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The present is the second of two ‘Early Modern German Shakespeare’ volumes published by the Arden Shakespeare. Volume 1 (2020), edited by Lukas Erne and Kareen Seidler, contains Der Bestrafte Brudermord (in English Fratricide Punished), a version of Hamlet, and Romio und Julieta (Romeo and Juliet). Volume 2 adds Tito Andronico (Titus Andronicus) and Kunst über alle Künste, ein bös Weib gut zu machen, in English An Art beyond All Arts, to Make a Bad Wife Good (The Taming of the Shrew). Jointly, the two volumes make available in English translation the best versions of Shakespeare’s plays as they existed in seventeenth-century Germany.

The aim of Arden’s ‘Early Modern German Shakespeare’ edition is to make these versions join the conversation about Shakespeare’s texts. As scholars have come to realize, many of Shakespeare’s English texts embed within themselves the contributions of actors, revisers and adapters. They are socialized products, in keeping with the eminently socialized art form that is theatre. We have been used to thinking of Shakespeare’s socialized early modern texts as purely English, but such monolingualism imposes upon them a restriction that simply does not square with the international traffic of early modern theatre companies and their plays. From the late sixteenth century, plays that were performed in commercial theatres in London also had an existence elsewhere, not only in the provinces but also on the Continent, and in particular its German-speaking parts. At a time when the United Kingdom has recently left the European Union, it seems a good moment to remember that Shakespeare’s plays have always also been European, and that we have much to gain from recovering the life they led on the Continent.

We acknowledge that the German-English language barrier may be a greater obstacle in the modern world of scholarship
than it was in the early modern world of the theatre. German is no longer the language of learning that it was in the nineteenth century, and the language of international Shakespeare scholarship is now emphatically English. Editing Shakespeare’s early modern German plays in German therefore means cutting them off from the attention of most Shakespeareans. That is the reason why the present volume and its companion volume make the plays available in English translation. We have also prepared editions of the original German texts, with short introductions and textual notes, and they are available online and for download on the University of Geneva’s institutional repository, ‘Archive ouverte UNIGE’, at https://doi.org/10.13097/archive-ouverte/unige:150834 (Tito Andronico) and https://doi.org/10.13097/archive-ouverte/unige:150835 (Kunst über alle Künste).

The preface to the first volume of our ‘Early Modern German Shakespeare’ edition provides short introductions to the presence of English actors on the Continent from the late sixteenth century and to Shakespeare’s contributions to the repertoires of early modern German theatre companies. It also supplies an illustration of the impact a passage in an early modern German version can have on our editorial and critical reception of a Shakespeare play. These prefatory materials, which are relevant to both volumes, are not repeated here (see Erne and Seidler, xiv–xxi).

Tito Andronico and Kunst über alle Künste have the distinction of being, respectively, the earliest and the best of the extant early modern German Shakespeare versions. Tito Andronico was published in a dramatic collection that appeared in 1620. The earliest dramatic collection containing a Shakespeare play was thus not the First Folio, published in London in 1623, but the Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien (English Comedies and Tragedies) published in octavo in Leipzig, Germany, and in German. Its early date means that it is closely connected to and can throw light on several Titus
documents, not only Shakespeare’s play but also the Peacham Drawing and the chapbook prose history of Titus Andronicus. As our edition aims to show, it is a key witness to the early history of Shakespeare’s play.¹

Published in two duodecimo editions dated 1672, Kunst über alle Künste bears witness to the sophistication German drama had acquired in the half-century since Tito. While it essentially preserves the dramatis personae and plot outline of The Taming of the Shrew (except for the Induction), and at times follows the original speech by speech and almost word for word, it also confidently reworks and elaborates on it. It constitutes a shrewd engagement with Shakespeare’s play, keenly alert to its dramatic potential and attuned to its gender and social issues while not afraid of positioning itself differently vis-à-vis those points.

Shakespeare’s has long become the epitome of dramatic authorship, but his seventeenth-century German translators and adaptors remain shrouded in mystery. Der Bestrafte Brudermord was probably revised for performance by the company of Carl Andreas Paulsen in the 1660s and Romio und Julieta for performance by Eggenberg’s Comedians at the court theatre of Český Krumlov (Bohemian Krumlov) in 1688, but who undertook the revisions is now beyond recovery (Erne and Seidler, 28–31, 90–100). Contrary to what might be expected, the earliest of the four plays, Tito Andronico, is the only one for which we can name a writer who was almost certainly involved in the adaptation: Friedrich Menius, a colourful figure who was prosecuted and condemned for both bigamy and heresy. Yet the exact form that Menius’s involvement took is far from clear (see below, pp. 64–74). Kunst über alle Künste is the work of an adaptor who is identified as a ‘Teutsche[r] Edelman’, a German gentleman, on the title page; he writes an address to

¹ For the co-authorship of Titus Andronicus, see below, p. 2, n. 1.
the reader in a distinctive voice but chooses to remain anonymous. To paraphrase the characteristically poignant formulation with which he explains his anonymity, it does not matter what a kitten is called, provided it catches mice (see below, pp. 140–3). While little is known about the identity of Shakespeare’s early modern German translators and adaptors, the plays published in this and its companion volume bear witness to the ingenuity of their dramatic engagement with Shakespeare’s drama.
INTRODUCTION TO

TITO ANDRONICO

(TITUS ANDRONICUS)

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

¹ See Metz, Studies, 17–43.
² The most comprehensive studies of Tito are Fuller and Braekman.
The German play is only 1,154 lines long, whereas Titus, now commonly believed to have been co-authored by Shakespeare and George Peele, comes in at approximately 2,500 lines. Unlike the early quarto texts of Titus, which have no formal act or scene divisions, Tito is divided into eight acts. While the plot is similar to that of Titus, the action in Tito is more streamlined and some elements are absent, including the classical references: no mention is made of Philomel and Tereus (2.2.43; 2.3.38–43; 4.1.47–53; 5.2.194), and no copy of Ovid’s Metamorphoses appears on the stage (4.1.42). The language of Tito is simpler than that of Titus, but it is not without moments of rhetorical force, particularly in Tito’s outrage at Aetiopissa (4.3.8–20) and his moving response to the futile loss of his hand (4.3.21–7), as well as his lamentations over his dead sons (4.3.28–33) and his defiled daughter (4.3.60–76). Throughout the play, there are parallels with the language and imagery of Titus, a number of which are discussed below, and many more in the commentary.

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

---

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

2 Quarto editions of Titus Andronicus appeared in 1594, 1600 and 1611. The First Folio collection of Shakespeare’s dramatic works, which divides the play into five acts, was published in 1623, three years after the first edition of Tito. Four plays in the 1620 volume are divided into five acts (and one of them, Sidonia und Theagene, is further divided into scenes). Julio und Hyppolita is in four Acts, while two plays in the collection, Von dem verlornen Sohn (The Prodigal Son) and Von eines Königes Sohne auß Engellandi vnd des Königes Tochter aus Schottlandt (A King’s Son of England and a King’s Daughter of Scotland), have six acts. It is most unusual for early modern plays in Germany or England to be divided into eight acts, and we know of no other instance.
Yet all the major characters are present, although with the exception of Tito their names are entirely different: Vespasianus (Lucius), Victoriades (Marcus), Andronica (Lavinia), Aetiopissa (Tamora), Helicates (Demetrius), Saphonus (Chiron) and Morian (Aaron). Tito’s equivalent of Saturninus has no name but is simply referred to as the Roman Emperor. As we will see below, the characterization of Morian and Aetiopissa differs substantially from that of Aaron and Tamora, and there are other, subtler differences that impact the other characters, notably Tito, Andronica and Vespasianus.

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

---

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

2 All references are from Ard³ TA unless indicated otherwise.
brothers’, Quintus and Martius (Ard\textsuperscript{3} TA, 47). Close attention to the German version here leads to the insertion of poignant stage business into an authoritative edition of Shakespeare’s play.

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

Despite this incipient awareness of \textit{Tito’s} importance, the German play remains a vastly underused resource in the study of \textit{Titus Andronicus}. For while recent editors of \textit{Titus} incorporate one or two of its stage directions, they take no account of many others that are no less important. For instance, in the opening scene of both plays, the Moor character, Morian in \textit{Tito} and Aaron in \textit{Titus}, is silent during the succession crisis but remains on stage when all the other characters leave and speaks a soliloquy. In \textit{Tito}, the play’s opening stage direction points out that Morian ‘\textit{has a humble cloak pulled over his magnificent clothes}’ (1.1.0 SD), and when the other characters have left, another stage direction informs us that ‘\textit{He pulls off the old cloak}’ (1.1.83 SD) to reveal his magnificent clothes. There is no
equivalent stage direction in *Titus*, but Aaron’s words are suggestive: ‘Away with slavish weeds and servile thoughts! / I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold’ (1.1.517–18). Does Aaron remove his ‘slavish weeds’ at the same time as he mentions them? At the very least, Morian enacts a version of what Aaron says, and it is not impossible that Aaron’s words were accompanied by a similar costume change.

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

Similarly, after Tamora has given birth, the Nurse enters to Aaron, Demetrius and Chiron with the ‘blackamoor child’ (4.2.51 SD). Tamora’s sons are dismayed and want to ‘dispatch’ (4.2.88) the baby. The conflict comes to a head when Demetrius demands, ‘Nurse, give it me’ (4.2.88), yet the baby is rescued by Aaron. There is no stage direction in the early editions of the English play to indicate how the moment was staged. The English dramatist Edward Ravenscroft, who produced an adaptation of *Titus Andronicus* in 1678 (published 1687), inserted a stage direction, ‘Aron takes the child from the Woman’ (Ard3 TA, 265), and Hughes comments that ‘Aaron probably takes the child from the Nurse’ (126). The stage action in *Tito* is
different, however, and arguably more dramatic: Saphonus ‘takes the child from the midwife, draws his sword and is about to kill the child’ (6.1.47 SD) when it is snatched from him by Morian. Here and elsewhere, Tito provides the best evidence we have of how the English play may have been performed, and the stage action is different from and arguably more complex and more interesting than that mediated to us through modern editions of Titus.

Other stage directions in Tito that may reflect the early performance history of Titus concern the character of Andronica (Tito’s Lavinia). When Andronica and her husband enter in the scene that will lead to the former’s rape and the latter’s murder, they do so ‘hand in hand’ (3.3.0 SD). The equivalent stage direction in Titus (‘Enter bassianus and lavinia’, 2.2.50 SD) does not convey this detail, although physical intimacy between Lavinia and her husband is suggested in the allusion to the newlyweds’ consummation of their marriage (2.1.14–17). When the husband is murdered, Titus has no stage direction that tells us what she does, but Tito informs us that ‘She goes to sit on the ground with the corpse’ (3.3.69 SD). After Lavinia/Andronica has been raped, she reappears on stage with the rapists who have mutilated her, and now make cruel fun of the fact (Titus, 2.3.1–10; Tito, 4.2.1–9). When the brothers have left, she remains on stage alone, and a stage direction in Tito, with no equivalent in Titus, informs us that she is ‘sighing and looking wretchedly up to heaven’ (4.2.9 SD2). When the mutilated Lavinia has been found by her uncle and brought by him before her father and her brother, Lucius responds verbally to the sight of his sister – ‘Ay me, this object kills me’ (3.1.65) – and the following line, spoken by Titus, implies that he has responded physically, too, for Titus asks him to ‘arise and look upon her’ (3.1.66). According to an editorially added stage direction in the Arden edition, Lucius ‘fall[s] to his knees’ (3.1.64 SD), whereas the editors of the New Oxford Shakespeare comment that ‘Lucius must have sat, fallen, or knelt, or perhaps
fainted at the sight of Lavinia’s injuries’ (215). Neither edition mentions that Tito supports this last possibility, for a stage direction spells out that Vespasianus, as the Lucius character is called in Tito, ‘falls to the ground in a swoon’ (4.3.59 SD).

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

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TITO ANDRONICO TO TITUS ANDRONICUS

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

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

1 Victoriades may be absent from the opening scene because the actor who plays his role later in the play is needed in this scene as one of the unnamed ‘Romans’ (see Appendix, pp. 417–19).
series of unnamed characters: Tribunes, Senators, Soldiers, Goths and a Captain. The opening scene of \textit{Tito} is short compared to that of \textit{Titus}. It focuses on a single issue, the selection of the new emperor, before concluding with Morian’s soliloquy. Vespasianus identifies Tito as the most deserving candidate for the imperial crown, to which the future Emperor (who is given no proper name) angrily objects, prompting Tito to recuse himself; as a result, the Emperor is crowned and Tito’s prisoners are presented to him. The action of the first scene thus ends harmoniously, without any physical confrontations or deaths, and the only indication of future complications is the Emperor’s volatile hot-headedness and the suggestion that he has a romantic interest in Aetiopissa despite his betrothal to Andronica (1.1.51–3). The English play, by contrast, dramatizes many issues: the contest for the imperial crown (1.1.1–66); Titus’ arrival in Rome and the sacrifice of Alarbus (1.1.66–171); Titus’ candidacy for the crown and his promotion of Saturninus (1.1.172–237); the fray following the disagreement over Lavinia (1.1.238–342); the burial of Mutius (1.1.343–95); Tamora’s deceitful peace-making between the Andronici and Saturninus (1.1.404–99); Aaron’s soliloquy (1.1.500–24); and Chiron and Demetrius’ quarrel about Lavinia (1.1.525–635).\footnote{The Folio introduces an act division after 1.1.499, so that Aaron’s soliloquy and the quarrel between the two brothers form the opening of the second act.} Two important episodes in \textit{Titus} have no equivalent in \textit{Tito}, namely the sacrificial murder of Alarbus and the disagreement about Lavinia, which leads to Titus’ murder of his own son, Mutius. The opening scene of \textit{Tito} is thus considerably more streamlined than the complex action found in \textit{Titus}.

In \textit{Titus}, Saturninus rejects Lavinia in favour of Tamora because of the altercation with Bassianus and the Andronici (1.1.280–325), but the Emperor in \textit{Tito} does not have the same motivation for rejecting Andronica. He simply states that he loves Aetiopissa far more than Andronica. He then crowns his
new consort onstage, whereas Saturninus only expresses his intention to make Tamora his consort (1.1.320–5). Tito thus dramatizes what Titus verbalizes.

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

The action that follows corresponds more closely to Titus: Helicates and Saphonus declare their love for Andronica and quarrel over who shall have her (2.1.38–66) in much the same way as Chiron and Demetrius do (1.1.525–44). Both plays highlight the problem that the object of the brothers’ desire is already married, and in both plays the Moor is instrumental in devising the rape plot. A hunt is called for, and the apparent pleasantness of the new day is offset by a foreboding dream (Tito, 3.2.1–5; Titus, 2.1.1–2, 9–10). This is followed by the rape and mutilation of Andronica/Lavinia and the imprisonment of two Andronici sons. Whereas in Titus significance is placed on Aaron’s plot to frame Titus’ sons for Bassianus’ murder by means of a pit, a forged letter and a bag of gold (2.2.1–50), in Tito the focus is exclusively on the attack on Andronica.
In Tito there is no reason for Morian and Aetiopissa to cross paths before meeting Andronica and her husband as there is in Titus (2.2.1–50), which means that the couple do not witness the Empress’ dalliance with the Moor, and therefore have no cause to berate them. In Tito 3.3, Aetiopissa enters to Andronica and, without any provocation, mocks her for not having a large retinue of servants. Andronica responds by commenting on the Empress’ ‘haughty spirit’ (3.3.28), which causes Aetiopissa to fly into a rage. In Titus the equivalent exchange takes a different course: Lavinia and Bassianus mock Tamora after seeing her dalliance with Aaron (2.2.51–88), and it is this that enrages her. Aetiopissa’s attack on Andronica and her subsequent vow for revenge (3.3.41–6) thus lack Tamora’s justification. The two versions of the confrontation between Andronica/Lavinia and the Empress reveal how the characters differ in the two plays. Tamora’s amorous dalliance with the Moor, which is absent from Tito, arises from her sexual licentiousness. The emphasis in the German play is on Aetiopissa’s arrogance, as the title’s reference to the ‘haughty Empress’ suggests.

