Rereading the Peacham Drawing

JUNE SCHLUETER

As the only extant contemporary illustration of a Shakespeare play in performance, the Peacham drawing has held a position of unique importance since 1925, when E. K. Chambers introduced it to the scholarly community.1 Preserved at Longleat House, the widely reprinted document consists of a folio sheet, across the top of which is a pen-and-ink drawing; beneath it, some 40 lines of text from Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus, written largely in secretarial hand; and, in the lower left margin, an italic autograph or attribution—Henricus Peacham—along with a cryptically rendered date, generally taken to be 1595.2

Among numerous difficulties attending an accurate reading of the Longleat manuscript, the most fundamental is the disparity between the drawing and the lines from Titus Andronicus inscribed below it. As R. A. Foakes succinctly puts it, “it looks as though the text has no direct relation to the drawing.” Foakes speculates that the text “could have been added later, and by another hand.”3 He stops short, however, of questioning whether the assumption of a correspondence between the drawing and Shakespeare’s play needs to be revised. Might the Peacham drawing not be of Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus at all?

The argument that follows proposes that the Peacham drawing depicts a sequence from Eine sehr klägliche Tragedia von Tito Andronico und der hoffrigen Käserin (A Very Lamentable Tragedy of Titus Andronicus and the Haughty Empress), a play performed in Germany by English actors which survives, in German, in a volume published in Leipzig in 1620 as Englische Comedien und Tragedien.4 Though distinct in numerous

2 The document is among the Harley papers in the library of the Marquess of Bath at Longleat House (Harley Papers I, fol. 159v), Warminster, Wiltsire, Great Britain. Chambers records what we know of the manuscript’s provenance: “Most of the Elizabethan papers in the composite volume [catalogued by Mrs. S. C. Lomas in 1907 as ‘H. M. Comm.,’ Longleat Papers, ii. 43'] were brought from Welbeck to Longleat by Lady Elizabeth Bentinck in 1759, and derive ultimately from the study of Sir Michael Hicks, a secretary to the first Lord Burghley. This may be one of them, although Mrs. Lomas does not identify the hand of the endorsement, which is not that of either Burghley or Hicks, and a pencilled reference in the margin to the second Sir John Thynne (1580–1623) may suggest that it had been preserved since the sixteenth century at Longleat itself” (326-27).
4 The full title of the Titus play is Eine sehr klägliche Tragedia von Tito Andronico und der hoffrigen Käserin darinnen denkwürdige actiones zu befinden (A Very Lamentable Tragedy of Titus Andronicus and the Haughty Empress wherein remarkable events may be observed). The full title of the volume is Englische Comedien und Tragedien / Das ist: Sehr Schöne / herrliche und ausserliche /geist- und weltliche Comedi und Tragedie Spiel / Sampt dem Pickelherog / Welche wegen ihrer artigen Inventionen, kurtzweilig auch theils vorarbildung Geschichte halten von den Engellen in Deutschland an Königlichen / Char- und Fürstlichen Höfen auch in vornehmen Reichs- Se- und Handel Städten seynz angiert und gehalten worden / und zwar nie im Druck ausgangen. An jetzo / Allen der Comedi und Tragedi Liebhaben / und Andern zu lieb und gefallen / der Gestalt in offenen Druck gegeben / dass sie gar leicht daraus Spielweiss widerumb angetlicht / und zur Erleuchtung und Erhöckung des Gemütz gehalten werden können (English Comedies and Tragedies, i.e. Very fine, beautiful and select, spiritual and worldly Comedy and Tragedy plays, with the down, which on account of their fanciful inventions, entertaining and partly true histories, have been acted and given by the English in Germany at Royal, Electoral, and Princely courts, as well as in the principal Imperial-Sea- and Commercial towns, never before printed, but now published to please all lovers of Comedies and Tragedies, and others, and in such a manner as to be fit to be easily acted for the delight and recreation of the mind). Published in octavo form with 384 unnumbered leaves and no identification of editor or publisher, the volume contains eight plays—Esther and Haman, The
The Peacham drawing. Reproduced by permission of the Marquess of Bath, Longleat House, Warminster, Wiltshire, Great Britain.
ways from the Titus Andronicus first published in quarto in 1594, A Very Lamentable Tragedy may well derive from the Shakespeare play. A more intriguing possibility, however, encouraged by the prominence of Titus’s son Vespasian in A Very Lamentable Tragedy, is that the German version is a translation of the lost “tittus & vespacia” recorded in Henslowe’s diary in 1592. In either case, the end of Act 1 of the German version contains a sequence of events that closely corresponds to the Peacham drawing.

