4.4.84 melody:] Wilson; mrlodie. Q1 (‘r’ corrected in ink to ‘e’); melody. Q2; melody. Q3, F; melody; Craig, Maxwell, Rolfe

4.4.85 mayst] Craig, Rolfe; maiest Q1; mayest Q2-Q3, F

4.4.85 Rome.] Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig; Rome, Qq, F

4.4.86 know thou, emperor] Kittredge; know thou Emperour Qq, F-F3; know, thou Emperor F4

4.4.91 food] F; feede Q3; seede Q1, Q2

4.4.94 ear] Q3; eares Q1-Q2

4.4.95 promises that,] Bate; promises,that Qq, F; promises, that, Craig, Maxwell; promises, that, Rolfe

4.4.96 ears] F; yeares Qq

4.4.98 before to be] Q1; before to F; before, be Capell, Rolfe;

4.4.98 SD [to Emilius] Rowe

4.4.101] Q1; line not in Q3, F

4.4.103 in] Q1; on F4, most early eds.

4.4.103 safety] Q2; saftie Q1

4.4.111 successantly] Q2; successantly Q1; incessantly Capell

4.4.111 SD Exeunt] Q1; Exit. F; Bate adds SD [by different doors]; Oxf. adds

5[.1] Rowe; Actus Quintus. F; not in Qq
5.1.0.1 SD *Flourish.*] F; not in Qq
5.1.0.2 SD *Drum*] Q3; *Drums* s Q1, Q2 (*Drums*)
5.1.0.2 SD *Soldiers*] Q1; *Colours* Capell, Rolfe
5.1.7 scathe] Q3; skath Q1-Q2 (read as scath by Waith, Craig, Wilson, Maxwell)
5.1.9, 121, 162 SD [1] *GOTH*] Capell; *Goth* Qq, F; A *GOTH* W08; FIRST *GOTH RSC* for the first line, and A *GOTH* for the next two
5.1.9 sprung] Q2; *sprong* Q1
5.1.13 Be bold] Qq (most eds); Behold F
5.1.13 us. We’ll] Bate; vs weele Q1, Q2; vs, weele Q3, F; us; we’ll Theobald; us: we’ll Craig, Maxwell
5.1.15 flowered] Qq-F (flowred); flow’d Wilson, Maxwell
5.1.16 avenged] Q3 (auengd), F (aueng’d); aduengde Q1, Q2 (aduengd)
5.1.17 SP [ALL GOTHS]] F2 (*Omn*); Qq, F continue with original Goth’s speech; *All the Goths* Rolfe, Craig; *The other Goths* Wilson; ALL OTHER GOTHs Hughes; *Goths*. Maxwell
5.1.20 SP [2] *GOTH*] Capell; *Goth* Qq, F; (see W08 notes on this and other Goth lines); SECOND GOTH RSC
5.1.20 Renowned] Q3, F; Renowmed Q1, Q2
5.1.23 building, suddenly] Q3; building sudainely, Q1-2
5.1.27 dam] Q2; Dame Q1
5.1.37 this, my] F; this my Qq
5.1.37 drawn] Q2; drawen Q1
5.1.40 Goth, this] Q2; *Goth* this Q1; Goth! This W08
5.1.43 here’s] Q2; her’s Q1
5.1.43 his] Q3; her Q1, Q2 (Capell, Maxwell)
5.1.44 whither] Q1; whether Q3, F
5.1.44 Oxf adds SD to *Aaron*
5.1.53] Capell adds SD *A ladder brought, which Aaron is made to ascend*; Bate adds to Capell’s SD, *another Goth takes the child; Goths bring a ladder, which Aaron is made to climb;* [Goths bring a ladder and force Aaron to climb it] Hughes; [a ladder brought, and Aaron forced to ascend] Wilson
5.1.53 Get...child,] Q1; *Theobald*, and most eds., assign ‘Get me a ladder.’ to *Lucius, then begin* Aaron’s speech with ‘Lucius, save the child,’ (Wilson adds SD [aloft])
5.1.58 more but ‘Vengeance ... all!’] Globe, (Capell *first to add quotation marks*); more, but vengeance ... all. Q1-2; more but vengeance ... all. Q3; more: but vengeance ... all. F-F3; more: but Vengeance ... all. F4
5.1.61 And if] Q1; An if Craig, Rolfe
5.1.65 treason] Q1; treasons Bate (*conj. Maxwell/Ard 2*)
5.1.67 by] Q3; in Q1, Q2
5.1.69] Q1; 2 lines in F (minde, / I)
5.1.71] Q1; 2 lines in F (by, / Thou)
5.1.84 nourish] Q1, F; nurse Oxf
5.1.86 to] Q1; to to F
5.1.87] Q1; 2 lines in F (thou, / I)
5.1.88 insatiate, luxurious] Q3; insatiate and luxurious Q1, Q2