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

In fact, no sons other than Vespasianus are mentioned in Tito until the beginning of Act 4, when we learn that two unnamed sons have, in fact, been imprisoned, not for murder but on the charge of having insulted Aetiopissa with ‘mockery and libels’ (4.1.7). Their imprisonment not only leads to their beheading,
which is necessary for the plot, but also draws further attention to Aetiopissa’s pride and cunning. Her responsibility for the sons’ imprisonment logically follows her threat to Andronica in the previous scene, where she vows to ‘murder your entire kin, including your parents and brothers’ (3.3.74–5). The difference between Tito and Titus thus highlights the status of the Empress as the chief villain in the German play.

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

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

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

---

1 Aetiopissa’s responsibility for the trick is corroborated by the Emperor, who congratulates her on her ingenious plan in 5.2.1–6.
(3.1.276–80) follows the gruesome delivery of the severed heads (which arrive after the raped Lavinia has been discovered and presented to her father), and the second oath is sworn once the identity of Lavinia’s attackers has been revealed (following 4.1.78). In *Titus*, there are not two oaths but one: Act 4 ends with Victoriades’ proposal to ‘consider how we can find out who has abused her thus’ (4.3.83–4), and Act 5 opens with the Andronici’s re-entry and Andronica’s revelation of her attackers’ identities, which prompt the Andronici to swear an oath. This means that the main catalyst for Titus’ first oath is a desire to revenge his sons’ deaths rather than his daughter’s attackers. By contrast, it is Andronica’s revelation that is the call to arms in *Tito*. Tito’s plot construction is thus such that it arguably gives greater importance to the protagonist’s daughter than does *Titus*.

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

---

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

2 In fact, she provides only one name in writing: ‘There is “Helicates” and also “hunt”’ (5.1.28–9). Tito infers that Saphonus was also involved and that the Empress was likewise to blame. While the dialogue in *Titus* implies that Lavinia makes arm gestures to indicate that there was more than one attacker (4.1.37–9), there is no such indication in *Tito*. 
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revelation of the names in *Tito* 5.1 are more direct, and the initiative to communicate them does not come from the female victim but from her brother. The scene opens with Tito lamenting and attempting to comfort Andronica, and Vespasianus enters with a basket of sand and a stick, stating that his sister should attempt to write the names by this means (5.1.18–20). Tito places the stick between Andronica’s stumps and she immediately succeeds in writing with it (5.1.21–7). *Tito* is thus less elaborate than *Titus*, and the two plays differ substantially in terms of the agency ascribed to the ravished daughter. Whereas Lavinia actively seeks to reveal her ordeal to her relatives, Andronica is prompted to do so by them.

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

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

(5.1.79–82)

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

---

1 An advantage of bringing a basket of sand that is then poured onto the floor is that it makes the action easier for the audience to follow.
to a call to arms, and Vespasianus is called upon to raise an army with which to destroy Rome.

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

Following Titus’s declaration of war at the end of Act 5, Act 6 shifts to the domestic concerns of the Empress, namely the birth of the mixed-race child. The action is similar to *Titus* 4.2.52–148, where the Nurse enters to Aaron, Chiron and Demetrius, and presents them with the child, telling Aaron that Tamora has ordered him to kill it; Aaron refuses and instead kills the Nurse. In *Tito*, the Midwife enters with the infant, noting that Aetiopissa wishes Morian to ‘secretly put it out of the way’ (6.1.2–3). Yet after Saphonius and Helicates discover the Midwife and question her about her ward, we learn that the child’s mother has ordered her to take the child to Morian ‘so that he can have it brought up in secret to make sure that no-one knows about it’ (6.1.28–9). Just as the outraged brothers are about to kill the child, Morian
enters and dismisses them, and the Midwife is able to deliver Aetiopissa’s message in full, bidding him ‘take it in secret to Mount Thaurin, where your father lives, so that he can raise it; no-one must know that it was born of the Empress’ (6.1.85–8). Thus, the respective plans of Tamora and Aetiopissa for dealing with the child are starkly different: where the former proposes death, the latter plans for future life.

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

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

---

1 For Mount Thaurin, which has no equivalent in Titus, see below, p. 220.
will use in battle’ and murder him if the bloodshed does not cease (7.3.3–5, 6–9). Tamora’s plan, on the other hand, is to trick Titus into persuading Lucius to a parley with Saturninus (4.4.88–98, 107–11); she does not originally intend to leave her sons with Titus until he demands it. In the English play, Titus’ feigned madness gives Tamora hope that the disguise plot will succeed, and in a substantial exchange between the two, Tamora attempts to persuade Titus that she is Revenge, accompanied by Murder and Rapine, while Titus’ asides alert the audience to the fact that he is not fooled (5.2.9–120). Ultimately, Tamora departs because she thinks that her plan has succeeded. In the German play, Tito does not pretend madness when Aetiopissa presents herself and her sons: they are accepted by Tito seemingly without question, as being ‘ordained by the gods to help . . . with good counsel in these wars’ (7.3.18–19). The brevity of the scene in Tito quickens the pace of the action that leads up to the climax of the scene, where the brothers are executed.

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

The ending of Tito is more streamlined than that of Titus. Tito calls a conciliatory banquet, whereas it is the disguised Tamora who suggests a feast in the English play (5.2.111–19).
Since peace has already been proclaimed in *Tito*, the banquet commences without incident. Tito serves the pies, is questioned about his melancholy by the Emperor, kills Andronica, proclaims that Aetiopissa is to blame, reveals that the pies are made of her sons’ flesh, kills Aetiopissa and is in turn killed by the Emperor. Vespasianus takes revenge on the Emperor, and Victoriades asks Vespasianus to take the crown; he initially protests but then agrees to do so. The pace of the ending in *Tito* is fast, and there is not much action that follows the spectacular deaths that occur onstage.

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

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

**ISSUES OF RACE IN *TITO ANDRONICO***

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

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

¹ For example, see Hall; Jones; Barthelemy; de Sousa; Bartels, ‘Making’; and Vaughan and Vaughan.
² ‘Mohrenland’ is defined by Grimm as ‘a land where Moors live, notably Mauritania and Ethiopia’ (*n. land worin die mohren wohnen; vornehmlich Mauritanien und Aethiopien*).
In the Renaissance Goths were synonymous with Germans; if you are an English company touring in Germany, you would be ill advised to have a barbarous Gothic/German queen and her rapist sons, and, therefore, you turn them into more distant barbarians, namely Ethiopians (this also means that you avoid the scandal of miscegenation between the empress and the Moor, a change that is in accordance with a certain moral cleansing of the text appropriate to Luther’s Germany . . .).  

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

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

---

1 Bate and Massai, 140. The long-standing assumption that Goths are synonymous with Germans has recently been challenged by Ndiaye, ‘Aaron’s Roots’.
necessarily mean that Aetiopissa and Morian belong to the same racial category, as the anxiety about their son’s appearance makes clear, and the issue of miscegenation is by no means ‘cleansed’ from the play. Even before the birth of the child, a contrast between Morian and Aetiopissa’s skin colour is firmly established. The opening stage direction insists as much on Aetiopissa’s whiteness as it does on Morian’s blackness: ‘Also enter AETIOPISSA, the Queen of Ethiopia, who is lovely and white, . . . and MORIAN, who is black’ (1.1.0 SD). Although the term ‘Ethiopian’ was typically associated with very dark skin, the plot requires a white queen.\(^1\) Her whiteness, evident in performance, is here spelled out for the reader to avoid confusion. In Act 1 the speech prefixes are variously ‘Königin auß Mohrenlandt’ (‘Queen of Africa’) and ‘Ætiopis.’, but after she is crowned in Act 2 she is largely ‘Käyserin’, which removes any reminders of her African origins. In Morian’s case, the reader is invited to visualize a black body, and the speech prefix (‘Morian’ from the German word for Moor) reiterates his racial difference throughout.\(^2\) As the text insists on Morian’s blackness, it seems likely that the travelling players capitalized on the sensational nature of this ‘black devil’ (‘schwartzer Teufel’, 7.1.22) by performing him in blackface.

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

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

\(^2\) Vaughan (9–15) discusses various strategies for performing blackness, including blackface make-up, masks, stockings and gloves. As Vaughan demonstrates, blackface was commonly used to represent Moors on the early modern English stage, so it is reasonable to assume that the travelling players would have replicated the technique in \textit{Tito}. It seems more likely that the white actor who played Morian pigmented his face than that he hid it behind a mask. He has a substantial speaking part, and it might have been impeded by a face-covering, but see Smith for uses of sartorial blackface.
perhaps an oversight or a lapse in logic on the play’s part, arising from a hasty and arbitrary switch from Goths to Ethiopians. Yet there is a literary and visual tradition concerning white Ethiopian princesses, among them the mythical princess Andromeda, Chariclea (from Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*, an ancient Greek prose romance) and Clorinda (from Torquato Tasso’s *Jerusalem Delivered*).¹ Chariclea in particular had a vibrant afterlife: Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica* underwent an impressive number of translations across early modern Europe, which in turn gave rise to a range of stage adaptations.² Thomas Underdowne’s English translation of the *Aethiopica* was published in 1569, and it probably influenced the lost play, *Chariclea* (1572).³ Further evidence of white Ethiopian princesses on the stage is found in the titles of other lost plays such as *Perseus and Andromeda* (1574) and *The Queen of Ethiopia* (1578), which may have been another adaptation of Heliodorus’ romance.⁴ Although the whiteness of the African female characters in these narratives was anomalous, dramatizations such as these established a theatrical precedent for the staging of white Ethiopian royal women.

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

---

¹ See Spicer and Iyengar.
² See Ricquier, 15–22. On European stage adaptations, see Ndiaye, ‘Everyone’.
³ Prior to Underdowne’s translation, material from the *Aethiopica* was available in John Sanford’s *The Amorous and Tragicall Tales of Plutarch Wherevnto is Annexed the Hystorie of Cariclea & Theagenes* (London, 1567, STC 20072). On the lost play, see Wiggins, 2.91–2.
⁴ See Wiggins, 2.109–10 and 2.183.
envisage Aetiopissa as a ‘tawny’ African, since distinctions were sometimes drawn between people from different parts of Africa and the degree of their ‘blackness’ in early modern literature.¹ A claim could even be made about Ethiopia as a Christian stronghold, which would make it imaginatively ‘easier’ to identify Aetiopissa and her sons as set apart from Morian, whose name carried Muslim connotations.² However, the play makes no allusions to religious difference and presents Aetiopissa as Queen of Ethiopia and ‘Mohrenlandt’ interchangeably, which makes claims about such fine differences problematic. Francesca T. Royster has argued that in Titus the trajectory of Moor, Goth, and Roman encapsulates a ‘denaturalization of whiteness . . . and its construction along an unstable continuum of racial identities’ (432). The German play, while not as explicitly interested in drawing attention to the polarized nature of black and white as Titus, nonetheless problematizes whiteness through the presence of a white African queen.

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

---

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

² For a discussion of Christianity in Ethiopia, see Salvadore, and Lowe, ‘Representing’.

³ Vaughan, 2, 43–50.
ravaged by the Romans. Aaron, whether as a slave or as a free
man serving the Goth queen, is an outsider.¹ Morian, on the
other hand, is his mistress’s countryman and has a powerful set
of connections to their homeland.²

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

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

¹ For a discussion of Aaron and his skin-colour, see Fiedler.
² The play does not specify whether Morian was born in Ethiopia, but it is clear that
he identifies powerfully with his erstwhile homeland.
between him and Tito: ‘Before long, old Tito rushed at me and – something that no man had ever done before – struck me off my horse with his lance so fiercely that I didn’t know whether I were dead or alive’ (1.1.123–7). Although Morian emerges as a powerful military figure, his account makes clear that he was finally overcome and humiliated by the superior skills of the Roman warrior.¹

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

¹ See below (pp. 43–4) for a discussion of how this encounter echoes material in the chapbook. In Jan Vos’ Dutch adaptation, Aran en Titus (Aran and Titus, 1641), the Moor publicly declares himself to be a supreme warrior (Buitendijk, ll. 176–9), and the List of Roles identifies him as the ‘Veldheer der Gotten’, which places him on an equal military footing with Titus, who is ‘Veldtheer der Romeinen’ (Buitendijk, l. 114).
³ This visual tradition is discussed by Korhonen. Examples of this type of contrast are found in Bindman and Gates, vol. 3, part 1.
arms, impresas and decorative objects such as Christoph Jamnitzer’s ‘Moor’s Head’ cup. As Anu Korhonen suggests:

In [European] popular culture, blackness was fictionalised into a highly abstract but simply observable bodily category. Proverbs, sayings, biblical quotations and many passing remarks in Renaissance texts all come together to construct blackness as an absolute, without differences or degrees, juxtaposed with a whiteness similarly simplified and categorized.

Black skin was perceived as a spectacle produced by this opposition, particularly when it was coupled with something white, be it white skin or white clothes, or with something precious and beautiful, such as gold, silver or jewels. Creating the dichotomy between black and white was essential to judging black as black, the conceptual and ‘racial’ black, not just a darker hue.

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

---

1 See Seelig, 183.
2 Another play in the Leipzig volume, Eine schöne lustig triumphirende Comedia von eines Königes Sohne auß Engellandt vnd des Königes Tochter auß Schottlandt (A Pleasant, Merry, Triumphant Comedy of the King of England’s Son and the King of Scotland’s Daughter), sees the King of England’s son temporarily disguise himself as a Moor in order to gain access to the King of Scotland’s daughter. While the character wears the disguise, his speech heading changes from ‘Sohn’ to ‘Morian’, but this disguise does not involve the use of make-up. A stage direction tells us that he dons a long black garment (‘ein schwartzen Rock’, sig. U7v) and covers his face with a type of veil (‘bindet einen Flor vor Angesichte’, sig. U7v). He then introduces himself to the King as a true-born Moor (‘ein gebornen Aetiopis’,
Unlike Aaron, Morian is presented as a character with a powerful sense of the past through a personal narrative that makes clear his former importance in Ethiopia. The speech he delivers is filled with anecdotal specificity, unlike the general and unspecific glimpses of Aaron’s past and background as a perpetrator of villainies not rooted in any particular time or place. More importantly, the narrative delivered by Morian at the end of Act 1 offers a rival construction of his character as his country’s champion that is quite distinct from Vespasianus’ later identification of him as a ‘black devil’. Morian’s identity as the ‘Thunder and Lightning of Ethiopia’ is predicated on ferocity in battle and the honourable defence of his country, and the audience is made aware of this early on in the play. By contrast, in Titus, ‘nothing but the blackness of his skin seems to link Aaron to a place of origin . . . Aaron displays no sense of a cultural past and seems to possess no memories’ (de Sousa, 104). As Emily C. Bartels points out, in appearing without a past, without a distinct culture, and being left to shape his identity from the quality of blackness, ‘the “raven-coloured” Moor appears to be a self-contained, self-incriminating sign system – a darkness that seems undeniably visible’ (Speaking, 80). Morian, however, renders such a sign system more complex, because his identity is shaped by more than the colour of his skin.