I

The text from Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus on the Longleat manuscript begins with an interpolated stage direction—“Enter Tamora pleading for her sonses going to execution”—then continues with Tamora’s 17-line plea to Titus to spare Alarbus’s life (1.1.104–20); an elliptical version of Titus’s reply (1.1.121–26), embellished with a warning to Aaron; and Aaron’s speech at 5.1.125–44. But, as scholars have long recognized, the lines explicate the drawing above only imperfectly. Whether the drawing is of 1.1.104 (as the stage direction and opening lines suggest) or of 1.1.129 (as Foakes proposes), the rendering would have to be a highly selective one. For at Tamora’s plea for mercy, a host of others are onstage as well, including a captain, four sons of Titus, men bearing coffin[s], Alarbus (?), and “others as many as can be” (1.1.69 s.d.). At Titus’s reply, though some or all of Titus’s sons are offstage killing Alarbus, other characters presumably remain. In the drawing,

Prodigal Son, Fortunatus, A King’s Son of England and a King’s Daughter of Scotland, Sidonius and Theagenes, Nobody and Somebody, Julio and Hyppolita, and A Very Lamentable Tragedy of Titus Andronicus—plus two Pickelherring plays and five untitled interludes. A copy of the volume is available in the Folger Shakespeare Library (PR 1246 G5 E59 Cage).

Translations of a Very Lamentable Tragedy may be found in Albert Cohn, Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Account of English Actors in Germany and the Netherlands and of the Plays Performed by Them during the Same Period (1865; rpt. New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1971), 157–236; and in Ernest Brennecke, in collaboration with Henry Brennecke, Shakespeare in Germany 1590–1700 with Translations of Five Early Plays (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1964), 18–51. Cohn’s parallel edition, with translation by Moritz Lippner, is convenient to use; on occasion, however, it is unreliable, making Brennecke the preferred text in English. Quotations in this essay follow Brennecke’s English translation, with page numbers cited parenthetically. When the German text is cited, it follows Cohn, with page numbers also given parenthetically. (The English title of the 1620 volume, given in this note above, is from Cohn, CVII–CVIII.)

The German text may be found in Cohn; in Wilhelm Creizenach, ed., Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten, Vol. 23 of Deutsche National-Literatur, Joseph Kürschner, ed. (Berlin and Stuttgart: W. Spemann [1888]), 17–52; and in Ludewig Tieck, ed., Deutsches Theater, 2 vols. (1817; rpt. Leipzig: Zentralarchiv der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1979), 1:367–407. Though often credited with reprinting the contents of the 1620 volume, Tieck includes only A Very Lamentable Tragedy and Fortunatus (2:5–57). Readers consulting Tieck should do so cautiously, since he bowdlerizes the text of A Very Lamentable Tragedy. In Act 6, for example, Morian explains his illicit relationship with the queen to her two sons, saying: “So sollet ihr wissen: dass sie mich zur Burlerey getrieben und gezwungen, weil ihr euern Vater die Lauten nicht so wohl hat schlagen können, auch dieser jetzige Kaiser als ich” (211) (“Know then that she urged me on, and forced me to this wanton love, for neither your father nor this Emperor could satisfy her as much as I” [40]). Tieck omits Morian’s claim of sexual superiority (italicized above), which Brennecke decorously translates.

5 R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, eds., Henslowe’s Diary (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1961), 17–18; see also 19–20. The earliest entry for this play is 11 April 1591, though corrections in other 1591 dates suggest that 1592 was intended.

6 Quotations from Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus follow Alan Hughes’s 1994 New Cambridge Shakespeare edition, which relies on the First Quarto (1594) except for 3.2, where the Folio text is followed. (Variations among the three quartos and the Folio of Shakespeare’s play offer no help in matching text to drawing.)
however, only seven characters appear. Moreover, whether the depiction of Aaron the Moor illustrates 5.1, as the inscribed text suggests, or the sequence in 1.1 evoked by the tableau, Aaron is a prisoner at either point and should not be brandishing a sword. Unable to reconcile the drawing to Shakespeare’s play, Foakes concludes that “the drawing does not fit any point in the action, and probably was not drawn from life.”