5.1.93 hands off] F; hands Qq

5.1.93 saw’st] F; sawest Qq

5.1.94] Q1; 2 lines in F (villaine / Call’st)

5.1.95-96 trimmed, and ’twas/ Trim] Capell; trimd./ And twas trim] Qq, F (trim’d/
And ’twas trim), Waith, Hughes; (see W08 note)

5.1.96 that] Q2; which Q1

5.1.97 barbarous] F; barberous Qq (Wilson asks if a pun was intended by barberous,
Maxwell says it is unlikely)

5.1.107 the] Q2; that Q1

5.1.107 mentioned] F (mention’d); mentioned Qq (i.e. mentionèd)

5.1.110 it?] Rowe; it, Q1-2; it. Q3, F

5.1.119 swoonèd] F3; sounded Qq, F-F2, Maxwell; swounded Craig, Wilson

5.1.121-124 Qq center the four SP’s

5.1.126 the] Q1; few F

5.1.132 break] Qq, F; stray and break (conj. Z. Jackson); fall and break Hudson

5.1.133 haystacks] Q3; haystalks Q1; haystakes Q2; (see W08 note)

5.1.134 their] Q1; the F

5.1.136 door] Q1; doors Craig, Rolfe

5.1.141 Tut.] Q2; But Q1

5.1.145 W08 adds SD (to a Goth)

5.1.146 Bevington adds SD Aaron is made to climb down; W08 Aaron is brought
down; Cross (ala Hughes) [Aaron is brought down from the ladder]

5.1.146 Wilson adds SD [soldiers gag him and bring him down]; Bevington Aaron
is gagged; Capell, Rolfe adds SD Enter a Goth

5.1.151.2 SD Enter Emillius] Q1; Enter a Goth with Aemilius Malone; [Enter a
Goth] Capell, Rolfe

5.1.152 SP [A] GOTH] Oxf; Goth Qq, F; 3rd GOTH Capell

5.1.154 Rolfe, Craig move 151’s SD [Enter Æmilius] to this line; Wilson ÆMILIUS
is brought forward

5.1.155 Emillius; what’s] Q1 (Emillius, what’s); Emilius, what F; Æmilius! what’s
Craig

5.1.165 SD March away. Flourish. Exeunt.] F (with Flourish appearing at the end
of 164); march away Q1; march away. Q2; march away. Exeunt. Q3; Flourish. [They]
march away. Bate (after Steevens); Away. [March. Exeunt.] Capell

5.2.0 Enter Tamora and her two sons disguised] Q1; Enter Tamora disguised as
Revenge [in a chariot], and her two sons, Chiron as Rape, and Demetrius as Murder
W08; Enter TAMORA and her two sons [CHIRON and DEMETRIUS], disguised
Hughes; Enter...disguised as Revenge attended by Rape and Murder Wilson; Enter
TAMORA, DEMETRIUS, and CHIRON, disguised. Rolfe

5.2.1 habiliment] Q1 and Q3 (habilliament), Q2 (habilitament), F (Habilitament)

5.2.8 SD They knock and Titus opens his study door.] Q1; They knock and TITUS
[aloft with papers] opens his study door. Bate; They knock and TITUS [above] opens his
study door Capell, Craig (places above at the end of the SD); [They knock/ Enter TITUS, above Rolfe; Aloft or within, holding papers RSC