The vision of racial difference in Tito is complex. Morian’s status as the black villain is complicated by the fact that he is a celebrated warrior. Tito treats the issue of miscegenation in a sig. U8v) who has sailed from Ethiopia to trade jewels. With this disguise he manages to fool the King’s daughter until he removes the veil from his face (‘Ziehet den Flor vom Gesicht’, sig. X2r). Although in both cases ‘Morian’ hails from Ethiopia, it is clear that in this play, where the disguise needs to be put on and removed with speed, the Moor’s race is figured sartorially by means of a veil rather than through cosmetic blackface. See Wiggins, British Drama, 4.21–2, and the Lost Plays Database entry on The King of England’s Son and the King of Scotland’s Daughter (c. 1598). Wiggins suggests that the disguise in the English play would have entailed ‘presumably dark skin’ (22), but in light of the German play, this seems unlikely (but see Smith on the use of vizors for blackface).
different way from *Titus* and the chapbook prose history (see below, pp. 44–5). Whereas Tamora is eager to eradicate the child born of her amorous indiscretion, Aetiopissa hopes to preserve her son’s life by sending him to live with his paternal grandfather, who may be imagined to be a sub-Saharan black African like Morian. The baby is not an aberration that needs to be killed off as in *Titus*. Rather, the infant can be integrated into a vision of the Roman Empire that hosts a diasporic community represented by an African patriarchal figure. This may suggest that the source play on which *Titus* is based (see below, pp. 36–40) had a more hopeful and inclusive vision of racial difference than it did after being reworked by Peele and Shakespeare.

**THE SOURCE OF TITO ANDRONICO**

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

**The Peacham drawing**

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

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

¹ The document is among the Harley Papers (Harley Papers I, fol. 159v). An overview of the provenance of these papers is provided by Schlueter, ‘Rereading’, 171, and Waith, 26–7.
dress wearing a laurel wreath and holding a standard or staff while what appears to be a sceptre lies on the ground, a crowned, kneeling female figure in an apparent show of supplication, two kneeling men with their hands bound, and a black male figure gesturing with his right hand at the sword that he holds in his left hand. The illustration is separated by a horizontal line from a stage direction, ‘Enter Tamora pleadinge for her sonnes going to execution’ (not in Shakespeare’s play), followed by a speech by Tamora that largely corresponds to Titus 1.1.107–23, and a reply from Titus that combines lines 124 and 128 from the same scene, with an additional two invented lines directed at Aaron that warn him to prepare for his death. Then follows a speech by Aaron that corresponds to Titus 5.1.124–44, where he boasts of his villainies, and, following Aaron’s speech, there is a speech prefix for Alarbus (who never speaks in Titus). Near the bottom left of the leaf is a signature, ‘Henricus Peacham’, with a date rendered in roman numerals, which has generally been identified as 1594 or 1595. An annotation opposite the drawing

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

2 Chambers interpreted the date as either 1594 or 1595 (Metz, Studies, 234), as did Adams (33), given that the terminal ‘qt’ could be read as quinto or quarto. Foakes (Illustrations, 48) interprets the date more firmly as 1595, following Wilson (19), and Waith (23), who provides the most detailed interpretation. Metz (Studies, 235) notes that 1595 is ‘probably correct’. Bate (Ard 3 TA, 39) does not overrule the 1595 interpretation but offers an alternative set of dates as possibilities (1604, 1614, 1615). The date was reinterpreted as 1594 by Berry (5–6). The signature has generally been associated with Henry Peacham (b. 1578), author of The Complete Gentleman (1622), who would have been sixteen or seventeen in 1595. Peacham’s abilities as a draughtsman are attested in his collections of emblems, among them Minerva Britannna (London, 1612, STC 19511). Waith (24) draws comparisons between the Peacham drawing and some of Peacham’s emblem drawings that survive in manuscript (three were based on the 1603 edition of James I’s Basilikon Doron and were carried out between 1603 and 1619: Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson Poetry 146; British Library MS Harleian 6855, art. 13, and MS Royal 12 A lxvi; a later collection from c. 1621 is at the Folger Shakespeare Library: MS V.b.45).
reading ‘Henye Peachams Hande 1595’ was probably made by the nineteenth-century scholar and forger John Payne Collier and therefore cannot be trusted (Waith, 23; Ard TA, 39).

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

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

---

1 Waith follows Munro’s initial suggestion about the technique of simultaneous representation.
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Bate proposes that read left to right, the first two figures should be taken as Roman soldiers, ‘who represent Titus’ victory in war and service to the state’ (Ard$^3$ TA, 41), and that the third figure is Titus wearing a laurel bough and holding in his left hand a ‘ceremonial spear or staff’, dressed in a toga and breastplate, which signal his civic dignity and martial prowess (Ard$^3$ TA, 41). The figure kneeling before him is Tamora, whose ‘flowing dress of the exotic Goth’ (Ard$^3$ TA, 41) and physical posture sets up a powerful contrast with Titus, while the two kneeling figures behind her are ‘emblems of all the play’s sons’ (Ard$^3$ TA, 42). The final figure, Aaron, brandishes a sword ‘to indicate the deaths he has instigated’ (i.e. of Titus’ sons), which may also echo the drawing of his sword to protect his new-born son (Ard$^3$ TA, 42), although Metz notes that Aaron here ‘personifies the indignation of the Gothic queen and princes’ (Studies, 244). In his interpretation of the drawing, Bate (Ard$^3$ TA, 41) calls attention to the general division of Romans and Goths: the triumphant, virtuous Romans stand to the left, and are visually separated from the cruel, villainous Goths by Titus’ upright staff, thus setting up an opposition that sits at the very heart of the play.

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

---

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

2 See Waith, 23–7.
could have been made first and the text added later, perhaps by a different hand. June Schlueter subscribes to Foakes’ suggestion and argues that the drawing is a representation of a Titus play that pre-dates Titus and is preserved in the German Tito, which she claims was based on the lost play, Titus and Vespasian (‘Rereading’). It is for this reason, she argues, that there is an awkward relationship between the image and the text: ‘we must conclude that the Shakespearean lines were added by someone whose assumption about the drawing confused and misled generations of scholars’ (‘Rereading’, 176).

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

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

¹ Waith (23) notes the disjunction between Aaron’s apparently lacklustre apparel in Titus and the magnificent attire of the Moor in the Peacham drawing.
the identification of the central figure as the Emperor rather than Titus is open to question, as Richard Levin has demonstrated (‘Longleat’, 325–9). Levin challenges the idea that the bearded male figure, who is wearing a laurel bough, could be anyone but Tito, given that the stage directions and the dialogue in Act 1 differentiate between the bough worn by Tito and the imperial crown that is eventually given to the Emperor (327–8). Levin (326) also takes issue with Schlueter’s proposition that the drawing is a literal representation of Act 1 of Tito. For instance, he draws attention to Morian’s sword, which is present in the drawing, although the text says nothing about it at this point, so it must either be read as a symbol of his former military exploits, or as a literal rendering of Morian later in the play. Furthermore, in the text Morian is alone when he delivers his speech on his past villainies, so the presence of other characters in the drawing only makes sense if we assume that the drawing represents different moments from Act 1 simultaneously (Levin, 326).

Where Levin rejects Schlueter’s argument in its entirety, we suggest that the Peacham drawing may be a composite representation of the first scene of an early Titus play that served as the basis for Tito and was later reworked into Titus. Read left to right, the figures may represent Titus’ son and brother, Titus wearing his laurel bough, the supplicant captive Queen, who kneels and holds up her hands in an action that is suggestive of her subordinate position and reliance on Titus’ mercy, her two sons, also bound to signify their status as prisoners, and the Moor as he appears at the end of the Act, no longer wearing a ‘humble’ cloak and boasting of his military supremacy. In fact, the Moor’s right hand is raised, the index finger pointing in the direction of the Queen (suggestive of their amorous dalliance) and towards Titus (recalling the hand-to-hand encounter the two men have had in Tito; see 1.1.123–7). The presence of the Moor’s sword is a detail that may be symbolic, but otherwise, the depiction of this figure agrees with what he wears in Tito. If we accept that the drawing may be a
composite and, given Andronica’s absence, also selective representation, it corresponds remarkably well to what comes down to us textually in Act 1 of \textit{Tito}.

Such a reading raises the question of why Titus’ brother would be present in the drawing when he is not called for in the opening stage direction of \textit{Tito}. A possible answer is that \textit{Tito} is not a perfect translation of the lost play. Indeed, even if \textit{Tito} correctly records the characters present in the opening scene of the play as it was performed in Germany, there is no guarantee that the equivalent of Victoriades would have been missing from the source play as performed in England, all the more so as the constraints of a travelling company often necessitated a trimming of certain roles on account of doubling.\footnote{As noted above (p. 3), \textit{Tito} could be performed with a minimum of ten actors, and if this was the case then it may not have been possible to have Victoriades on stage.}

Given the disagreements between image and text in the Longleat manuscript, Metz proposes that the drawing ‘should be studied directly, not through or under the guidance of or influence of the appended verses’ (\textit{Studies}, 242). If we follow this invitation to think about the drawing without the impediment of reconciling it with the text that follows, it is easy to imagine that what we have in front of us is a representation of an \textit{Ur-Titus}. Given the other evidence to support a lost \textit{Ur-Titus} presented below, it seems plausible that the drawing is based on a performance of that play.\footnote{Metz (\textit{Studies}, 241) quotes Foakes on the likelihood that the drawing was done from memory, although there is no reflection on the amount of time that could have elapsed between the performance and the drawing (i.e. it could have been a number of years, in which case the date on the manuscript may reflect the year in which the artist executed the drawing, not the year in which he saw the play).}

If Foakes and Schlueter are right that the text was added by a different, and perhaps later, hand, this would account for the discrepancy between the opening scene of \textit{Titus} and the illustration. Schlueter’s call to reinterpret the Peacham drawing in the light of evidence preserved in \textit{Tito}
is thus useful, even though the evidence is too complex to allow for more than a tentative conclusion.¹

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

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

¹ Note that Schlueter, in a so far unpublished essay, has recently revisited the Peacham drawing and its relationship to Tito. She proposes a new interpretation of the date (in the 1570s, if the third letter in the date is taken as a ‘g’, or in the 1570s or 1560s if the third letter is taken to be a long ‘s’), and argues that Henry Peacham senior, not his son, may have been responsible for both drawing and text, which record ‘visually and literally, an early scene from Titus and Vespasian’ (‘Longleat’, 10). We are grateful to Schlueter for sharing her essay with us.
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(‘titvs’, ‘tittus’, ‘titus’) (Foakes, *Diary*, 19–20). Under the entries pertaining to the Earl of Sussex’s Men for the year 1594, there is found a ‘ne’ play performed on 23 January: ‘titus & ondronicus’, two more performances of which are noted (‘titus & ondronicus’ on 28 January and ‘tittus & ondronicus’ on 6 February) (Foakes, *Diary*, 21).

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

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

*(Knack, sig. F2v)*

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

1 ‘Lyke wise Vaspasian, Romes rich Emperour’ (sig. A2r); ‘Or lyke Vaspasian, Romes vertuous gouernour, / Who for a blowe his sonne did giue a Swaine, / Did straight commaund that he should loose his hand. / Then vertuous Edgar, be Vaspasian once,’ (sig. B3v).
Henslowe’s entries tell us that the play was popular, but they are unable to tell us what the play was about. For Cohn, the name Vespasianus was evidence enough to show that the lost play must have focused on the same material as the German play. For others, such as Eleanor Grace Clark, the link was too tenuous. She argued instead that the lost play was about the historical emperor Vespasian (AD 9–79), and the siege of Jerusalem by his son Titus in AD 70, who was promoted to joint emperor on his return to Rome (Clark, 524). More recently, Martin Wiggins has also identified the lost play with the siege of Jerusalem story, suggesting that the play may have drawn ‘on the medieval romance version of the story (The Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian, printed c. 1508’). Yet Bate has argued that Titus and Vespasian may have been the Ur-Titus. If it was, he suggests (Ard TA, 138–9), the conjunction ‘and’ in the original title may explain why Henslowe misnamed the revised play ‘Titus & Ondronicus’ when it was performed by the Earl of Sussex’s Men on 23 January 1594 (Foakes, Diary, 21). Scholarly opinion on the subject matter of the lost Titus and Vespasian thus remains divided.

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

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

3 McCarthy and Schlueter propose that Titus and Vespasian was written by Thomas North (1535–1603?) in 1562 in response to Jasper Heywood’s Thyestes (1560) and Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville’s Gorboduc (1561). They argue that this play was later adapted by Shakespeare and Peele into Titus Andronicus, and that traces of North’s original are preserved therein. Their evidence for this comes from an analysis, using EEBO and the plagiarism software WCopyfind, of ‘rare or
If we suppose that Titus’ son was called Vespasian in an earlier version of the English play, we need to ask why he would have been a titular character. W. W. Greg pointed out that the title of the German play, *Tito Andronico and the Haughty Empress*, is not the same as that of the lost English play, and argued that the role occupied by Vespasianus therein is subordinate rather than equal to that of Tito.\(^1\) Yet the title of the play may have been changed by the travelling players or when *Tito* was prepared for publication in 1620. Moreover, although Tito is clearly the main protagonist in the German play, his son is not necessarily as ‘subordinate’ as Greg suggests. The play begins and ends with a powerful visual pairing of Vespasianus and the Roman crown: in Act 1, he holds the crown in his hand and announces his father’s candidacy for the honour (1.1.1–13), and at the close of the play, Vespasianus exits with his uncle, who now holds the crown that he will bestow upon his nephew before the populace (8.2.75–7).\(^2\) As demonstrated

---

2. Braekman argues that the opening speech is wrongly ascribed to Vespasianus, and that Victoriades must have delivered it because it echoes lines spoken by Marcus in *Titus*, where he is a tribune and is thus in a position to act as spokesperson for his brother, whereas ‘this is not the case with Vespasianus’ (48). This is questionable, given Vespasianus’ prominence in the play. If the play was performed with ten actors, perhaps it had to be decided whether it was more important to have Tito’s brother or his son onstage at the beginning of the play (see Appendix, pp. 418–19). Having Vespasianus enter holding the crown in the opening scene may serve to foreshadow the play’s ending, where Vespasianus exits in order to receive the crown formally.
above (see pp. 14–15), Vespasianus is an important character in Tito, perhaps more prominent than his equivalent in Titus. It may be significant that the original *dramatis personae* list of Tito begins with Vespasianus. The important role played by Vespasianus in Tito, together with the fact that Tito corresponds to material in the English chapbook prose history that is absent from Titus, may indeed be evidence that Titus and Vespasian was the *Ur-Titus* that Shakespeare and Peele later reworked.¹

The chapbook prose history and the ballad

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

---

¹ The existence of a lost *Ur-Titus* has important implications for the much-debated question of the date of Titus (see Ard 3 *TA*, 136–9, and Metz, *Studies*, 190–7). The first performance of Titus is recorded by Henslowe’s ‘ne – Rd at titus & ondronicus the 23 of Jenewary [1594]’ (Foakes, *Diary*, 21), when it was played by Sussex’s Men. Scholars who take seriously the allusion to Titus in Knack (see above, p. 37) maintain that Titus must already have been in existence by 1592. Others opt for an even earlier date, in order to reconcile the date of Titus with Jonson’s comment about audiences’ tastes in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614): ‘Hee that will sweare, Ieronimo, or Andronicus are the best playes, yet, shall passe vnexcepted at, heere, as a man whose Iudgement shewes it is constant, and hath stood still, these fiue and twentie, or thirtie yeeres’ (sig. A5v). This would date the two plays mentioned between 1584 and 1589, which has led to speculation about Titus being a very early play indeed. However, Jonson might have been conflating the *Ur-Titus* with Titus in his appraisal of Andronicus’ popularity with audiences. It is plausible that Shakespeare’s Titus as we know it was composed, in the sense of being adapted from an older play, shortly before Henslowe’s first recorded performance, which would warrant the description ‘ne’.
Dicey. The prose history largely conforms to the main points of the action found in *Titus*, but there are also some substantial departures and episodes that have no equivalents in the play. The narrative printed in the chapbook undoubtedly reproduces, or is otherwise based on, an Elizabethan source, but it is impossible to date this source.