Other scholars’ more persistent efforts to match the drawing to Shakespeare’s play have resulted in an assortment of proposals, all reviewed by G. Harold Metz in Shakespeare’s Earliest Tragedy: Studies in Titus Andronicus. Metz himself argues that the drawing employs the convention of simultaneous (and selective) representation, which portrays events separated in time (and only those onstage characters the artist elects to portray). He proposes that the drawing represents four events from Shakespeare’s play: 1) Tamora’s plea to Titus to spare Alarbus’s life; 2) Tamora’s and Chiron’s expressions of anger at Titus’s barbarity in slaying Alarbus, as well as Demetrius’s resolve to avenge the death (1.1.130–42); 3) Titus’s refusal of the crown (1.1.187–200); and 4) Aaron’s speech, following his and his infant son’s capture, about his own villainy (5.1.125–44). On this last point, Metz sees the depiction as a general characterization of Aaron rather than of any action of his in the play—how else to explain the prisoner’s sword?

Jonathan Bate’s reading in the new Arden3 Titus relies even more heavily than Metz’s on an emblematic approach. Bate proposes that the drawing offers a “composite representation” of the whole play. The two soldiers represent “Titus’ victory in war and service to the state.” The two sides of the drawing define the opposition between Romans and Goths. The queen’s two kneeling sons are “emblems of all the play’s sons: they are simultaneously a kind of doubled Alarbus on the way to execution, Chiron and Demetrius pleading together with their mother for their brother’s life, and Titus’ two middle sons, Quintus and Martius, whose death is the quid pro quo for that of Alarbus. . . .” Aaron appears because he is “instrumental in their execution,” his sword indicating the deaths he has caused. Although Bate is clearly familiar with Peacham’s work within the emblematic tradition and responsibly interprets the drawing within such a frame, it is unlikely that he, or others, would have pursued a symbolic reading had there been a clear correspondence between drawing and text. But in A Very Lamentable Tragedy such a correspondence does in fact exist.

Act 1 of the German version is considerably more compact than Shakespeare’s; besides Andronica (Titus’s daughter), whose silent role precedes the tableau, the opening stage direction signals the entrance of only the seven characters in the drawing: Vespasian, Titus, the Emperor, the queen, the queen’s two sons, and Morian, the blackamoor. When Titus Andronicus refuses the imperial diadem, the Emperor is crowned instead. After pledging to marry Andronica, the Emperor turns to Titus’s prisoners—the queen of Ethiopia, Aetiopissa; her two sons, Helicates and Saphonus; and her black attendant and paramour, Morian. He receives the prisoners as a gift from Titus: “Thus, Queen of Ethiopia, do I liberate you and present you herewith to my gracious lord and Emperor” (21). On behalf of herself, her sons, and her servants, Aetiopissa formally surrenders. The Emperor then promises to raise the suppliants to high position and proposes they all go in. Morian remains

7 Foakes, 50.
9 Metz, 243–45.
onstage to tear off his mantle and reveal himself in his “festive attire” (19) (“prechtige Kleider” [161]). He delivers a long expository speech documenting his sexual relationship with the queen, anticipates cuckoldng the Emperor should he marry Aetiopepissa, confesses his complicity in the poisoning of the queen’s husband, and boasts of villainies. His handsome dress and the second half of his speech characterize him as a military man. “The Thunder and Lightning of Ethiopie,” who “in perilous battles . . . would fight like a grim lion, not like a mortal man at all, but like an actual devil in the flesh” (22)—until he met his match in Titus Andronicus. Morian speaks of his furious fight with Titus, who unhorsed him violently, closing his speech with an account of his capture by the Roman army in Ethiopia: “Then they cut down every man, and thereafter took much booty, and carried off me, the Queen, and her sons to Rome” (22). He then exits to clear the stage, completing the sequence that began with the liberation of the prisoners and here ends with the boastful Moor displayed in military posture and garb.

Accepting the Peacham drawing as a literal rendering of this sequence requires that we discard the long-standing assumption that the figure in classical cuirass and buskins who wears the laurel crown and holds the tasseled ceremonial spear is Titus Andronicus. Though this assumption is inviolate when Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus is the prooftext, it becomes untenable in relation to A Very Lamentable Tragedy; for at this point in the action of the German version, it is the Emperor who wears the Roman crown,11 and it is he, not Titus, whom the queen of Ethiopia addresses and to whom she and her sons surrender. The queen’s folded hands and bended knees are thus not an expression of pleading for the life of a son about to be executed (since this does not occur in the German version) but a gesture of obeisance: “we submit ourselves to your Majesty as your most humble servants. Dispose of us as you please” (21).