5.2.9 Bate adds SD [aloft] (here and for all speeches from the study)
5.2.14 Collier MS adds SD Showe Paper; Wilson [he shows a paper written with blood (after 15)

5.2.18 give it action] F; giue that accord Qq; give it that accord Pope; give’t that accord Riverside

5.2.20] Q1; 2 lines in F (me./ Thou)
5.3.22 witness these] Q1; these Theobald
5.2.22] Q1; 2 lines in F (stump./ Witnesse)
5.2.28 Know, thou] Capell; Know thou Qq, F1-3; Know though, F4

5.2.30 th’ infernal] Q1; the infernal Craig, Rolfe
5.2.31 thy] Q1; the F
5.2.32 thy] Q1; my F
5.2.38 them out] Q2; the mout Q1
5.4.0 offenders] Q3; offender Q1, Q2
5.4.2 mine] Q1; thine Q2 (Edin. copy)
5.4.9 globes,] RSC, Hughes; Globes. Qq, F; globe. Dyce, Rolfe, Maxwell (conj. Capell), Craig; globe, Bate/W08/ (conj. W. S. Walker)

5.2.50 thee two] Q1; two Rowe
5.2.50 as black] Q3; black Q1, Q2
5.2.52 murder] Q1; murderers Capell
5.2.52 caves] F2; cares Qq, F
5.2.54 the] Q2; thy Q1 (Rowe)
5.2.56 Hyperion’s] F2 (Hiperions); Epeons Qq; Eptons F
5.2.57 very] Q1; weary (conj. Wilson/Cam1)
5.2.61 these] Dyce; them Qq, F; they F2
5.2.62 Rape] Q1; Rapine F2
5.2.65 worldly] Q2; wordlie Q1
5.2.66 mad, mistaking] Qq, F (mad mistaking); mad-mistaking W. S. Walker
5.2.69 SD [Exit aloft or within] RSC; [Exit aloft] Rowe; [Exit above] Rolfe, Cam; [Exit] Hughes; [he shuts the window Wilson; not in Qq, F
5.2.71 fits] Q2; humors Q1
5.2.76 banquet] Q2-3, F (Banquet); banket Q1, Maxwell
5.2.80 ply] Q1 (plie), Q2-Q3; play F
5.2.80 SD Enter Titus, on main stage] RSC; Enter Titus, below Rowe, Rolfe; [Enter TITUS] Maxwell, Hughes; TITUS comes from the house Wilson