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

The orthodox view today of the relationship between the three iterations of the Titus story is that the prose history was the source for *Titus*, which then served as the source for the ballad (Waith, 28–32; Metz, ‘History’ and ‘Versions’). Yet there have been notable exceptions. Bate expands upon earlier arguments to propose a different order of composition,
whereby *Titus* served as the basis for the ballad, and the ballad was expanded into the prose history in the eighteenth century (*Ard 3 TA*, 82–4). Bate is dismissive of the idea that the chapbook could be the source of *Titus*, but he does add the caveat that ‘there is always the possibility that it drew on some other lost prose narrative or that Shakespeare was reworking a lost old play’ (*Ard 3 TA*, 84). Bate does not address *Tito* in his consideration of the play–ballad–chapbook relationship, yet the German adaptation may shed light on it. There are a number of features on which *Tito* and the chapbook agree against *Titus*, which may imply that the prose history served as the source for a lost Titus play that was taken to the Continent by travelling players and is now preserved in *Tito*.1 If this early version served as the source for *Titus*, this would explain why particular episodes are altered further, shifted or removed altogether.

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

---

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

2 Aaron claims he is sent by the Emperor (3.1.151), although his comments later in the play suggest otherwise (5.1.111–20).
notes that in the prose history ‘the Moor never emerges as an independent character; he remains, until his concluding confession, the instrument of the Queen’ (176), which is also true for Morian in *Tito*, but not for Aaron in *Titus*. There are two other correspondences. For instance, Tito’s plan to sell his property in order to raise an army and be revenged upon the Emperor and Aetiopissa (5.1.62–4) echoes the beginning of the chapbook account, where Titus ‘got together Friends, and sold whatever he had of value to hire Soldiers’ (36) in order to help Rome defeat the Goth invaders. Andronica’s unnamed husband (see p. 169) is likewise unnamed in the chapbook, where he is the Emperor’s son rather than brother.¹

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

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

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

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

¹ The power of the imagination to imprint on the foetus was credited by a number of early modern physicians. For example, Ambroise Paré (sig. 4N3v) considered it a possible cause of unnatural or monstrous offspring.
a passage with no equivalent in *Titus*, the Empress also overcomes the problem of being separated from the Moor, which she does by poisoning her husband (1.1.98–100); this happens before she comes to Rome and becomes pregnant with Morian’s child.

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

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

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

**GERMAN TITUS PLAYS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY**

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

> These plays are acted, namely the first one about how Abraham wants to sacrifice Isaac at God’s command; the other one about Andronico and his son Vespasiano,
how they recruit people from foreign lands to fight against the Emperor, and how they finally invite the Emperor and his godless wife (who was an instigator of this homegrown war) to a feast, and how during the feast Andronica, the Empress, Andronicus himself and finally also the Emperor are killed.¹

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

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

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

¹ ‘Werden diese Comedien agiert, als die erste wie Abraham auf Gottes Geheiss seinen Sohn Jsac opfern will; die ander vom Andronicu und seinem Sohn Vespasiano, wie sie wider den Kaiser Volk aus fremden Land aufbringen und zuletzte den Kaiser mit seinem gottlosen Weibe (welche ein Anfängerin ist dieses einheimischen Krieges) zu Gast bekommt, und in dieser Gasterei die Andronica, die Kaiserin, und Andronicus selbst und zuletzt auch der Kaiser umbracht werden’ (Quellen, 210).
popular in seventeenth-century Germany.\footnote{Vos might have based his play on Adriaen Van den Bergh’s lost 1621 translation. See Braekman, 10.17–19, and Buitendijk, 64–5.} The popularity of \textit{Aran en Titus} cannot be overstated: the play was frequently performed and went through many editions in its home country. A Latin version was performed at the gymnasium in Tiel in 1658 and survives in a printed edition (the translation was probably made by Caspar van Baerle for the rector, J. van Aelhuisen).\footnote{This was entitled \textit{Aran en Titus. Mutua vindicatio, interprete schola Thielana} (\textit{Aran and Titus. Mutual Revenge. Acted by the Thiel School}). See Fuller, 14, and Worp, 53.} German adaptations of Vos’ play were popular throughout the second half of the seventeenth century, both commercially and as school performances. It is unclear how Vos’ play was first translated into German, but the German dramatist Georg Grefflinger promised a translation of a play entitled \textit{Andronicus mit dem Aron} (\textit{Andronicus with Aron}) in the preface to his translation of Pierre Corneille’s play, \textit{The Ingenious Tragicomedy called Cid} (\textit{Die Sinnreiche Tragi-Comoedia gennant Cid}, Hamburg, 1650, sig. *2v). It is unclear whether this translation was ever completed or published, but it is evident that Grefflinger was referring to Vos’ play, particularly since the reference comes in the context of Spanish and Dutch plays.

The earliest evidence of a performance of Vos’ play in Germany comes from a school production in Schwäbisch Hall in May 1656, described in a programme entitled \textit{Aran und Titus, Oder Tragödia von Raach und Gegen-Raach} (\textit{Aran and Titus, or a Tragedy of Revenge and Counter-revenge}).\footnote{This document contains a scene-by-scene summary of the action, a short preamble, an ‘epilogue’ and a list of roles together with the names of the boys who played them. See Rudin, ‘Textbibliothek’, for a discussion (79–80) and reproduction of this programme (99–105).} The programme was printed by Hans Reinhard Laidigen in a quarto pamphlet of eight pages, which includes a list of roles and the names of the boys who played them, as well as an act-by-act summary. The action as we find it in the summary reflects Vos’ play, and the text used by the boys probably came from a troupe
of travelling players, whose presence is noted in Schwäbisch Hall that same year. Bärbel Rudin’s research demonstrates that the High German (Hoch Teutschen) comedians sold a Moorish cloak, a sceptre and a crown to the City, and that costs for an unbound book of various comedies (‘ein vngebunden Buch von vnderschiedlichen comoedien’) were met by the Rector (‘Textbibliothek’, 79). Some months later, in July 1656, the High German comedians petitioned to perform Von dem Tapffern Römer Tito Andronico (Of the Brave Roman, Tito Andronico) at Strasbourg, where a note in the hand of the actor Christoph Blümel describes the play as ‘a stately, well-written history, for the first time translated into German, and never seen here before’ (‘eine statliche, wolgeschriebene Histori, die erst ins teutsche gebracht, und noch nie hier gesehen worden’; Rudin, ‘Textbibliothek’, 79). Whilst the title in Blümel’s petition does not explicitly relate to Vos, the fact that the comedians can be traced to Schwäbisch Hall suggests that they were in possession of a German translation of Vos’ play (see below, pp. 51–2). Blümel was an educated man, whose handwriting and name can be identified in a number of extant manuscript playtexts from the Wanderbühne (Rudin, ‘Textbibliothek’, 78–9; see p. 51, n. 2), so he may have been responsible for the translation himself, or used a text prepared by someone else like Greßlinger.

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

¹ A digital reproduction is available through the Bavarian State Library: https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb11206615.html.
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‘Textbibliothek’, 81–2). The pamphlet contains a prologue, and choruses for Acts 2, 3, 4 and 5, all of which appear to be free verse translations of their equivalents in Vos’ Aran en Titus.

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

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

---

1 This performance is documented by Birken; he notes that ‘the Emperor Saturninus falls for the captive Goth Queen, who had an affair with the Moor’ (‘Key[ser] Saturninus hängt sich an die gefangene Gothische Königin, die mit dem Mohren buhlte’, 300). Birken mentions seeing a revival of this production the following year: ‘I saw the comedy of the sold and returned Andronico’ (‘Die Comoedie vom verk[auften] und wiederbeck[ommenen] Andronico gesehen’, 397). See also Gstach, 617.
entitled *Titus und Aran* (*Titus and Aran*) and appears to be a free prose translation of Vos’ *Aran en Titus*. The choruses are omitted but the names agree with Vos, except for Titus’ daughter, who is called Lavinia instead of Rozelyna. Rudin (‘Textbibliothek’, 78–81) has convincingly demonstrated the likelihood that Blümel’s troupe, who had performed Vos’ play in Germany, were responsible for this manuscript version, given that various members of their company formed the Eggenberg troupe, including Hoffman, Schwartz and Blümel himself,\(^1\) whose signature and hand are found in other of the plays in the Vienna Rathaus Library collection.\(^2\) Other plays in the collection can be traced to Český Krumlov by their watermarks or by the fact that their titles are also found in the castle’s household records.\(^3\)

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

---

2. For a recent edition of *Aran und Titus*, see Hulfeld and Mansky (97–180). The sixth play contained in the Vienna Rathaus Library collection of *Wanderbühne* plays, *Comaedea von der glückeligen Eifersucht zwischen Rodrich und Delmira von Valenza* (*The Comedy of the Blissful Jealousy between Rodrich and Delmira of Valencia*), contains a title page bearing Blümel’s name, and Český Krumlov castle records provide evidence of a payment for *Die Eifersucht* in the year 1677 (Záloha, ‘Divadelni’, 70). Likewise, *Aurora und Stella* (*Aurora and Stella*), which is present in the collection, is also mentioned in the castle records for the year 1688 (see Záloha, ‘Divadelni’, 71).
3. See Schindler.
Goth Moor means that this play was not based on *Tito*, where the Moor is not a Goth. These texts and traces of performance suggest that translations of Vos’ *Aran en Titus* were more popular than the version that we find preserved in *Tito*, but, unlike *Tito*, they all date from the second half of the seventeenth century, not the first.¹

**TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION**

*The Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien of 1620 and 1624*

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

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

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

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

Handel Städten seynd agiret vnd gehalten / worden, vnd zuvor nie im Druck auß- / gangen. / An jetzo, / Allen der Comedi vnd Tragedi Lieb- / haben, vnd Andern zu lieb vnd gefallen, der Gestalt / in offenen Druck gegeben, daß sie gar leicht darauß / Spielwěß widerumb angerichtet, vnd zur Ergetzligkeit vnd / Erquickung des Gemüths gehalten wer- / den können. / Gedruckt im Jahr M.DC.XX.’
Introduction to Tito Andronico

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

¹ For the Pickelherring plays in the 1620 volume, see Hilton, 292–9.
advice, ‘The following English excerpts may be acted between the comedies’ (‘Nachfolgende Engelische Auffzüge können nach Beliebung zwischen die Comoedien agiret werden’, sig. 2Y6r). Each jig focuses on Pickelhering or a clown figure.¹

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

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

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

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

⁴ For Julio vnd Hyppolita, see Cohn, cxi, 113–56.
reflect a conscious decision to start with the biblical pieces, before progressing to less respectable matter and genres.¹

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

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

¹ For the plays in the 1620 volume, see also Schlüeter, ‘Across’; Hackel, 120–31, 165–80; Noe; and Cohn, cvii–cix.
² For an example of the close correspondence between the two texts, compare the following two excerpts: ‘So ist hingegen gewiß vnd auß allen Historien bekannt, daß auch etlichen particularen beydes vmb ihrer Kunst vnd dann vmb ihrer Tugendt willen grosse Ehre, vnd solches auch öffentlich ist erzeiget worden’ (Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien, sig. A2v); ‘so ist doch gewiß vnnd auß allen Historien bekannt, daß auch etlichen particularen beydes vmb ihrer Kunst, vnnd dann vmb ihrer Tugendt willen grosse Ehre, vnd solches auch öffentlich ist erzeiget worden’ (Garzoni, Piazza Universale, sig. 3B4v).
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bookseller, printer or even place of publication. Yet quite a lot can be inferred about the genesis of the collection from other sources. In 1921, the Swedish scholar Johan Nordström published a handwritten list by the German-born academic Friedrich Menius (1593/4–1659) of works he had written (see below, pp. 58, 66–8), which includes ‘English Comedies, 2 parts. Altenburg, published by Gottfried Grosse, bookseller in Leipzig, 1620, in octavo’ (‘Englische Comoedien 2 Theil. Altenburg in Verlegung Gottfried Großen Buchhändlers zu Leipzig. a:o 1620. in 8:vo’.) (Nordström, ‘Friedrich’, 86–91, 87). The information in the Menius manuscript (Uppsala, University Library, MS Nordin 1997; see Fig. 3, number 2) is also in a printed list of publications appended to Menius’ *Syntagma de origine Livonorum* (Dorpat, 1632 (1635), sigs G2r–G3v), a book about the origins of the Livonians, who lived in what is now northern Latvia and southern Estonia.¹ Much of the information Menius provides about the title and size of the collection of plays is confirmed by the Leipzig book fair catalogue of spring 1620, *Catalogus Universalis* (VD17 1:066359V), published by Gottfried Grosse and Abraham Lamberg, which mentions ‘English Comedies and Tragedies together with the Pickelhering, Leipzig, at Gottfried Gross’, 8°, 1620’ (‘Engelische Comoedien vnd Tragoedien sampt den Pickelhaering, Leipzig bey Godfrid Großen, in 8’, sig. F3v). The same information appears in an entry in Georg Draud’s *Bibliotheca librorum germanicorum classica*, published in Frankfurt in 1625 (VD17 12:154632L), a massive 800-page bibliography of German books. In a list of ‘Comedies of various worldly stories, including virtues and vices’ (‘Comedien von

¹ ‘Catalogus Lucubrationum Friderici Menii’, in *Syntagma de Origine Livonor[vm]* (Dorpat: [Jacob Becker], 1632 (1635), sigs G2r–G8v). The information in the printed list is almost identical with that in the manuscript; it reads, ‘Engelische Comoedien 2. Theil. Altenburg in Verlegung Gottfried Großen Buchhändlers zu Leipzig. a:o 1620. in 8:vo’ (sig. G2r).
3 Friedrich Menius, ‘Catalogus Lucubrationum Friderici Menij’ (Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek, shelfmark: Nordin 1997).
allerhand Weltlichen Geschichten, auch Tugenden vnd Lastern’, sig. 4A3r) is a reference to ‘English Comedies and Tragedies together with the Pickelhering, Leipzig, at Gottfried Gross’, 8°, 1620’. The information provided by Menius about the publisher and the place of publication is thus confirmed by independent sources.

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

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

---

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

2 Benzing (1149) notes that Grosse in fact owned a printing house but leased it to a fellow Leipzig stationer, Johann Albrecht Mintzel.
1580 to 1621; he played an important role in moving a significant part of the German book trade from Frankfurt to Leipzig (see Brauer). Gottfried became a partner in his father’s business in 1618 and took it over from him after his death, publishing at least 549 titles in the period from 1618 to 1637. He became an alderman of the City of Leipzig in 1623. Gottfried’s older brother Friedrich (1580–1602) had set up his own bookshop quite a bit earlier, which another brother, Henning the Younger (1582–1622), took over after his early death (Brauer).