The two figures on the left in the drawing are, then, not sons of Titus or coffin bearers or scruffy officers of the Dogberry kind (as Alan Hughes would have it).12 Rather they are Titus and Vespasian pictured in costumes appropriate to the early modern stage. Martin Holmes notes that both are in half-armor, one dressed as an Elizabethan infantry officer, with a plumed Spanish-style bonnet and breeches “cut after the fashion of the Swiss mercenary infantry” of the sixteenth century, the other clad in late-fifteenth-century German (“Gothic”) armor, out of use by 1595, and a combed morion with plumes. The medley of costumes in the tableau, with figures in mixed or outdated military uniform and in both classical and contemporary dress, lends support to the principle that, on the early modern stage, the overall effect of the costume was more important than its historical accuracy. As Holmes points out, “The Goths and the Moor are clad in Roman armour, while two out of the three Romans are not, and yet . . . the general effect looks somehow quite right.” The two men-at-arms “look like the audience’s ideas of St George in a pageant, or recollections of Essex in the tilt-yard or Ralegh coming home from an expedition abroad. It is less important that they should look like real Romans than that they should be recognizable at once as national heroes, and such modern or

11 The stage directions concerning the crown, which is at various times proffered (to Titus, to the Emperor, to Viciotiaedes, and to Vespasion), are problematic and may be explained by my discussion of the 1620 editorial hand later in this essay. Here, I am assuming that the Roman crown was a laurel wreath of the kind that appears in depictions of the Emperors Caesar and in modern productions of the Roman plays. (In the Peacham drawing Aetiopepissa, as queen of Ethiopia, wears a crown of the kind identified with royalty in early modern England.)
12 Hughes, 22.
near-modern armour as was available would therefore be appropriated to."

I would add that the combed morion is also the headgear worn by the figure being honored with laurel boughs in Claude Paradin's "Optimus civis" (1557).

The costumes of the men-at-arms, though anachronistic and inaccurate, are both emblematically and theatrically sound. Along with the other costumes in the tableau, they support the contention that the Peacham drawing depicts an actual theatrical wardrobe. As Holmes puts it, they show "features that the artist was highly unlikely to have imagined and must therefore be assumed to have been and drawn upon a living actor."

Rereading the Peacham drawing as a depiction of the Act 1 sequence of A Very Lamentable Tragedy has an inevitable consequence for the text below it. For if the Peacham drawing is not of Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus, we must conclude that the Shakespearean lines were added by someone whose assumption about the drawing confused and misled generations of scholars.

II

This correspondence between the Peacham drawing and A Very Lamentable Tragedy reawakens interest in a secondary thesis, proposed more than a century ago: that the German version is a translation not of Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus but of the lost Titus and Vespasian recorded in Henslowe's diary in 1592. While my rereading of the Peacham drawing does not rely on the validity of this secondary thesis, consideration of it could move us closer to a fuller understanding of the Longleat manuscript.

Peripheral support for the thesis may be found in the often-cited reference to Titus in A Knack to Know a Knave, a play presented for the first time in June of the same season in which Titus and Vespasian was performed, both by the Lord Strange's Men, probably at the Rose Theatre:

14 The emblem came to my attention through Heather James's chapter on Titus Andronicus, Vergil, and Rome in Shakespeare's 'Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire' (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997). The combed morion is often depicted in early modern emblems.
15 Holmes, 151. That Peacham went to the theater is sure: as a schoolboy of no more than ten, he saw Tarlton in a performance that so impressed him that he recalled the actor's comic prowess years later in The More the Merrier, Containing: Threessore and Olde Headlesse Epigrams (1608), Thalia's Banquet: Furnished with an Hundred and Olde Dishes of Newly Design'd Epigrams (1620), and The Truth of our Times: Revealed out of one Mans Experience, by way of Essay (1638). References to the theater in his writings further record his interest. That Peacham was an artist is also established. In 1606 he published The Art of Drawing with the Pen, and Limming in Water Colours, More Exacte Then Heretofore Taught and enlarged with the true manner of Painting upon glasse, the order of making your furnace, Annealing, &c. Published, For the behoife of all young Gentlemen, or any els that are desirous for to become practitioners in this excellent, and most Ingenious Art (the first book of its kind in English), and in 1612 a revised, expanded edition, Graphice or The Most Anciente and Excellent Art of Drawing and Limming, also issued as The Gentleman's Exercise and, in 1634, as Part 2 of the third edition of The Compleat Gentleman. Fashioning him absolut, in the most necessary and commendable Qualities concerning Minde or Body, that may be required in a Noble Gentleman. Whereunto is Annexed a Description of the order of a Maine Battaille or Pitched Field, eight severall wapes: with the Art of Limming and other Additions newly Enlarged. In both he gives practical instruction to scholars and gentlemen on the art of drawing, from draperies and birds to the human face and form; advice on water colors, painted windows, and oil painting; and an assessment of classical painters. In The Compleat Gentleman he speaks of his attraction to art: "ever naturally from a child I have been addicted to the practice" of painting. He tells of having been beaten by "ill and ignorant schoolmasters when I have been taking, in white and black, the countenance of some one or other (which I could do at thirteen or fourteen years of age . . .)" (129). Peacham also drew and signed a frontispiece portrait of Prince Henry for James Cland's "Le Povraict de Monseigneur le Prince" (1612), which is in the British Library (MS Royal 16E XXXVIII). For a critical biography of Peacham, see Alan R. Young, Henry Peacham (Boston: Twayne, 1979).
The quarto of *A Knack to Know a Knave* containing the passage was published in 1594; if the lines were in the June 1592 production, then the reference would be too early to allude to the “titus & andronicus” performed by the Earl of Sussex’s Men and labeled “ne” (new) in January 1594, or to the “andronicus” performed by the Lord Admiral’s and/or Lord Chamberlain’s Men at Newington Butts in June 1594, or to the first quarto of Shakespeare’s play, published that year. Yet, as Chambers observes, “the allusion in *Knack to Know a Knave* . . . points to a knowledge of Titus and the Goths . . . in 1592, and no such combination is known outside *Titus Andronicus*”—unless the lost play “titus & vespuca,” performed in 1592, was not about the siege of Jerusalem but about Titus and the Goths.18 That the Goths are not present in the German version need not damage that play’s kinship with the lost *Titus and Vespasian*. As Bate has argued, “To the Elizabethans, Jutes, Getes, Goths and Germans were . . . interchangeable.”19 Given this identification, it is reasonable to suppose that the relocation of the enemy to Ethiopia—or “Mohrland,” as it was called in German—was unique to the text played by English actors in Germany.

Further identification of *A Most Lamentable Tragedy* with *Titus and Vespasian* may be inferred from the presence of Vespasian. While there is no such character in Shakespeare’s play, in the German version Vespasian delivers the opening lines and offers Titus the crown.20 It is as Titus’s son later in the play, however, that Vespasian earns the pride of place reflected in the title. In Act 4 Vespasian is present when Morian tells Titus of the queen’s offer of ransom; like Shakespeare’s Lucius, he offers to cut off his own hand to save his father’s; afterwards, horrified at the empress’s savagery in cutting off his brothers’ heads, he vows to fight like “a raging devil” (33) in revenge. In Act 5 Vespasian provides his mutilated sister with sand and staff so that she may identify her offenders and then, with the support of Titus’s treasury, sets off to “raise an army of warriors” and to fight like “a furious tiger,” as he did in “the recent fray with the Moors” (36). He returns


18 Paul E. Bennett, in “The Word ‘Goths’ in *A Knack to Know a Knave*” (*Notes & Queries* 200 [1955]: 462–63), argues that the allusion in *Knack* is to the lost *Titus and Vespasian*, which he takes as a play about the siege of Jerusalem, proposing that “a slip of the tongue or pen” (462) accounts for the substitution of “Goths” for “Jews.” Eugene M. Waith, editor of the 1984 Oxford Shakespeare edition of *Titus Andronicus*, agrees that the allusion is to *Titus and Vespasian* but includes in his argument a reference to Vespasian elsewhere in *Knack*; that Roman emperor, however, who, according to the *Knack* reference, ordered that his son lose his hand after giving a swain a blow, does not match the Vespasian of the German version. A more recent editor concedes that “it is possible . . . that [the *Knack* allusion] refers to Shakespeare’s lost source, or even to *titus and vespuca*” (Hughes, ed., 4).

19 The comment is Bate’s, made in his introduction to *Titus Andronicus* after reviewing the treatment of Saxons, Jutes, and Angles in William Lambard’s 1576 *Pervambulation of Kent* (19). For a historical account of the relationship between the Roman Empire and its Germanic peoples, see Herwig Wolfram, *The Roman Empire and Its Germanic Peoples*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Berkeley: U of California P, 1997).

20 The Act 1 “Vespasian” may be a misprint for “Victoriades,” brother of Titus Andronicus.
in Act 7, triumphant, having assembled an army of “sixty thousand horsemen in full armor and a hundred thousand men on foot” (42), razed cities throughout Italy, plundered, burned, and killed. Nor does he cease his fighting upon his return to Rome, waging four fierce battles there and assaulting the imperial palace. With father and uncle, Vespasian is agent of the Andronicus revenge on the empery: he deceives the empress’s paramour, then orders him hanged. In Act 8 he helps to orchestrate the Thyestean banquet and stabs the Emperor to death. At play’s end it is Vespasian who becomes the emperor of Rome.