5.2.91 are. What] Craig, Rolfe; are,what Qq, F; are; what W08; are; what Pope;
5.2.96 have] Q2; hath Q1
5.2.97 I’ll] F; I will Qq
5.2.98, 101 SD [to Demetrius], [to Chiron]] Oxf 1
5.2.103 he is] Q1; he’s Hanmer, Rolfe
5.2.104 SD [to Tamora] Bevington
5.2.106 mayst] Q2 (maist); shalt Q1
5.2.106 thy] Q3; thine Q1-Q2
5.2.121 Oxf1/ W08 adds SD calling
5.2.121 brother! 'Tis] Rolfe ('t is), Bate; brother, tis Qq, F ('tis)
5.2.121 SD Enter Marcus.] placed here by Theobald; after 120 in Qq, F; MARCUS comes forth Wilson
5.2.123 inquire] Q1 (enquire)
5.2.128 Feasts] F; Feast Qq
5.2.131 SD [Exit.] F2
5.2.136 Lucius] Q1; Lucius’s W. S. Walker
5.2.137 SD [Aside?] per Hanmer (Aside, to her sons)
5.2.137 bide] Q2; abide Q1 (Rowe)
5.2.140 Yield] Q1 (the ‘l’ is broken resembling an apostrophe, Yee’d), Q3 (Yeelde), F; Yeede Q2
5.2.142 SD [Aside] Rowe
5.2.142 know] Q2; knew Q1
5.2.142 suppose] Q2; supposd Q1
5.2.144 dam] Q3; Dame Q1-2
5.2.148 dost, and, sweet Revenge,] RSC; dost and sweet Reuenge Q1; doost, and sweet reuenge Q2-Q3 (sweete), F (doo’st); dost—and sweet Revenge, Rolfe, Bate; dost; and, sweet Revenge, Maxwell, Craig; dost; and sweet Revenge, Hughes
5.2.148 SD [Exit Tamora] Capell; Rowe places after 147
5.2.150 Tut] Q1-Q2, F; But Q3
5.2.151.1 SD [Enter Publius, Caius and Valentine.] Rowe; not in Qq, F; [Enter Titus’s kinsmen, PUBLIUS, VALENTINE and CAIUS] Hughes; [Enter Publius and Others.] Rolfe, Maxwell, Craig; PUBLIUS and others come from the house Wilson
5.2.154 Chiron, Demetrius.] Q1 (Chiron. Demetrius.), Q2-3 (Chiron. Demetrius.), F; Chiron and Demetrius. Theobald
5.2.154] Q1; 2 lines in F (Sonnes/ I)
5.2.156 Murder, Rape] Q2; Murder and Rape Q1
5.2.161 And stop their mouths, if they begin to cry.] Qq; line not in F
5.2.161 SD [Exit.] Rowe; Exit. Publius, &c. lay hold on Chiron and Demetrius Capell, Rolfe
5.2.162 forbear! We] Craig (we); forbear we Q1; forbear, we Q2-Q3, F; forbear; we W08, Hughes
5.2.163 Oxf adds SD [They bind and gag them]
5.2.165 fast.] Q1; fast. Exeunt F, Hughes; (most editors follow Qq, as the F compositor probably mistook the catchword ‘Enter’ in either Q2 or Q3 as the SD Exeunt);
5.2.172 vile] Q1, Q2 and Maxwell (vild), Q3 (vilde), F (vil’d)
5.2.182 Whilst] Q2; VVhiles Q1
5.2.191 her own] Q1; her F
5.2.193 banquet] Q2-3, F (Banquet); banket Q1, Maxwell
5.2.195 Progne] Qq, F; Procne Theobald
5.2.200 vile] Q1-2; vilde Q3; vil’d F
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5.2.201 everyone] Bate; every one Q1 (euerie), Q2-Q3, F
5.2.202 might] F; may Qq