Gottfried Grosse’s publications, like his father’s, were mostly theological and religious in nature, notably sermons (like Johannes Andreae’s *Vier Geist- und Trostreiche Evangelische Predigten*, 1619, VD17 14:017557D, and Johann Meelführer’s *Postilla Davidica*, 1619–20, VD17 14:666249W); theological tracts, in Latin, like the *Decas Quaestionum* (1621, VD17 14:028545Q), by Erhart Lauterbach and Tobias Schubart, and in German, like Balthasar Marschner’s pamphlet against purgatory, *Päpstischer Irrwisch* (1630, VD17 23:649084E); prayer books like the *Andächtige Christliche Gebet* (1624, VD17 14:681366B); and Luther’s hymns, entitled *Geistliche Lieder* (1621, VD17 7:684853N). Grosse also took over from his father the publication of the important Leipzig book fair catalogue, as well as the *Continuatio* (e.g., VD17 39:124315U), a precursor of the newspaper, which regularly appeared in time for the Leipzig book fair and contained political and military news that had accumulated since the previous fair. Grosse also occasionally published books of other kinds, like a Hebrew language manual by Wilhelm Schickard (*Der Hebraische Trichter*, 1629, VD17 23:293103G), or a Latin collection of orations, letters and religious poems by the French humanist Marc-Antoine Muret (1619–20, VD17 28:730179B). Grosse published few literary titles, and those he did seem to have been mostly in Latin, like Ovid’s elegies (*P. Ovidii Nasonis De Ponto Libri IV*, 1627, VD17 1:060931C) and a collection of six comedies by Terence, *P. Terentii Afri Comoediae Sex superstites*.
(1632, VD17 1:043285K). An exception to this rule was Zacharias Lund’s collection of poems, Allerhand artige Deutsche Gedichte (1636, VD17 23:293764M). Apart from the Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien (the 1620 and the 1630 volumes; see below, pp. 71–4), Grosse appears not to have been involved in the dissemination of plays in the vernacular.

A second edition of the Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien, also in octavo, appeared in 1624. The title page replicates that of the first, save for an additional line that announces that the collection is a corrected reprint (‘Zum Andern mal gedruckt vnd corrigirt’). 1 Although some of the printer’s errors in the first edition were indeed corrected, new ones were introduced. The second edition was clearly set from the first, but type shortage seems to have led to the use of a mixture of differently sized typefaces, including in the portion that contains Tito (see Figs 4 and 5). 2 The frequent changes in font size, which give the volume an unusual, unprofessional appearance, suggest that Grosse was not involved in its publication. Indeed, there is no trace of it in the relevant Leipzig book fair catalogues where one would have expected it to be mentioned, that is, those of autumn 1623, spring 1624 and autumn 1624. 3

---

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

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

3 In 1670, the Frankfurt publisher Johann Georg Schiele issued three octavo volumes entitled Schau-Bühnen Englischer und Frantzösischer Comödianten (Theatre of English and French Comedians) of which the second (VD17 35:725477W) contains three plays previously published in the 1620 collection (Fortunato, Sidonia and Theagene, and Another Merry Pickelherring Play) and the third (VD17 35:725483X) two such plays (Queen Esther and Haughty Haman and Prodigal Son). See Noe, 3. The third volume also contains three plays of the 1630 collection (Noe, 51). Tito Andronico was not reprinted until the nineteenth century.
4 Sample page of Tito Andronico, in Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien (Leipzig, 1620), sig. Qq5r (University Library, LMU Munich, shelfmark: W 8 P.germ. 46).
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5 Sample page of *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (n.p., 1624), sig. Qq5r (Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, shelfmark: R 17 Come 1).
Friedrich Menius and the 1620 Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien

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

In or around 1630, Menius seems to have briefly served as a pastor near Riga before being offered a post as a history teacher at the gymnasium (grammar school) at Dorpat (now Tartu). When Gustavus Adolphus, in 1632, upgraded the gymnasium to a university, Menius became its first professor of history and antiquities at the newly founded Academia Gustaviana. His quiet, scholarly life in Dorpat seems to have ended in 1637 when a dispute led to the discovery of his bigamy (although his
first wife had died in the meantime). He escaped arrest by leaving in a hurry and was outlawed from Dorpat. In the following year we meet him in Ösel (Saaremaa), today an Estonian island but in Menius’ time in Danish possession, where he alienated the local governor and other dignitaries. Having moved on to Sweden, he appears to have secured a position as a supervisor in a copper mine in Småland, perhaps through the intercession of his brother, Dietrich Meyn, who was a cook at the royal court in Stockholm. Menius later moved to Stockholm where, in 1644, he published a mystical-occultist work, *Consensus Hermetico-Mosaicus*, which claims to explain the origins of all things visible and invisible. Menius published the book under a pseudonym, Salomon Majus, but this did not prevent him from getting into trouble with the Lutheran authorities. He was arrested, prosecuted and condemned for heresy. Queen Christina seems to have asked for his execution, but he was pardoned after spending a year in prison and making a public recantation. He tried to secure a position as the queen’s historiographer, but that understandably came to nothing. His career as a scholar was over, and little more is known about him until his death in 1659.¹

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

---

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

² For laureation in the Holy Roman Empire, see Flood, xlvii–cclv.
collection published in 1620 (see below, pp. 66–7), yet the fact that not a single copy of the collection has survived and that it does not seem to have received any further editions suggests that he remained little known as a poet. What German poetry of his that we have come across is of mediocre quality.¹ The fairly undistinguished and repetitive prose of Tito is by no means incompatible with his involvement in the play.

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

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

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

² For Menius’ allegedly planned books, see Donecker, ‘Arbeiten’.
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Gottfried Grosse. The first is a collection of Latin poems, *Poemata artificiosa varij generis*; the second are the *Engelische Comoedien*; and the third is a comparison of funeral rites in different cultures and periods, entitled *Syntagma Historico-Politico-Juridicum de ritibus funebribus omnium gentium*. Of these, only the *Engelische Comoedien* are extant, whereas the other two titles seem to have perished and are not even mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogues of 1620 (or 1619).\(^1\) The six other items were all published between 1630 and 1635, one in Riga in 1630 and five in Dorpat between 1632 and 1635. Of the six, four are prolegomena for his major planned work, which never reached print, a chronicle of Livonia ranging from the ancient past to the present: *Intrada und Vortrab der grossen Universal Liefflandischen Historischer Geschichten Beschreibung* (Riga: Gerhard Schröder, 1630) is an announcement and sketch of the great chronicle; *Historischer Prodromus des Lieff-landischen Rechtes und Regiments von Anfang der Provintz, Erfindunge, als auf I: K: M: von Schweden Gustavi M: Todt* (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1633) is about the history of Livonian law; *Diatriba Critica de Maris Balthici nominibus et osijs* (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1634) examines various names used to designate the Baltic Sea since ancient times (Donecker, ‘Arbeiten’, 39); and *Syntagma de origine Livonorum Dorpati* (Dorpat: n.p., 1635) presents materials related to the origins of the Livonians. The other two titles are an account of the opening ceremony of the University of Dorpat, *Relatio von Inauguration der Universität zu Dörpat* (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1632), and a tract which counters an interpretation of a recently published sermon by Johannes Döling, according to which the Apocalypse was imminent, *Proba der Letzten Zeit von der großen Verfolgung, Restaurirung*

---

\(^1\) This may suggest that the two lost titles received a small print run, perhaps subsidized by Menius himself.
des Wahren Gottes-dienstes, Vntergang des Pabstuhmbs, und Zukunfft des Jüngsten Tages (Dorpat: Jakob Becker, 1633). These six titles have all survived.\footnote{Of \textit{Intrada}, a copy is preserved at the University of Tartu Library (shelfmark F 7,s.97). Of \textit{Historischer Prodromus}, two editions are in fact extant, of which one is dated 1633 (VD 17 14:079927K) and the other, also published by Becker according to the imprint, is undated (VD17 39:123077C). (Referring to the end of the preface, VD17 claims that the latter edition is also of 1633, but the date in question, 20 October 1633, dates the original preface, not the edition’s year of publication.) We know about only one copy of the first edition, at the Latvian National Library in Riga, whereas quite a number of copies are extant of the second edition, including one at the British Library (shelfmark G.R.C. 1436.b.46). See also Jaanson, items 35 and 36. Of \textit{Syntagma}, at least three copies are extant: at the Latvian National Library in Riga, the Russian National Library in St Petersburg and at the Stiftsbiblioteket in Linköping, Sweden (Donecker, \textit{Origines}, 124; Jaanson, item 89). \textit{Relatio} is extant in various libraries (Jaanson, item 5); of \textit{Proba}, at least two copies have survived: at the Royal Danish Library in Copenhagen and at the University Library of Uppsala (Jaanson, item 37); and of \textit{Diatriba}, two copies are known: at the Tallinn University Academic Library and at the Russian National Library in St Petersburg (Jaanson, item 70). For the contents of these six titles, see also Donecker, ‘Arbeiten’, 37–43.} In sum, then, seven of the nine titles in Menius’ list have come down to us, and the bibliographic information for all of them squares with that provided by Menius. Whereas the list of Menius’ forthcoming publications should hardly be trusted, that of his published books seems entirely reliable. We thus have reason to believe that Menius’ information about the \textit{Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien} of 1620 is trustworthy, and that he must indeed have made a significant contribution to the 1620 collection.

Menius included the 1620 volume of ‘Englische Comoedien’ in the list of his works, but the list as well as the octavo collection do not explain in what way exactly the volume is his. In the absence of clear evidence, scholars have arrived at different conclusions. Fredén ends his long study arguing that Menius deserves to be considered the author (‘Verfasser’) of the 1620 collection (\textit{Friedrich}, 491). Haekel seems to endorse
Fredén’s conclusion (117–18), as does Katritzky, who writes that ‘Gustaf Fredén’s author attribution is generally accepted’ (‘Paintings’, 213). Braekman (9.22–5) and Bate (Ard³ TA, 43) suggest that Menius ‘reported’ the plays,¹ and John Alexander writes that Menius ‘in all likelihood wrote down the texts from notes and memory’ (463). Schlueter, by contrast, contends that ‘despite earlier scholars’ speculations that these texts were reconstructed from memory, it would appear that the notary, perhaps in his official capacity, had the resident company’s playbooks in hand’ (‘Across’, 232–3); accordingly, she holds that the volume was ‘Compiled by Menius’ (‘Fortunati’, 120). Marti similarly refers to Menius as the volume’s ‘Herausgeber’ (360), i.e. editor.² Others have considered Menius as the plays’ translator (Williams, 197) or even made of him the first translator of Shakespeare into German (‘erster Übersetzer Shakespeares ins Deutsche’; Klöker, 312). While Menius’ involvement in the 1620 Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien is generally accepted, there is thus considerable disagreement over the exact form that involvement took.

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

¹ Bate later refers to a stage direction in Tito as ‘Menius’” (Ard³ TA, 46).
² According to the ‘King of England’s Son’ entry in the Lost Plays Database, the ‘octavo volume [was] edited by Friedrich Menius’.
and ‘exit’ (*Friedrich*, 170–89). These features are hard to reconcile with the assumption that Menius simply assembled theatrical manuscripts from a touring company and had them published more or less unchanged. That does not mean that Menius necessarily reported plays he had seen in performance. It is equally possible that he had access to theatrical manuscripts but revised them with a view to publication. In particular, he may have expanded and added stage directions. The title page of the 1620 collection, we recall, insists that the plays are ‘printed in such wise that they can be easily prepared for performance and serve for the delight and recreation of the mind’, a comment that may reflect the particular attention Menius paid to stage directions in preparing the dramatic texts.

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

---

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

2 Dahlberg claims to have identified a linguistic oddity in the 1620 volume that appears in both dialogue text and stage directions, namely the recurrent use of ‘hefftig’ (severe, intense) as an intensifier (‘hefftig gut’, ‘hefftig gross’, etc.), which he takes as evidence that the same writer was responsible for the dialogue text and the stage directions (329). Further analysis of the linguistic make-up of the plays in the 1620 volume might help to strengthen or invalidate Dahlberg’s argument.
from the beginnings of the Thirty Years’ War was deepening, John George I, Elector of Saxony, convened a Kreistag in Leipzig to take place on 30 January 1620, to which Philip Julius sent delegates from Wolgast and Stettin (see Nicklas, 201–4; Thiede, 2.89). It is not impossible that Menius, as a public notary, was among the delegates, and that he took advantage of his stay in Leipzig to find a publisher for his manuscripts (not only the *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* but also the Latin poems and the tract on funeral rites). Even if Menius did not personally travel to Leipzig, it is possible that he entrusted his manuscripts to someone else who did and who had them published on his behalf.

Menius’ list of his own works appended to his *Syntagma de origine Livonorum* mentions ‘Englische Comoedien 2. Theil’ (sig. G2r), which has understandably puzzled scholars (e.g., Fredén, *Friedrich*, 490–1; Dahlberg). According to today’s typographic conventions, ‘2. Theil’ would mean *second part*, but conventions were looser in the seventeenth century than they are today, and, in any case, the manuscript in fact reads ‘2 Theil’ which suggests that Menius meant *two parts*. If so, it may be tempting – but we think mistaken – to believe that the other part Menius had in mind is the collection published ten years after the first, in 1630, with the title ‘Love’s Fight, or the Other Part of the English Comedies and Tragedies, in which very pleasant, choice Comedies and Tragedies are to be found, never previously printed’ (‘Liebeskampff Oder Ander Theil Der Engelischen Comoedien vnd Tragoedien, In welchen sehr schöne, außerlesene Comoedien vnd Tragoedien zu finden, vnd zuvor nie in Druck außgegangen’; VD17 23:285896G). Like the 1620 collection, that of 1630 mentions the year of publication on the title page but no printer, publisher or bookseller. Yet the catalogue of the Leipzig book fair of autumn 1629, *Catalogus Universalis*, published by Gottfried Grosse and Abraham Lamberg (VD17 1:069589P), mentions in a list of ‘German books in sundry arts’ (‘Teutsche Bücher in allerhand
Künsten’), ‘English Comedies, the other part, published by the author, Leipzig, to be found at Gottfried Grossen’s, 8°’ (‘Englischer Comaedien Ander theil, in Verlegung des autoris, Leipzig bey Gottfried Grossen zu finden. 8.’, sig. D4r). The book fair catalogue of the following spring, again co-published by Grosse (VD17 1:069587Y), mentions the collection under its main title, ‘Love’s Fight, or the other part of the English Comedies and Tragedies, Leipzig, at Gottfriede Grossen’s, in 8°’ (‘Liebes Kampff, oder Ander Theil der Englischen Comoedien vnd Tragoedien. Leipzig bey Gottfriede Grossen, in 8’ (sig. E4v). Not only the title, ‘Engelischen Comoedien vnd Tragoedien’, and the designation of 1630 as ‘the other part’ (‘Ander Theil’) connect the 1620 and the 1630 volume. Much of the text on the two title pages is in fact identical (see Brauneck and Noe, 1.vii, 2.3). It should also be noted that the preface to the 1620 volume announces a follow-up volume with further plays if the first one is well received: ‘Should it be the case that you enjoy [the plays] and find them pleasant, more of the same kind will follow soon’ (‘da man nun vermercken wird / daß sie ihnen lieb und angenemb / sollen derselben bald mehr darauff folgen’, sig. A3v). Moreover, as has been shown by Richter (9–11), the Preface to the 1630 volume, like that of the 1620, is mostly copied from printed sources, notably chapter 34 of the second part (Ander Theil. Der guldenen Sendtschreiben) of Aegidius Albertinus’ translation of Antonio de Guevara’s Epistolas familiares (Munich, 1603, VD17 3:605728D; and reprinted in 1607, 1615, 1618 and 1625), and from a preface to the German translation of the Amadis chivalric romances, which had first appeared in 1569 (Newe Historia vom Amadis auß Franckreich, VD16 A 2113) and was frequently reprinted in the early seventeenth century (e.g. in 1617, Das erste Buch der Historyen vom Amadis auß Franckreich; VD17 1:631962N).