There was a moment in the history of scholarly commentary when identification of *A Very Lamentable Tragedy* with *Titus and Vespasian* seemed secure. In 1865 Albert Cohn observed that “this Vespasian, like all the other characters of the German piece, was taken from the original ‘Titus Andronicus,’ and thus we should have to acknowledge that ‘Titus and Vespasian’ as the original on which Shakespeare’s play was founded.”21 Henry Morley, editor of an undated edition published by Henry Altemus prior to the 1904 discovery in Sweden of the first quarto, agrees: “. . . thanks to Mr. Albert Cohn, we have restored to us, in mangled form, the old play of *Titus and Vespasian*, with absolute certainty that it was the original of *Titus Andronicus.*”22 And Harold DeW. Fuller, in a major piece in *PMLA* in 1901 that compares the three extant versions (Jan Vos’s Dutch version, *Aran en Titus*, being the third), concludes that the Dutch play originated in the “*titus & ondronicus*” recorded in Henslowe’s diary in 1594 and the German version in the “*titus & vespacia*” recorded in Henslowe’s diary in 1592.23

By 1926, however, the scholarly sands had shifted. A. M. Witherspoon, in the Yale *Titus Andronicus*, dismissed as “gratuitous” the assumption that “Henslowe’s *titus & vespacia* was the original of the German play.”24 He departed from Cohn and, for that matter, from Chambers, who supposed that “Strange’s may have handed over *Titus Andronicus* in its earlier form of *Titus and Vespasian* to Pembroke’s for the travels of 1593. . . .”25 Witherspoon, along with others, was convinced that the *Titus and Vespasian* identified in Henslowe’s diary as “new” in 1592 and performed several times was about the siege of Jerusalem—even though “Jews” would have to replace “Goths” in the *Knack to Know a Knav* passage if it were to allude to a play or any of the narrative poems or ballads on the subject. The Peamch drawing, of course, was not available to early scholars. But virtually every editor of *Titus Andronicus* since 1925 has discussed it. Yet there is no indication that any of them considered the Peamch drawing in the context of the relationship that I propose between the drawing and the lost *Titus and Vespasian*. Had they done so, they would have seen the connection among the allusion in *A Knack to Know a Knav*, the record of “*titus & vespacia*” in Henslowe’s diary, the surviving German version, and the Peamch drawing.

21 Cohn, CXIII.
23 Harold DeW. Fuller, “The Sources of *Titus Andronicus*,” *PMLA* 16.1 (1901): 1-65. The Dutch play is Jan Vos’s 1661 *Aran en Titus*, reprinted in Jan Vos: *Toneelwerken*, W.J.C. ed. Buitendijk (Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975), 99-210. Fuller’s conclusion regarding the source of the Dutch play is flawed by the assumption that the *titus & ondronicus* recorded in Henslowe’s diary was not Shakespeare’s play; the discovery of the 1594 quarto proved otherwise.
III

Rereading the Peacham drawing as a sequence from a lost play with only the German version as corroborating prooftext is not without its problems. For one, following the list of the seven characters who enter at the outset is a note that Andronica is also there ("Auch ist da die Andronica" [161]), and a stage direction indicates that Titus "Presents his daughter to the Emperor. The Emperor takes her by the hand" (20). But Andronica is not in the Peacham drawing: if the silent daughter of Titus Andronicus was indeed onstage and moved into the tableau at that point in order to take the Emperor’s hand, she would have moved out of it before Peacham took his drawing. Also problematic is a stage direction indicating that Titus "Takes the Queen [by the hand] and leads her to the Emperor," a move that would similarly interrupt the tableau, leaving the characters arranged only briefly in the way that Peacham drew them.

The integrity of Peacham’s drawing can be restored, however, by considering the source of these and other stage directions, which characteristically describe virtually every movement onstage. Although one might suspect at first that such an over-annotated text was intended for performance use, the evidence leads to another conclusion: many of the stage directions in the plays in the 1620 volume were the work of an editorial hand.