5.2.203 SD He cuts their throats] Q1; Rolfe moves this SD after 196 ‘Lavinia come,’
5.2.204 I’ll] Q1; I will W. S. Walker, Craig
5.2.205 gainst] F; against Qq
5.2.205.1 SD [with the bodies] Capell, Craig (dead bodies); [they bear the bodies into the house] Wilson; [Exeunt, bearing the dead bodies Rolfe
5.3.0 SD [with Aaron prisoner ] Rowe
5.3.0 SD and one carrying the child/ ] Kittredge; and his child in the arms of an attendant Wilson
5.3.1 'tis] Q1; it is Craig, Rolfe
5.3.3 [1] GOTH Capell; Goth. Q1 (Got.), Q2-Q3, F; A GOTH W08, Hughes, RSC
5.3.6 sustenance] Q3; sustnance Q1-Q2
5.3.7 empress'] Q1-2 (Empresse), Malone; Emperours Q3; Emperous F
5.3.10 I fear] Q1; If ere F
5.3.11 SP AARON] F (Aron.); Moore. Qq
5.3.11 my] Q1, F; mine Q2-3
5.3.14 inhuman] Qq (inhumane), F (Inhumaine)
5.3.15.1 SD Flourish] F; not in Qq; [Flourish within] W08, Rolfe (after Aaron’s exit)
5.3.15.1 SD [Exeunt some Goths with Aaron.] RSC; not in Qq, F; [Exit Aaron under guard./ Bate; Exeunt Goths, with Aaron Rowe (after 14), W08 (after 16); [Exit Aaron, guarded by Goths]
5.3.16.1 SD Sound trumpets] Q1; after SD at 15.1 Bate; om. Rolfe
5.3.16.2 SD Tribunes and others [including Emilius]] Dyce (Aemilius); Tribunes and others. Qq, F; Aemilius, Tribunes, Senators and others Rolfe, Craig
5.3.17 SP SATURNINUS] F (Sat.); King Qq
5.3.17 more] F; mo Q1; moe Q2-Q3, Rolfe
5.3.21 careful] Q1 (carefull); care-full Waith
5.3.22 ordainèd] Q3; ordainde Q1-2
5.3.25 SP SATURNINUS] Q3; King. Q1; Empe. Q2
5.3.25.1 SD Hautboys] F (Hoboyes at end of line 25); Trumpets sounding Q1; Sound trumpets Q2-Q3; Hautboys sound. Rolfe
5.3.25.1 SD A table brought in] F (centered); not in Qq; A table brought in. [They sit.] Capell; A table brought in. The company sit down at table. Craig; The Company sit down at table. Rolfe
5.3.25.2 SD meat on the table] Q2; dishes Q1; dishes on the table Rolfe
5.3.25.3 SD [and Young Lucius/] Bate; Young Lucius, and others Rolfe, Malone
5.3.26 my gracious lord] Q2; my Lord Q1
5.3.26 Q1; 2 lines in F (Lord,/ Welcome)
5.3.28 all:] F; all Q1-2; all, Q3
5.3.30 SP SATURNINUS] Q3; King. Q1-2 (and at 39, 41, 48, 53(Q3), 59 (Q3))
5.3.30 attired] F (attir’d); attired Qq (ie attirèd)
5.3.33 beholding] Q1; beholden Bate (as being suggested by beholding)
5.3.34 SD [Aside?] this edn.
5.3.38 deflower’d] Qq (deflowerde), F (deflowr’d); deflowered most editors
5.3.43 and] Q1; om. Hanmer
5.3.44 precedent] Qq-F (president), Maxwell keeps president
5.3.45 Bate adds SD [Unveils Lavinia]; Ravenscroft adds SD Titus pulls off