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

A corollary of this argument is that the connections between the paratext of the 1620 and the 1630 collections originate with the publisher, not with Menius. Menius’ name is notably absent from the 1620 collection, and this despite the fact that his bibliographic ego was by no means small, as suggested by his long list of his own past and future publications. What this may suggest is that Menius, or someone who acted on Menius’ behalf, sold his manuscripts to Grosse, but that Grosse decided on the wording of the title page (with its absence of Menius’ name) and contributed the (unsigned) preface. If so, it was Grosse, not Menius, who announced in the preface that another volume of plays would be published if the first one met with
approval – an announcement of a commercial spin-off that it makes sense a publisher would make.¹

The 1620 Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien and their theatrical origins

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

---

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

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

³ ‘[N]eulich etliche und zwantzig Engländer, musicanten, springer, täntzer und der pussenreisser, so die artes voluptarias üben und anders nirgends zu nützen, als daß sie fraß, schwalg und ander unordnung und verschwenden befördern’ (Meyer, 199).
Church, much to the outrage of the court chaplain, Gregorius Hagius, who vociferously complained in a series of letters to the duke and his mother. In one of his letters, he specifically objects that the plays were written and performed in an ‘unknown language’ (‘Ire Comedien in vnbekannter sprach geschrieben sindt und agirt werden’, Meyer, 203), no doubt in English.\(^1\) According to Meyer, we next hear of English players (referred to as ‘Musikanten’, musicians) at the Wolgast court seventeen years later, in 1623. In a petition to the duke, dated 30 August 1623, prefaced ‘Der Musicanten Supplication’ and signed by ‘Richard Jones’, ‘Johan Kostreßen’ and ‘Robert Dulandt’, they ask for permission to return to England after a year’s employment at the ducal court.\(^2\) A second, unrelated petition, dated 28 May 1624 and signed by ‘Musicant Richard Farnaby’, mentions an unspecified number of other ‘Musicanten’ (Meyer, 209) who were also at the Wolgast Court.\(^3\) The third and last petition, dated 10 July 1624, is by Richard Jones (signed ‘Richardt Jones / Engelender undt Musikant’; Meyer, 210), who is back in Wolgast and asking for employment after his projects in England had come to nothing (Meyer, 209–10).\(^4\)

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

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

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

\(^4\) For Jones, see Fredén, Friedrich, 110–11; and Schrickx, ““Pickleherring””. Meyer (207–8) also found a petition by students from the University of Greifswald who asked the duke for financial and logistical support in their staging of a tragedy at the University (whose patron the duke was). The date of this document is corrected by Fredén from 1619, as given by Meyer, to 1614 (‘L’auteur’, 423–4; Friedrich, 95).
The patchy documentary record brought to light by Meyer is thus confined to two periods: 1606 and 1623–24. Fredén seems to have come across additional relevant documents, but, frustratingly, he does not reference them. In 1607, Fredén claims, the duke ordered a small troupe of English ‘Musikanten’, based in Hamburg, to his court (Fredén, Friedrich, 104–6). Four years later, a group of English comedians asked for employment at the duke’s court,¹ and in the reply they received, they were asked to accept a previously made offer, or to depart (Fredén, Friedrich, 106). Fredén adds that bills dating from 1613 and the following years suggest that considerable amounts were spent on ‘Musikanten’ (Friedrich, 107), although it does not emerge whether these were English or German. All in all, then, what is known about the documentary record does not exclude the possibility that English players were present at the Wolgast court during the years (1617–20) when Menius might have witnessed them, and perhaps received, recorded or adapted their theatrical texts. Nor, however, should theatrical activity at the Wolgast court during the years in question be taken for granted.

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

¹ Fredén points out that in this (unidentified) document, the word ‘Komödiant’ is used as a synonym for ‘Musikant’ (Friedrich, 106).
was at the Wolgast court in 1622 and 1623, were members of the company headed by Green. After their time at the court of Wolfenbüttel, for instance, they seem to have travelled east with other members of the troupe and can be found in Danzig in August 1615 (Schrickx, ‘“Pickleherring”’, 141). Green had started his theatrical career on the Continent around 1603, initially as a member of a company led by Robert Browne, although he seems to have been in charge of his own troupe by summer 1607 (Schrickx, ‘“Pickleherring”’, 137; Foreign, 203–7). We know about the repertory of the company led by Green thanks to a letter (commonly known as the ‘Theaterbrief’) by the Archduchess Maria Magdalena to her brother, the later Emperor Ferdinand II. The letter mentions ten plays performed in Graz from 6 to 19 February 1608, of which three are in the collection published in 1620: ‘die Comedi von dem verlorenen sohn’ (The Prodigal Son), ‘fortnatus peitl und Wünschhietel’ (Fortunatus and his Purse and Wishing-cap) and ‘Niemandts und iemandt’ (Nobody and Somebody) (Schrickx, Foreign, 332–3). Of the last of these plays, a manuscript dated 1608 is extant with a dedication by Green to the Archduke Maximilian Ernest of Austria. Fortunatus, as pointed out above, is based on Dekker’s Old Fortunatus, but the version in the 1620 collection has added the character of Pickelhering, which strengthens the connection between Green, Vincent (‘alias Pickelhering’) and the Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien.

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

---

1 For an English translation of the ‘Theaterbrief’, see Schrickx, Foreign, 208–12.
2 For the 1608 manuscript and its relationship to the play printed in 1620, see Chambers, Elizabethan, 2.281–2; Flemming; Hay; Brauneck and Noe, 6.28–32; and Bosman.
5). Documents from the Acts of the Privy Council show that Vincent was intermittently back in England in 1617 and 1618, making provision ‘of certeyne necessaries for the use of the Prince his master and for the King and Queene of Poland’ (Schrickx, “Pickleherring”, 140) but probably also drafting further players for the troupe led by Green. Vincent, as Schrickx has pointed out, ‘was an important intermediary in providing entertainers for the troupe headed by Green’ (‘Pickleherring’, 141). In the summer of 1617, Jones was back in England with Vincent, but in the following summer, Jones stayed on the Continent and Vincent returned from England to the Continent with his wife and children as well as with Jones’ wife.¹ We know that by 1622, Jones at least was at the Wolgast court, and he and fellow players may of course have been there before. There is thus considerable circumstantial evidence that associates the plays in the 1620 collection with Green, Vincent, Jones and their fellow players.

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

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

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

The 1620/1624 Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien: extant copies

Copies of the 1620 edition are extant in various libraries: the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Unter den Linden (two copies: call numbers Yp 5801 and Libri impr. rari oct. 255); the Universitäts- und Forschungsbibliothek in Erfurt/Gotha (call number Poes 8° 01527/02); the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (call number A: 105 Eth. (1)); the Universitätsbibliothek LMU in Munich (call number 0014/W 8 P.germ. 46); the Universitätsbibliothek in Leipzig (call number 94-8-4775); the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek in Hannover (call
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number Lh 3308); the University of Chicago Library (Special Collections, call number PT1264.E57); and the University of Pennsylvania Library (call number V49.163 En3 1620).\(^1\) The copies at the British Library (call number C.95.b.36) and the Folger Shakespeare Library (call number PR1246.G5 E59 Cage) belong in fact to the second edition (1624), although a 1620 title page (or, in the case of the Folger copy, a facsimile title page) has been added to them. Other extant copies of the second edition are at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (call number A: 100.1 Eth. (2)); the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek in Göttingen (call number 8 PDRAM III, 30); the Württembergische Landesbibliothek in Stuttgart (call number R 17 Come 1); the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften (call number B4/DWB); the University of Pennsylvania Library (call number V49.163 En3 1624); and the Beinecke Library, Yale University (call number Zg17 A13 624). A fragmentary copy of the second edition is at the Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek in Weimar (call number Scha BS 4 A 02749).

Editorial history

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

\(^1\) Our edition of the German text (see above, p. xvii) has been prepared from the Munich copy. Four copies are imperfect and lack certain leaves: the first one at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Yp 5801) lacks A2, A7, A8, C3 and C6; the one at the Universitätsbibliothek in Leipzig lacks A1–B3; the copy at the University of Pennsylvania Library breaks off at leaf Y5 and lacks the five interludes placed towards the end of the volume; and the title page of the Chicago copy is a photostat facsimile.
and of the Plays Performed by them during the Same Period (1865). The German text was next published in Wilhelm Creizenach’s *Die Schauspiele der englischen Kömodian ten* in 1889, and, more recently, in Manfred Brauneck and Alfred Noe’s *Spieltexte der Wanderbühne* (1970), which conservatively reproduces all the plays contained in *Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien* (1620) and *Liebeskampff* (1630). These editions contain no or little annotation. The most recent German edition of *Tito*, with a slightly fuller apparatus, appears in an appendix to Markus Marti’s German translation of the English play (2008).

There have been two translations of *Tito* into English. Lippner’s translation in Cohn’s *Shakespeare in Germany* and Ernst Brennecke’s in *Shakespeare in Germany 1590–1700* (1964). Brennecke’s was unintentionally based on a copy of the second edition (1624): he used the copy at the Folger Shakespeare Library, to which a facsimile of the 1620 title page had been added. Lippner’s text is entirely unannotated, and Cohn devotes no more than a page and a half to the play in the introduction (112–13). Brennecke’s introduction, at four and a half pages, is longer, but not by much, and his annotation consists of merely three short footnotes. Despite the existence of two retranslations, little has thus been done before the present edition to mediate *Tito Andronico* to an English-speaking readership.
Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew* (c. 1592) has aroused lively debate right from the start. Shortly after its first recorded performance in 1608, John Fletcher wrote a sequel, *The Woman’s Prize, or The Tamer Tamed* (c. 1611), featuring the widower Petruccio triumphed over by his new wife Maria. The play continued to have a far-reaching effect throughout the seventeenth century as John Lacy produced another version, called *Sauny the Scot* (1667; printed 1698), which intensifies the violence against the female protagonist. But it was not only at home that Shakespeare’s play prompted strong responses. *The Taming of the Shrew* reached the Continent by the middle of the seventeenth century, and a Dutch translation (and partial adaptation), Abraham Sybant’s *De Dolle Bruyloft* (‘The Mad Wedding’), was published in 1654. A first German version, *Die wunderbare Heurath Petruvio mit der bösen Catharine* (‘The wonderful wedding of Petruvio with bad Catharine’), is known to have existed by 1658. *Kunst über alle Künste, ein böses Weib gut zu machen* (‘An Art beyond all Arts, To Make a Bad Wife Good’), a five-act prose play published in 1672, is the first extant German version of *The Taming of the Shrew*. It often remains close to the English text, while adapting it intelligently and adjusting it to its new cultural and linguistic context. *Kunst* deeply engages with some of the questions Shakespeare’s play raises, including issues of gender, by significantly altering key speeches, adding new passages and inventing a female servant, Sybilla. It also
foregrounds social issues by strengthening the prominence of the servants, making them comment on and act as foils for their social betters. The German play is a highly sophisticated early dramatic response to Shakespeare’s play. Kunst has never been translated into any language, was edited only once, in 1864, by Reinhold Köhler, and has no modern stage history (although it emphatically deserves to have one). The present edition remedies this inaccessibility. Its aims are to provide a detailed examination of the play’s engagement with The Taming of the Shrew and to assess its role in the reception of Shakespeare abroad.

**THE RELATIONSHIP OF KUNST ÜBER ALLE KÜNSTE TO THE TAMING OF THE SHREW**

*Kunst über alle Künste* is by far the artistically most ambitious and successful of the early modern German Shakespeare adaptations. It is also the only such adaptation that is longer than the original. Whereas *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* and *Tito Andronico* are much shorter than *Hamlet* and *Titus Andronicus*, and *Romio und Julieta* is somewhat shorter than *Romeo and Juliet*, *Kunst* is longer than *The Taming of the Shrew* by about 40 per cent. Kunst does not preserve the Sly Induction, but it does feature a brief prologue that introduces the theme of wife-taming and frames the play to come as an exemplary how-to lesson for the audience. The rest of the play is divided into five acts (‘Handlungen’), largely mapping onto *The Shrew*’s structure, although with some exceptions (see below, pp. 87–93). This part of the introduction is devoted to an exploration of the relationship between Kunst and *The Shrew*, and has four sections. The first establishes the basics by explaining how the

---

1 *The Shrew* has 2,394 lines (in the Arden 3 edition), whereas Kunst has 3,407.
dramatis personae and the plot of the German play correspond to and depart from Shakespeare’s. The second explores in greater depth some of the specific ways in which Kunst adapts The Shrew’s plot, in particular the untangling and clarification of sequences which the adaptor may have considered potentially confusing. The third deals with a central feature of the adaptation, its addition to Shakespeare’s play of many soliloquies and asides, and examines what effects this addition has. The fourth section takes a closer look at how the verbal, cultural and dramatic language of Kunst relates to that of Shakespeare’s play.

Characters and plot: correspondences and differences

Kunst über alle Künste and The Taming of the Shrew have an intricate – and intricately related – plot, and Kunst renames almost all the characters. Only Katherina has a name that is recognizably the same: Catharina. Many characters in the German play have speaking names, and since their meaning is of some importance, we have usually translated them into English (see the List of Roles and notes). Table 1 provides a short guide to character correspondences between Kunst and The Shrew.

Apart from Sly and the other characters who appear in the Induction, all the significant characters in The Shrew have their equivalent in Kunst, with the exception of the Haberdasher, whose small part (in TS, 4.3) is conflated with that of the Tailor. Kunst, in turn, has two characters (apart from the Prologue) with no equivalent in The Shrew: Veit, Theobald’s servant, appears in five scenes (1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 5.2) and is assigned thirty-one speeches, so his role is by no means small. Sybilla, Catharina’s maid, enters the play quite late, in Act 3, Scene 3, and does not speak until her next appearance in Act 4, Scene 2, but she is an important character late in the play and has twenty-two speeches assigned to her (in 4.2, 4.4 and 5.2), including a soliloquy at the end of Act 4, Scene 4. While Veit is generally a
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**TABLE 1** Character correspondences between *Kunst über alle Künste* and *The Taming of the Shrew*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kunst</th>
<th>Shrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient Job / Prologue</td>
<td>Christopher Sly etc. / Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharina</td>
<td>Katherina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabina</td>
<td>Bianca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theobald</td>
<td>Baptista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfons</td>
<td>Hortensio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Gremio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardman</td>
<td>Petruccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wormfire</td>
<td>Grumio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilarius</td>
<td>Lucentio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Tranio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabian</td>
<td>Biondello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blasius</td>
<td>Merchant / Pedant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Vincentio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardman’s Servants</td>
<td>Petruccio's Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matz</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz the Tailor</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Eulalia</td>
<td>Widow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
commentator (many of his speeches are asides), Sybilla’s relationship with Wormfire and consequent pregnancy make her an actress in a subplot in which Hardman and Catharina’s servants mirror and contrast with their master and mistress.

Even though Kunst’s other characters have their correspondences in The Shrew, their degree of proximity to Shakespeare’s parts varies considerably. Many of Alfons’ speeches, for instance, are reasonably close to Hortensio’s, and their total line number is not vastly different: eighty-four for Alfons and seventy for Hortensio. Structurally, the two characters correspond closely to one another, and each time Hortensio appears on stage in The Shrew, Alfons does so in Kunst in the parallel scene. At the other end of the spectrum, the part of Wormfire in Kunst vastly expands on that of Grumio in The Shrew. Apart from a single line in Act 3, Scene 2, Grumio’s speaking part is confined to three scenes (1.2, 4.1 and 4.3). Wormfire, by contrast, has a significant presence in nine scenes (1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4 and 5.2), including a scene, Act 2, Scene 2, that consists of a soliloquy from him, and several others in which he has many asides (see below, pp. 105, 110–13). Whereas Grumio has sixty-three speeches, the total for Wormfire is 166, more than any other character in the play except for Hardman. While Kunst thus adapts some parts rather lightly, it transforms others fundamentally.