In 1939 a Swedish scholar, Gustaf Fredén, convincingly argued that Frederick Menius, a seventeenth-century German-born academic, was the compiler and editor of the 1620 volume. Fredén was building on the 1921 discovery of Johan Nordström, who had found a handwritten list of Menius’s published and unpublished work, which included the following item: "Englische Comedien 2.Theil. Altenburg in Verlegung Gottfried Groszen Buchhändlers zu Leipzig. A:o 1620. in 8:vo."26 (The second part, which included no new plays from the documented repertory of the English actors, appeared in 1630.) Born in Woldegk (Mecklenburg) in 1593 or 1594, Menius attended the universities of Rostock and Greifswald (1609–17); served as public notary at Wolgast in Pomerania (1617–21); secured a position at the University of Dorpat in Poland (now Tartu, Estonia) in or after 1621; and, in 1637, under an accusation of bigamy, fled to Sweden, where he remained until his death ca. 1659. Since English actors and musicians were at the Wolgast court of Philip Julius, Duke of Pomerania, when Menius served there, the notary may have attended some of their performances.27 At the time Menius would have been editing the collection of plays previously available to the public only in performance, he was already associated with

---


27 Philip Julius, Duke of Pomerania, was nephew to Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig, known for his hospitality to English actors; records place English actors and musicians at Philip Julius’s Wolgast court from 1604 to 1623.
Gottfried Gross, publisher, through his own collection of poems, *Phēmata artificiosa varij generij*, published by Gross that same year.

In a 1969 thesis done at Ghent under the direction of Willem Schrickx, a meticulous researcher on the English actors in Germany and the Netherlands, W. Braekman reviewed Fredén's work, as well as that of Nordström. In support of their argument, he points to the title page of the 1620 volume, which notes that the plays are being published in a form that would enable them easily to be acted ("dass sie gar leicht darauss Spielweiss widerumb angerichtet . . ." [25]); then, like Fredén, he analyzes the stage directions in *A Very Lamentable Tragedy.*

Braekman's analysis reveals a consistently visible editorial hand, responsible for numerous stage directions. More irksome than helpful, at least to the theater historian, these discursive interpolations often create a redundancy with the text, where stage directions implicit in the dialogue would normally be sufficient to provide actors with their cues.

The opening stage direction in *A Very Lamentable Tragedy* is one such example. Although the text will immediately make clear that the Emperor has not yet been proclaimed emperor and will indicate the circumstances of the queen and her entourage, the stage direction provides those details: "the Emperor also enters, but at this time he is not yet Roman Emperor" (19); "The last four are the prisoners of Titus Andronicus" (19). Similarly, in Act 4, following the rape of Andronica, to designate the entrance of Aetioissa’s sons, the stage direction reads: "Now there appear Helicastes and Saphonus who had previously gone into the forest with Andronicus, where they had satisfied their lust and had horribly mutilated her" (31). In Act 6, after Morian kills the midwife who brought his infant son onstage, the stage direction reads “Stands still; looks at his infant son sleeping in his arms” (41), even though the preceding scene has made clear that Morian has his son in his arms (27). Frequently, the stage direction makes explicit the action inscribed in the dialogue: “Now let me throw off these old rags”/"He takes off the old mantle" (21); “I now place the crown upon your head”/"Sets the crown on her head" (22); “But what an astonishing thing do I see now—the Empress all alone and hurrying toward us!”/"Empress approaches them" (26). Braekman concludes: “It thus becomes apparent that the text of *G* [the German version], as we have it, shows definite signs of editorial revision and cannot be regarded as faithfully representing the actual play the English actors performed in Germany.”

Given these analyses, I would argue that any difficulties in the correspondence between the Peacham drawing and *A Very Lamentable Tragedy* derive from the stage directions. I make no claim that the lost *Titus and Vespasian* on which the German version was based was similarly annotated or that the production Peacham saw was staged, or blocked, in the same way. This is an important caveat, but it does not obviate the value of *A Very Lamentable Tragedy* for rereading the Peacham drawing.

---


29 Braekman, 28.
The question remains as to whether the attribution on the Longleat manuscript is indeed Henry Peacham's autograph. Preserved in the British Library as Harleian MS 1500 are several pages of genealogical notes that Margaret C. Pitman, in her unpublished 1933 University of London thesis identifies with Henry Peacham, whose interest in armory and blazonry is recorded in *The Compleat Gentleman*. Among the notes are two pages bearing signatures that Pitman describes as Peacham's. The first, primarily in English, with Latin opening and closing, reflects an unattractive hand and an undistinguished autograph. Though in Latin and with a flourish that follows the curve of the flourish under Peacham's name in the Longleat manuscript, the autograph bears little resemblance to the attribution in the Longleat manuscript. I reproduce it here:

![Signature](image1)

The second, which begins with a Latin paragraph, then shifts to English, reflects a quite different but similarly unattractive hand and a signature, in English, that is a bit more like the carefully penned signature of the Longleat manuscript. I reproduce that as well:

![Signature](image2)

The definitive signature, however, appears in the manuscript of Peacham's *Emblemata Varia* (ca. 1621), catalogued at the Folger Shakespeare Library as MS. V. b. 45. Written in a fair hand, the autograph is strikingly like that of the Longleat manuscript:

![Signature](image3)

---


31 The full title of this work is *Emblemata Varia, recens ad大家一起, suis Icomibus, unag[ue] carmine Latino donata, Authore Henrico Peachamo*. A facsimile edition of this manuscript, with an introduction by Alan R. Young, was published by the Scolar Press in 1976.
Watermark from the Peacham drawing. Reproduced by permission of the Marquess of Bath, Longleat House, Warminster, Wiltshire, Great Britain.
My proposal, then, is: a) that the Peacham drawing depicts a sequence from *A Very Lamentable Tragedy*, a play that survives, in German, in the volume published in Leipzig in 1620 containing plays performed by English actors in Germany, and b) that the Peacham drawing, along with the autograph, is independent of the lines from Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* inscribed below it. In examining questions affiliated with this proposal, I have also suggested c) that *A Very Lamentable Tragedy* may well be a translation, with interpolated stage directions, of the lost "titus & vesplaca" recorded in Henslowe's diary in 1592 (which might also be a source for Shakespeare's play). I would add, by way of preserving the independent integrity of my proposal, that the third part of my hypothesis does not need to be proven true for the first two to stand.

**Addendum**

Published here, for the first time, is a reproduction of the watermark on the Longleat manuscript, acquired through the kindness of the Tate Gallery and Longleat House. A single-handed, pedestaled pot with crown and four spheres above, the Longleat watermark is one of many variations on this common sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century species, which appears on paper used in England and supplied from France. Indeed, a similar though not identical design of a single-handed, pedestaled pot, with crown and a crescent within a sphere above, appears on paper used by Peacham for emblems from 1603–10.32

G. Harold Metz, who published a note about the watermark in 1985,33 reviewed the hundreds of tracings and drawings of pots in compendia assembled by C. M. Briquet, W. A. Churchill, Edward Heawood, and M. Beazeley,34 selecting eight examples that he thought "very close" to the Longleat watermark, all on paper for which the first recorded use ranged from 1523 to 1611. Though I prefer to compare the Longleat watermark with those Briquet assembles as figures 12519 through 12528, which feature crowns styled with the rounded lobes of the Longleat watermark rather than the five-jeweled crowns of Metz’s examples, I do not quarrel with Metz’s "reasonably safe" conclusion: that "the paper on which the sketch was drawn and the cento written can be dated in the last decade of the sixteenth century."35 I would add, however, that the conclusion would hold were the presumed date of the document some years later.

Indeed, scholars who have examined the Longleat manuscript have been puzzled by the date inscribed in the left margin below Henry Peacham’s name.

---

32 These emblems are catalogued in the British Library collection as MS Harleian 6855 art. 13.
Peculiarly rendered in Latin abbreviation as “Anno m° q° q° q°,” it was interpreted as 1595 by the scholar (John Payne Collier?) or librarian (Canon John Edward Jackson?) who wrote on the manuscript’s vertical fold.36 The vexing third character has attracted the attention of scholars for nearly seventy-five years, with no one improving on Chambers’s initial, casual suggestion that it could be “a slip for an Arabic 9.”37 When Jonathan Bate considered the question, he approached it through the analogy of the roman MDCV, with the figures expressing, in turn, 1000, 500, 100, and 5, and proposed that the date could be 1605, 1604, 1614, or 1615.38

In an analysis appearing in the Spring 1999 issue of *Shakespeare Bulletin*, Herbert Berry offers what will surely become the definitive reading of the elusive date, along with an argument for two different hands. Peacham, he concludes, did the autograph; another hand wrote the lines from *Titus Andronicus* and the date: 1594. While neither his paleographical analysis nor mine concerning the German version resolves all of the difficulties of this provocative document, together they offer a new perspective on the much-misunderstood Longleat manuscript.

---

36 See Joseph Quincy Adams, ed., *Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus: The First Quarto 1594* (New York: Charles Scribner’s, for the Trustees of Amherst College, 1936). Metz agrees that the endorsement is probably by Collier but identifies the pencil notes in various places as the hand of Canon Jackson (1805–91), librarian to the Marquess of Bath (“Titus Andronicus: A Watermark,” 450–53).

37 Chambers, “First,” 326.

38 Bate, ed., 32.