Lavinia’s Veil after line 48
5.3.47 SD He kills her.] Q3; not in Q1-2; [Kills Lavinia. Rolfe
5.3.48 hast] F; hast thou Qq
5.3.52 now] Q1; is now Q3, F
5.3.52 To do this outrage: and it now is done.] Q1; line not in F
5.3.54 SP TITUS] Q2; T. Q1
5.3.54 Will’t ... eat? Will’t] Q1 (Wilt ... eate,wilt)
5.3.54] Q1; 2 lines in F (eat,/ Wilt)
5.3.55 daughter?] Q3 (daughter), F; Daughter thus? Q1, Q2
5.3.60 are both, baked] Q2; are both baked Q1; are, both baked Bate; are, both bakèd
Grey, W08, Hughes; are both, baked Craig
5.3.60 that] Q2; this Q1
5.3.60 Oxf adds SD [revealing the heads]
5.3.64 SP SATURNINUS] F; Emperour. Q1; Empe. Q2-3
5.3.64 SD [He kills Titus.]] Ravenscroft, Rowe
5.3.66 SD [He kills Saturninus.]] Ravenscroft, Rowe; not in Qq, F; He kills
Saturninus. A great tumult, the Andronici, and their Friends, gain the Steps of Titus’s
House: Tumult ceases Capell; [Kills Saturninus. (after Rowe) A great tumult. Exeunt
Lucius, Marcus, Aemilius, and others and enter above.] Riverside (after Globe); [He kills
Saturninus. Uproar./ The Goths protect the Andronici, who go aloft] Bate; [He kills
Saturninus. A great tumult. Lucius, Marcus, and others go up into the balcony.] Cam,
Rolfe; He kills Saturninus. [A great tumult, during which Marcus and Lucius go to the
Marcus, Lucius, and their partisans go up into the balcony.] Craig, Witherspoon; An
uproar, during which Lucius and Marcus may go aloft RSC
5.3.67 Bate adds SD [Aloft.] to all remaining speeches spoken from above
5.3.68 uproars] Q1 (vprores); uproar Craig, Rolfe
5.3.68 like] Q3; as Q1-Q2
5.3.69 Scatterèd] Q3 (scattred); Scatterd Q1-Q2
5.3.69 tempestuous] Q1, F; tempestious Q2-3
5.3.71 scattered] Q2 (scattered); scattered Q1 (ie scatterèd)
5.3.72 body.] Q1 (bodie.); body; Capell
5.3.73 SP [A] GOTH] F (Goth.); Romane Lord. Q1, Q2-3 (Roman Lord.); Capell,
Craig, Maxwell, Wilson continue with Marcus speaking here (body;/ Lest); AEMIL Riv.
(Sisson)
5.3.73 Let] Q1; Lest Capell
5.3.74 curtsy] F3; cursie Qq, F-F2; cur’sy Maxell
5.3.74 to] Qq, F (too)
5.3.75 castaway] F; cast away Qq
5.3.80 Rome’s] Q2 (Romes); Roomes Q1
5.3.80 Craig, Rolfe adds SD (to Lucius)
5.3.82 sad attending] Q1; sad-attending W. S. Walker
5.3.83 baleful burning] Q1; baleful-burning W. S. Walker
5.3.88 SP [MARCUS] Bate; F continues Goth’s speech; Qq continues Romane Lord’s speech
5.3.91 my very] Q3; my Q1, Q2
5.3.91 utt’rance] Q1 (vttrance); utterance Craig, Bate, Rolfe
5.3.92 you] Q2; yee Q1
5.3.93 Lending your kind hand] F; And force you to Q1; Lending your kind Q2-3
5.3.94 Here is a captain] Q2; Her’s Romes young Captaine Q1; Here is our captain W. S. Walker
5.3.94 tale:] RSC; tale, Qq, F; tale Hughes; tale; Craig, Rolfe
5.3.95 Your hearts will thro] Q2; VWhile I stand by Q1
5.3.96 This, noble] F (This Noble); Then gracious Q1; Then noble Q2-Q3
5.3.97 cursèd Chiron and Demetrius] Q2; Chiron and the damn’d Demetrius Q1
5.3.98 murderèd] Rowe; murdred Qq, F
5.3.100 faults] Q1; fault Hudson
5.3.108 oped] F (op’d); opt Qq
5.3.109 And I am] F; I am the Q1-Q2; and I am the Q3;
5.3.109 turned] F4; turned Qq, F-F3 (ie turnèd)
5.3.119 Oxf1 adds SD [Points to Aaron’s Baby.]; W08 places this SD after ‘child:’
Witherspoon, Rolfe [Pointing to the Child in the arms of an Attendant.] (after ‘child:’)
5.3.119 this] Q3; the Q1-Q2
5.3.124 And...is to witness...true,] Q1; And...is, to witnesse...true. F; And...is to witness, ... true. Maxwell; Damn’d...is, to witness...true. Theobald
5.3.125 cause] F4; course Qq, F-F3
5.3.125-127 revenge ... bear.] F; reuenge. ... beare, Q1; reuenge. ... beare. Q2;
reuenge, ... beare. Q3
5.3.128 you have] Q2; hauve you Q1
5.3.128 truth, what] Q1; truth. What Wilson; truth: what Maxwell
5.3.129 amiss?] Q3 (amisse?); amisse, Q1-2
5.3.130 now] Q2; pleading Q1
5.3.131 Andronicie] F; Andronicie Qq
5.3.132 cast us down] Q2; hurle our selues Q1
5.3.133 brains] Q2; soules Q1
5.3.137 Come, come] Q1 (Come come); Come, Marcus, come Ard2 (conj Maxwell)
5.3.137 reverend] F4, Wilson, and most editors; reuerten Qq, F-F3, Maxwell
5.3.141 SP MARCUS] Qq, F (Mar.); Rom. Capell; Romans. Waith; ALL Cam (1863); Omnes. Ravenscroft
5.3.142 Go,] Q1 (Goe); MARCUS (to attendants) Go Capell; Wilson (to soldiers), Bate (to others); RSC (To Goths)
5.3.144 adjudged] Q3 (adiudgd), F (adiudg’d); adiudge Q1-2
5.3.144 direful slaughtering] Q3; dyrefull slaughtring Q1-2; direful-slaught’ring W. S. Walker