Kunst’s plot may be briefly summed up as follows: the opening scene skips the preliminaries of Lucentio’s arrival in Padua and immediately dramatizes Catharina’s confrontation with her father Theobald and Sabina’s suitors, Alfons and Sebastian. This is followed by a brief exchange between Hilarius and his servants about the previously established disguise scheme, and the arrival of Hardman. The next act closely adheres to the structure of The Shrew. It introduces Felix, disguised as Hilarius, and Hardman as suitors of Sabina and Catharina, and it dramatizes the first meeting and the engagement of Hardman and Catharina. The play adds a
soliloquy by Wormfire in which he mentions Sybilla, Catharina’s maid, and his potential sexual partner. Act 3 includes Sabina’s poetry and music lessons, as well as the mad wedding, together with the newly-weds’ arrival at Hardman’s home, where he puts his taming technique into action. Act 4 weaves together several plot strands. It shows Alfons’ interruption of his suit to Sabina after seeing her flirt with Hilarius. It dramatizes the tailor’s visit to Hardman’s house and the couple’s journey back to Theobald. The act also includes the disguise of Blasius as Hilarius’ fake father, and his violent meeting with Hilarius’ real father, Adrian, who swoons when it occurs to him that the schemers may have killed his son. The last act resolves all conflicts and disguises: Hilarius has married Sabina, and Alfons Eulalia; a mock-trial is set up for the offenders in the disguise scheme; and Wormfire is given permission to marry Sybilla (who is now pregnant). A wager on wifely obedience proves Catharina to be the most tamed of the three wives on stage. The play ends with the servants alone and an allusive song is sung by Fabian about sexual relationships and fidelity.

Anyone familiar with The Shrew will recognize in this summary many similarities with Shakespeare’s play, while also noting plot elements that are absent. Kunst’s plot correspondences to Shakespeare’s play are summed up in Table 2 (the symbol indicates that the correspondence is relatively loose, whereas – means that there is no correspondence).

As the table shows, the scenic order of the two plays is largely the same. The Shrew has a total of twelve scenes, whereas Kunst has sixteen, but the difference is easily accounted for: Kunst splits The Shrew’s Act 1, Scene 1 into two scenes, and Act 4,
### Table 2 Plot correspondences between *Kunst über alle Künste* and *The Taming of the Shrew*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kunst</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>The Shrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prologue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Patient Job</strong> laments conjugal life with a bad wife, and introduces the play as an example of how to tame a shrew.</td>
<td><strong>Induction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theobald</strong> rejects <strong>Alfons’</strong> and <strong>Sebastian’s</strong> suit for <strong>Sabina</strong> until <strong>Catharina</strong> is married.</td>
<td><strong>1.1.48–66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–35</td>
<td><strong>They promise to provide tutors for the daughters, and quarrel with Catharina.</strong></td>
<td>1.1.92–104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–103</td>
<td><strong>They secretly form a pact to find a suitor for Catharina in order to free Sabina for marriage.</strong></td>
<td>1.1.112–44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104–77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of the disguise scheme involving Hilarius and Felix.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1.185–235</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–49</td>
<td><strong>After initial frustration for being left out, Fabian makes peace with Felix.</strong></td>
<td>1.1.236–42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hardman arrives at Alfons’ house, declaring his wish to marry a rich woman.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2.1–57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–61</td>
<td><strong>Alfons suggests Catharina and, together with Sebastian, promises Hardman financial reward for his suit. Hilarius is present, disguised as a poetry teacher.</strong></td>
<td>1.2.58–215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62–316</td>
<td><strong>Fabian and Felix enter, and the latter joins in the quest for Sabina.</strong></td>
<td>1.2.217–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316–416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catharina abuses Sabina and is stopped by her father.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1.1–38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–81</td>
<td><strong>The suitors and disguised tutors enter. Hardman introduces himself to Theobald. All are invited inside.</strong></td>
<td>2.1.39–140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82–259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260–85</td>
<td><strong>Hardman describes his taming technique in a soliloquy.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1.167–79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunst</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The Shrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286–486</td>
<td>He and <strong>Catharina</strong> have an exchange of insults and fake praise.</td>
<td>2.1.180–282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487–574</td>
<td><strong>Catharina</strong> rejects <strong>Hardman</strong>’s suit, but the latter pretends she has agreed.</td>
<td>2.1.283–328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575–670</td>
<td><strong>Felix</strong> and <strong>Sebastian</strong> vie for <strong>Sabina</strong>’s hand, competing for age and wealth. <strong>Theobald</strong> favours <strong>Felix</strong> provided his father consents.</td>
<td>2.1.329–414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td><strong>Wormfire</strong> talks about his flirting with <strong>Sybilla</strong>.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td><strong>Hilarius</strong> and <strong>Alfons</strong>, disguised as tutors, quarrel, then give Sabina her lesson.</td>
<td>3.1.1–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–30</td>
<td><strong>Hilarius</strong> teaches her dactylic composition, <strong>Alfons</strong> sings her a song on the metamorphoses of Jupiter.</td>
<td>3.1.26–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–202</td>
<td><strong>Veit</strong> and <strong>Alfons</strong> speculate about the relationship between <strong>Sabina</strong> and <strong>Hilarius</strong>.</td>
<td>3.1.85–90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203–33</td>
<td><strong>Catharina</strong> complains about the shame of being abandoned on her wedding day. Reports arrive of <strong>Hardman</strong>’s and <strong>Wormfire</strong>’s outrageous dress.</td>
<td>3.2.1–83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td><strong>Hardman</strong> and <strong>Wormfire</strong> arrive, dressed in strange clothes.</td>
<td>3.2.84–126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–85</td>
<td><strong>Felix</strong>, <strong>Hilarius</strong> and <strong>Fabian</strong> reflect on <strong>Hilarius</strong>’ disguise scheme.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86–147</td>
<td><strong>Sebastian</strong> reports on the intimidating ceremony inside the house.</td>
<td>3.2.148–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148–76</td>
<td>When <strong>Catharina</strong> refuses to leave with <strong>Hardman</strong>, he carries her out on his shoulders, leaving the perplexed guests behind.</td>
<td>3.2.183–253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunst</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The Shrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349–98</td>
<td><strong>Hilarius</strong> and <strong>Sebastian</strong> discuss the latter’s love suit, followed by <strong>Fabian</strong> and <strong>Veit</strong> discussing their masters’ illicit wooing.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 1–95</td>
<td><strong>Wormfire</strong> arrives at <strong>Hardman</strong>’s house and gives an account of the exhausting journey.</td>
<td>4.1.1–105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96–186</td>
<td><strong>Hardman</strong> abuses the servants and refuses <strong>Catharina</strong> food and sleep.</td>
<td>4.1.106–67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The servants comment on Catharina’s patient endurance.</td>
<td>4.1.168–76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>In a soliloquy, <strong>Hardman</strong> explains his taming strategy as a random mixture of rage and affection.</td>
<td>4.1.177–200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 1–20</td>
<td><strong>Sabina</strong> expresses her longing for <strong>Hilarius</strong>.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–85</td>
<td><strong>Hilarius</strong> arrives, and they embrace and kiss. They are secretly watched by <strong>Felix</strong> and <strong>Alfons</strong> who abjures <strong>Sabina</strong>.</td>
<td>4.2.1–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86–105</td>
<td><strong>Fabian</strong> enters with the news that he has found someone to impersonate <strong>Hilarius</strong>’ father.</td>
<td>4.2.60–72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 1–72</td>
<td><strong>Wormfire</strong> and <strong>Sybilla</strong> feast while <strong>Catharina</strong> enters starving.</td>
<td>4.3.1–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73–104</td>
<td>The women discuss their impressions of <strong>Hardman</strong> in private.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105–326</td>
<td><strong>Hardman</strong> and <strong>Alfons</strong> arrive, again teasing <strong>Catharina</strong> with food. The tailor offers his wares, but <strong>Hardman</strong> rebukes him for bad work.</td>
<td>4.3.36–195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td><strong>Felix</strong> and <strong>Blasius</strong> discuss how to perform the role of father convincingly.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunst</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The Shrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Adrian worries about his son.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>Journeying to her father’s house, Hardman tests Catharina’s obedience by insisting he decides what is the time of day.</td>
<td>4.5.1–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–30</td>
<td>They meet Adrian.</td>
<td>4.5.27–77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99–150</td>
<td>Adrian meets Fabian, and Blasius and Felix in disguise. The impostors flee.</td>
<td>5.1.15–101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150–75</td>
<td>Adrian swoons, thinking they have murdered his son. Theobald’s servants carry him inside.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176–95</td>
<td>Hardman and Catharina promise each other peace, and kiss in public.</td>
<td>5.1.132–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196–205</td>
<td>Sybilla reflects upon Catharina’s improved future nights and her own impending wedding.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Theobald and Adrian grieve for the supposed death of the latter’s son.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–17</td>
<td>Sabina and Hilarius enter, married, and beg forgiveness from their fathers for deceiving them.</td>
<td>5.1.102–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–56</td>
<td>Catharina and Hardman renew their mutual affection and respect.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57–70</td>
<td>Felix, Fabian and Blasius are punished for their disobedience in a mock trial.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72–193</td>
<td>Wormfire asks permission to marry Sybilla, who is pregnant.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194–216</td>
<td>Catharina and Eulalia have a disagreement.</td>
<td>5.2.16–49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kunst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kunst</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>The Shrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217–68</td>
<td>Felix sings an erotic hunting song about the love suits of his betters.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269–344</td>
<td>The men have a wager about whose wife is most obedient. <strong>Hardman</strong> wins, and <strong>Catharina</strong> provides a brief conclusion on marital love and respect.</td>
<td>5.2.64–195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345–93</td>
<td><strong>Wormfire, Sybilla</strong> and <strong>Fabian</strong> conclude the play; <strong>Fabian</strong> performs an explicitly sexual song.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scene 1 into three. *Kunst*’s only scene that has no correspondence in *The Shrew* is Act 2, Scene 2, which consists of a soliloquy by Wormfire. What complicates matters slightly is that two act-breaks occur at different moments: *The Shrew* ends Act 3 after the ‘mad wedding’ scene, but *Kunst*’s third act continues until the end of *The Shrew*’s following scene. The two plays also differ in the final act-break: *The Shrew* ends Act 4 after Petruccio and Katherina, on their return to her father, have met Vincentio, Lucentio’s father. *Kunst*’s act-break does not occur until later, after Adrian, Hilarius’ father, has met his son’s servants. Nonetheless, every scene in *The Shrew* has correspondences in *Kunst*, and the material *Kunst* adopts from *The Shrew* essentially occurs in the same order as in Shakespeare’s play.

### Adapting the plot of The Taming of the Shrew

While *Kunst* thus generally follows *The Shrew*, it restructures a number of passages and adds dramatic configurations that are absent from Shakespeare’s play. In what follows, we wish to identify some of the key features of *Kunst*’s adaptation of *The Shrew*. An important effect of some of *Kunst*’s interventions is
that it untangles *The Shrew*’s plot when it is potentially confusing, or difficult to stage. This applies in particular to the beginning of the play, when Hilarius falls in love and devises the disguise scheme; to the plot involving the fake father of Hilarius; and to the illicit wedding of Hilarius and Sabina. Other important adaptive interventions by Kunst are observable in the last act and, in particular, the final scene: the mock trial and the servants’ coda are indicative of the adaptation’s interest in issues of gender and class.

*The Shrew* begins with the Induction involving Sly the tinker; this presents the main action of the shrew taming as a play, a ‘comonty’ (*TS*, Induction 2.133), as Sly puts it – probably a malapropism for ‘comedy’. Kunst preserves neither the Sly Induction nor its brief return at the end of the first scene (*TS*, 1.1.247–52), perhaps owing to a source that had already omitted them, although it is equally possible that Kunst deliberately cut the lengthy Induction as part of its adaptation. Kunst substitutes for the Induction an equally metatheatrical device, however, the Prologue of Patient Job, which frames the play as instruction for wife-taming. *The Shrew*’s Induction’s concern with social rank, the porousness of social stratification but also its ultimate impenetrability are not, however, removed from Kunst, but receive sustained treatment, in particular through the servant figures (see below, pp. 103–4).

The main plot of Kunst starts by clarifying Lucentio’s falling in love and the invention of the disguise scheme which frames the first appearance of Katherina and Bianca. Lucentio and his servant Tranio arrive in Padua from Verona in order to study (*TS*, 1.1.1–47). They ‘stand by’ (*TS*, 1.1.47 SD) when a company of people enters and witness their conversation, in particular the complaint of Bianca’s suitors, Gremio and Hortensio, about their situation (*TS*, 1.1.48–144). Lucentio also overhears Bianca’s reference to her passion for learning which, together with her beauty, makes him fall in love with her. The audience only learns of Lucentio’s falling in love when he and
Tranio, left alone on stage, speak about what they have just witnessed (TS, 1.1.145–219). Tranio gently mocks his master for the suddenness of his emotions and for his exaggerated praise of Bianca. As it becomes clear that Lucentio wants to marry her, he and Tranio invent the disguise scheme and exchange their clothes. When Biondello enters, he is shocked by the sartorial changes. Lucentio comes up with the explanation that he has killed a man in a quarrel and needs to remain incognito, but does not clarify why Tranio is to become a suitor to Bianca. Biondello briefly expresses discontent for missing out on Tranio’s social promotion, but the two servants make up in Lucentio’s presence (TS, 1.1.220–46).

*Kunst* omits the frame in *The Shrew’s* Act 1, Scene 1, in which Lucentio eavesdrops and falls in love. Instead, it presents consecutively the dialogue involving the suitors and the sisters on the one hand and the dialogue between servants and master on the other hand. Rather than staging Hilarius’ arrival and falling in love in the main play’s first scene, *Kunst* has Hilarius and Felix enter in the second, already in disguise (1.2.1–12). Hilarius reminds Felix of the reasons for the disguise, effectively dropping the audience into the middle of the subplot. Fabian appears and is amazed at the altered appearances, but rather than explaining the situation, Hilarius exits and lets Felix make sense of the situation to Fabian. Felix falsely suggests that Hilarius committed a crime and hence his consequent need for disguise, and the two servants discuss the unfairness of the change in Felix’s station (1.2.15–67). *Kunst* thus creates a more linear dramatic sequence which eliminates some of *The Shrew’s* intricacies, notably the eavesdropping frame, the spontaneous invention of the disguise scheme by both Tranio and Lucentio, and Lucentio’s bombastic use of love language which Tranio teases him about.

A result of the adapted beginning is that the initial character of Hilarius, unlike that of Lucentio, is not quite fleshed out, and the disguise scheme is introduced rather abruptly. In reorganizing the material, *Kunst* also, crucially, chooses to put
Catharina centre-stage. Whereas Bianca is central to Act 1 as the object of Gremio’s and Hortensio’s suit, and of Lucentio’s love-struck gaze, her Kunst counterpart, the meek Sabina, is absent from the equivalent scene. Kunst delays Sabina’s first appearance until Act 2, Scene 1, in which she is depicted in stark contrast to the domineering Catharina. The impression given of Sabina, then, is that she is a vaguely sketched obedient daughter, unlike Bianca who speaks up for herself in Act 1, Scene 1, however briefly (TS, 1.1.80–3). Sabina’s development in the course of the play, then, is all the more remarkable: she evolves from a mere supporting role into a self-confident young woman with sexual desires and initiative, as shown most notably in Act 4, Scene 1. Kunst’s adaption of the beginning of the main play thus has a profound effect not only on dramatic arrangement but also on characterization; it is fundamentally different from its Shakespearean model.