5.3.145.1 SD [Exeunt Goths.] RSC; [Exeunt some into the house. Bate; Exeunt Attendants Cam; [To Attendants. Rolfe

5.3.145.2 SD [Lucius and Marcus may descend]] RSC; not in Qq, F; Lucius and the rest come down; with them, young Lucius Capell; All disappear from above Ravenscroft; A long flourish till the Andronici come down.] Bate; [Marcus and Lucius come down] Hughes; LUCIUS, MARCUS, and others descend Craig

5.3.146 SP [ALL ROMANS]] Ravenscroft (OMNES); Rom. Capell; Qq, F continue with Marcus’s speech; All. Cam (1863)

5.3.146 hail, to] Q2 (haile to); haile Q1; haile! Rolfe

5.3.151 all aloof] Q1-Q2 (all a loofe), Q3, F; aloof Hughes (though not indicated in notes so it could be a mistake)

5.3.151 Capell adds SD Kneels over Titus’s body

5.3.153 pale, cold] RSC; pale cold Qq, F; pale-cold W. S. Walker

5.3.153 Johnson, Rolfe adds SD [Kisses Titus]

5.3.154 blood-stained] F3; blood slaine Q1-2; blou d-slaine Q3, F-F2

5.3.155 Bevington adds SD [Kisses Titus]; Capell adds SD Kneeling by him.;

(Kissing Titus) W08 after the SP

5.3.160 Collier MS adds SD [to his son]

5.3.161 show’rs.] F (showres:); showers, Qq

5.3.163 Sung] Q2; Song Q1

5.3.164 matter] Q2; storie Q1

5.3.166 child,] Q3; child Q2; not in Q1

5.3.165-169 Meet...///...woe:] Q2-F; And bid thee bare his prettie tales in minde./ And talke of them when he was dead and gone./ Marcus. How manie thousand times hath these poore lips,/ VVhen they were liuing warmd themselues on thine,/ Oh now sweete boy giue them their latest kisse, Q1

5.3.171 him ... him] F; them ... them Qq

5.3.172 SP YOUNG LUCIUS] Hughes; Boy F; Puer. Qq

5.3.172 Bate adds SD [Kisses Titus] (after Bevington who added the SD after 173)

5.3.172 even] Q3; eu’n Q1-Q2

5.3.175 SD [Enter Aaron guarded by Goths]] RSC; [Enter AARON under guard] Bate; Enter Romans with Aaron Rowe; Re-enter Attendants with Aaron Dyce; Enter attendants with Aaron Rolfe; [Enter some with AARON] Hughes; Soldiers return with AARON Wilson

5.3.176 SP ROMANS] F; Romane. Q1; Romaine. Q2-Q3; EMIL Ravenscroft; Aemilius Globe (conj Dyce); [1.] Roman Craig

5.3.184 O] F; Ah Qq

5.3.191 emperor] Q1, F (Emp.)

5.3.192 father’s] Rowe; fathers Q1, Q3; Fathers Q2, F; fathers’ Cam (anon)

5.3.195 heinous] Q2, Q3 (hanous), F (heynous); rau inous Q1, Collier M.S.

5.3.196 rite] Q3, F (Rite,); right Q1-2

5.3.196 mourning] Q1; mournefull Q3, F (mournfull)
5.3.196 weeds] Q2; weede Q1
5.3.198 of prey:] F; to pray, Q1-Q2, Q3 (prey)
5.3.199 beast-like,] F; beastlie Q1, Q2-Q3 (beastly)
5.3.202 From] F; By Q2-3
5.3.203 Then] Q3; Than Q2
5.3.200-204 so, shall have like want of pity/.../it ruinate.] Q2; dead let birds on her take pittie. Q1
5.3.204 SD Exeunt all] F (Exeunt omnes); Exeunt. Q1; not in Q2-3; Exeunt Rolfe
5.3.204 SD [with the bodies.] Bate; not in Q2-3, F
5.3.205.2 SD FINIS] Q2-F (centered below text); Finis the Tragedie of Titus Andronicus. Q1