Another of The Shrew’s plot lines which Kunst simplifies is that of the Merchant from Mantua who plays fake father to Lucentio. In Act 4, Scene 2 of The Shrew, Biondello enters to Lucentio, Bianca and Tranio and announces that he has spotted a man arriving in Padua who ‘[i]n gait and countenance’ looks ‘like a father’ (4.2.66). Once Lucentio and Bianca have departed, the Merchant enters. Tranio then tricks him into dressing like Vincentio by convincing him that there is a ban on Mantuans arriving in Padua and that he needs to assume the identity of his master’s father for his own safety (4.2.73–122). Kunst, on the other hand, omits the set-up of this third disguise plot. When Fabian enters to Hilarius and Felix towards the end of Act 4, Scene 1, Felix inquires whether he has ‘found an honourable father’ (4.1.87–8). Fabian reports that he has, that the ‘grave gentleman . . . looks as honourable as Saint Valentine, is filled to the brim with imagined wisdom, and when it comes to natural philosophy, thinks he is the biggest pig in the sty’ (4.1.91–4). Blasius, as Fabian adds, is ‘willing to do anything for gain’ (4.1.96–7) and so has agreed to the scheme. For the
far-fetched idea of the ban on Mantuans, *Kunst* thus substitutes
the simple idea of pecuniary profit.

The plot line of *The Shrew*’s Merchant is bound up with the
secret wedding of Bianca and Lucentio. Shortly after being
disguised as Lucentio’s father, the Merchant meets Baptista, and
the match between Bianca and the Merchant’s supposed son
is struck. Lucentio (as Cambio) is sent home to notify Bianca
of her wedding which is to take place later in the day (4.4.19–
71). Biondello then intercepts Lucentio and tells him that Tranio
has prepared a secret wedding to take place between him and
Bianca (72–106). The plot line of the secret wedding interacts
with that of the fake father and his unmasking in Act 5, Scene 1,
where the focus switches from one to the other with quick-
changing entries and exits. While the confrontation between
Vincentio and the Merchant rises in tension, brief sequences
pertaining to the secret wedding (5.1.1–6, 36–9) punctuate the
unmasking of the Merchant, each plot line increasing the other’s
pace and urgency until they both join when Lucentio and Bianca
enter as a married couple (5.1.97 SD).

As part of the clarification and simplification of *The Shrew*’s
complex dramatic structure, *Kunst* does away with the
dramatization of the secret wedding. In Act 4, Scene 1, Sabina
and Hilarius meet, kiss and promise each other their lasting love.
Alfons, who has spied on them, gives up his wooing of Sabina
and decides to ‘reciprocate the friendliness and desire of a young
rich widow’ and to ‘link [his] life to hers’ (4.1.50–2). Sabina and
Hilarius part with a kiss, and when we next meet them in Act 5,
Scene 1, they enter ‘well dressed’ (5.1.17 SD), presumably
straight from their secret wedding, and apologize to their fathers
for their transgressions. Between these two scenes, we see the
fake-father scheme implode: in Act 4, Scene 3, Blasius reassures
Felix that he ‘will take care of everything and settle the business
to my lord’s [i.e. Theobald’s] liking’ (4.3.1–2). But in the
following scene, Blasius, Fabian and Felix, in Hilarius’ clothes,
come face to face with Hilarius’ real father, Adrian, who assumes
they ‘must have strangled [his] poor son’ (4.4.150) and swoons, giving them the chance to escape. By the last scene, they have been arrested and are subjected to a mock trial. Kunst thus reduces the complications of The Shrew’s plot by focusing on the fake father scheme and eliminating the dramatization of Hilarius and Sabina’s secret wedding.

The last scene of the German play weaves together the substantial, entirely original trial scene with a largely faithful adaptation of The Shrew’s wager sequence. It separates different sequences in The Shrew and skilfully blends them with original material. To appreciate the dramatic make-up of Kunst’s conclusion, one needs to see first how differently the two plays reach the final scene.

The Shrew’s Act 5, Scene 1 brings together the several disguises: the fake father (the Merchant), the fake suitor (Tranio) and the fake tutor (Lucentio). Initially, the different storylines clash (5.1.15–99). The confrontation between the fake and the real father threatens to spiral out of control, and only abates upon the arrival of Lucentio and Bianca who are now married. Biondello, Tranio and the Merchant flee, realizing they are ‘undone’ (5.1.101). Vincentio’s anger at being duped by his servant persists (5.1.110–11) as he ignores his son’s explanations and requests for peace (5.1.114–20), and threatens violence: ‘I’ll slit the villain’s [i.e. Tranio’s] nose that would have sent me to the jail’ (5.1.121–2). Baptista, too, is outraged at having his paternal authority thwarted by Bianca and Lucentio (5.1.123–4). With threats to ‘be revenged’ (5.1.126) on the servants and/or disobedient children, the scene uneasily concludes without any reconciliation. The Shrew’s last scene starts with a banquet presided over by Lucentio. Peace-making has thus occurred offstage and between scenes. Huge threats of revenge only a scene earlier have dissolved into ‘kindness’ (5.2.5) and tolerance towards the servants who are present, though without speaking roles.

Kunst’s penultimate scene differs from that of The Shrew in that the fathers gladly accept their new children-in-law (5.1.25–
and pardon their offspring. Overall, the reactions to the fake father and the secret wedding are more benevolent and forgiving. Rather than showing aggression towards the fake father and Felix who has impersonated his son, Adrian is overcome by emotion and repeatedly swoons (4.4.144–70). When he revives, he and Theobald lament the loss of Hilarius both as son and as possible son-in-law (5.1.16–17). Once their children arrive alive and married, Theobald and Adrian forgive their breach of custom. Whereas *The Shrew* deals with the business of reconciliation behind the scenes, the audience of *Kunst* thus becomes its witness.

As for the transgressions by Felix, Fabian and Blasius, Hilarius, solicitous of their pardon, asks for forbearance, Hardman pleads for the preservation of harmony, and the fathers agree to mere mock-punishment:

*Hilarius* . . . I must now also beg forgiveness for all those who have acted in this, for my sake, as others than themselves.

*Adrian* They should at least be frightened, especially that fool who wanted to make me mad.

*Hardman* This day is a day of joy. We should mingle nothing upsetting or grievous with it.

*Adrian* Then they should undergo an amusing kind of punishment, and all for their own good.

*Theobald* I add my voice to this, because my house ought to be a place of pleasure and gladness. So bring them all in, please.

(5.1.44–56)

While the breach of sumptuary law cannot go unpunished, nothing ‘grievous’ (5.1.51) is to interfere with the wedding celebrations. The punishment of the servants therefore takes the form of a communal ritual, so that those who attempted to rise unlawfully are restored to their proper place in society.

While *The Shrew* is keen to establish visual harmony through the banquet and Lucentio’s pacifying words (5.2.1–11), *Kunst*
performs the return to previous power structures through the trial (5.2.1–193), a long sequence that is wholly original to the German play. Sebastian first pronounces a harsh judgement: ‘Master Blasius Nosewhite and Felix are condemned to sweat out the nobility they wrongfully assumed in a hot bath house for three days. Fabian will wait upon them and serve them food, but no drink’ (5.2.23–6). When the offenders beg for mercy, Sebastian revisits the judgement and supposedly condemns them to assistance and participation in the wedding celebrations:

Master Blasius shall join Ceres and Bacchus, and make friends with them for eight days and longer in Sir Theobald’s lodgings in tolerable temperatures . . . Felix will hear an acceptably merciful judgment from his own master, and will behave like a modest guest. Fabian, on the other hand, will be handed over to Wormfire for his excesses, who will put him into the pillory, and run wine through him until he falls to the ground powerless, having done his duty to justice. When he has recovered his modest standing, he shall be made an inspector over the law of the jug. He shall diligently pour the cups overfull.

(5.2.50–65)

The sentence takes the form of an inversion of the scapegoat ritual. Rather than creating social exclusion by assigning unmerited blame, there is social inclusion of the offenders in a prolonged post-wedding Bacchanalian feast.

Just as the trial seems to conclude, Wormfire, in characteristic mock-Latin, states that he ‘must confer another more or less dirty thing to the Sacro-Sanctae Justitiae’ (5.2.77–8), and so the trial scene transitions to its second part. As Sybilla is expecting a child, Wormfire asks for permission to marry her, his embarrassment masked by comically convoluted Latinate language (5.2.91–105). The attendants gently tease them, and Hilarius suggests that their punishment for pre-marital sex
should be a prohibition to be ‘bedfellows’ (5.2.115), but after some comical resistance from the couple, they are allowed to get married. They are to be ‘handed over to the priest’ (5.2.162–3) and to participate in the wedding celebrations, and, after the birth of their child, ‘this whole company shall serve as godparents’ (5.2.168–9). In both parts of the trial scene, the threat of punishment and mock humiliation are thus followed by forgiveness, benevolence and joyful social integration.

After this long and funny but linguistically complex additional material, Kunst returns to material dramatized in The Shrew’s final scene, in particular in the short altercation between Katherina and the Widow (5.2.16–38), and the wager sequence with the demonstration of Katherina’s tameness (5.2.64–195). Interpolated within the passage based on The Shrew is the recitation by Felix of a poem – ‘a little wedding wish’ (5.2.218), as he puts it – that retells the story of the three suitors, Hilarius, Alfons and Sebastian, figured as huntsmen of Sabina, who is troped as a deer (5.2.224–55). Apart from adding to the comic conclusion through its recapitulatory effect, the poem also reminds us of Felix’s predicament as a servant in his concluding plea to Hilarius for continued patronage and employment.

Kunst aligns itself closely with The Shrew for the men’s wager on their wives’ obedience (The Shrew, 5.2.64–195; Kunst, 5.2.267–344). It comes as a surprise to the modern reader, however, that, amid this faithful rendition of the English original, Kunst chooses to condense Katherina’s famous speech on female obedience in marriage (TS, 5.2.142–85), the longest speech of the play (it has forty-four lines), into a two-line nugget of sober advice, borrowed from St Paul’s Letter to the Ephesians: ‘Let me put it briefly. You men, love your wives. And you women, obey your husbands’ (5.2.340–1).1 In The Shrew,

---

1 ‘Husbands, love your wives . . .’ (5.25); ‘Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands . . .’ (Ephesians 5.22).
Katherina’s long and rhetorically sophisticated speech, with its massive potential for different interpretations, is the moment towards which the play’s conclusion moves. Kunst, by contrast, breaks the structure of the final scene into several smaller units: the mock trial of Felix, Fabian and Blasius; the mock trial of Wormfire and Sybilla; the performance of Felix’s recapitulatory poem; and the men’s wager on their wives’ obedience.

One reason why the German play can afford to reduce Katherina’s long and troubling speech to a succinct piece of advice is that it completes a reinterpretation of the relationship between Petruccio and Katherina which started some time earlier. Although Hardman makes Catharina undergo more or less the same treatment as Petruccio gives Katherina, Kunst stresses that the couple’s relationship leads to mutual contentment and peace. In a significant departure from Shakespeare’s play, Hardman, in his second soliloquy (corresponding to The Shrew, 4.1.177–200), says, ‘I confess I love her dearly’ (3.5.8). In keeping with this are the names Hardman uses for Catharina. Even though Shakespeare’s female protagonist insists on her full name – ‘They call me Katherine that do talk of me’ (2.1.183) – Petruccio reduces her name to ‘Kate’, consistently during their first encounter and frequently after it too.  

Hardman, however, uses the shortened ‘Trina’ during their first encounter but almost invariably calls her ‘Catharina’ elsewhere in the play, suggesting a more respectful attitude. Catharina shows similar signs of benevolence towards Hardman in the course of the play. In her conversation with Sybilla, for instance, she says, ‘I believe this man has bewitched me, because I have to be gentle to him almost against my will’ (4.2.102–3). At the end of Act 5, Scene 1,

---

1 After Act 2, Scene 1, Petruccio calls her ‘Kate’ thirty times and ‘Katherine’ only twice, in the last scene (TS, 5.2.127, 136).

2 For the diminutive of the shortened form of Catharina’s name which Hardman uses once in the penultimate scene, see 5.1.57 and note. See also 5.2.123, 206 and notes.
immediately after their kiss in public (cf. TS, 5.1.139–41), Kunst adds a short passage that sums up the stage that their relationship has reached:

**HARDMAN**  Do you see now, my love, that this is much better than when we are at odds? So let us put away all tricks and stubbornness, and live in peace and pleasure after wearing down our horns. I will chase away the mad Hardman, and you must chase away the bad Catharina. Thus we shall be an honourable couple renowned in all the world.

**CATHARINA**  I am content with you if you are content with me.

**HARDMAN**  Amen.

(4.4.186–95)

By the time we reach The Shrew’s last scene, then, the outcome of Petruccio’s taming still hangs in the balance. In Kunst, by contrast, the last scene only confirms what the play has previously shown, which is that the couple have made peace.

An effect of Kunst’s reorganization of the final scene is the special prominence it gives to the servants. In keeping with this adaptive decision, Kunst, after the exit of the higher-ranking characters, adds a coda with the play’s four chief servants, Felix, Fabian, Wormfire and Sybilla (5.2.345–93). For much of the final scene, then – the long mock trial, the performance of the poems and the coda – Kunst puts the servants centre-stage. While The Shrew's festive conclusion is essentially about the newly-wedded couples – Petruccio and Katherina, Lucentio and Bianca and, to a lesser extent, Hortensio and the Widow – Kunst’s conclusion is socially more inclusive and gives considerable space to those servants (Felix and Fabian) who have helped bring about the marriages and to those (Wormfire and Sybilla) who serve as foils to the unions of their social superiors. Whereas The Shrew moves towards Katherina’s parade of her new obedience as its defining moment, Kunst
divides the scene into several smaller units where a significant exchange is limited to gentle mockery of the servants and their robust resistance to it. The weaving together of The Shrew’s last scene with Kunst’s substantial addition of the trial and the songs by and coda with the servants shows a sophisticated adaptor of Shakespeare’s play who deftly interwove new material, while keeping the playful mood of the original.

Soliloquies and asides
To its often close adaptation of The Shrew’s text, structure and themes, Kunst adds many soliloquies and asides that offer subtle twists to the original in terms of meaning and theatrical pace. The soliloquies often precede or succeed versions of the Shakespearean material, adding anticipatory or retrospective perspectives on what we will soon see or have just witnessed. They elegantly create brief points of rest which allow for (re)consideration of action and motivation and result in dramatic progression at highly variable speeds.

One example of a soliloquy that slows down the progression of the plot is that of Fabian (3.2.164–76) when he compares his own lack of success with the rosy prospects enjoyed by Felix through the disguise scheme. Sandwiched between the passage where Hilarius and Felix discuss the fake father scheme and Sebastian’s report of the mad wedding, Kunst’s soliloquy slightly halts the rapidly accumulating events of The Shrew where the entry of groom and servant, the discussion on the fake father, and Gremio’s report of the ceremony follow each other thick and fast. The overhasty betrothal, wedding and impatient leave-taking of Petruchio overwhelm Katherina by presenting her with seemingly inevitable facts, tricking her into acceptance through the speed of theatrical sequencing. There is a logic to the overwhelming thrust of The Shrew’s forward-moving plot, and soliloquies would lessen its effect. Kunst,
however, puts a premium on varied pace which permits the exploration of motivation and emotional state.

The Shrew’s chief soliloquies give us access to Petruccio’s reflections just before he meets Katherina (2.1.167–79), and after their shocking homecoming (4.1.177–200). Both instances concern his taming techniques of playing hot and cold with her, and of withdrawing even the most basic of physical comforts, food and sleep. Other than Petruccio, a few characters have short soliloquies at the end of scenes and, in one instance, at the beginning of a scene. Of these, Kunst provides versions of similar length by Felix (2.1.663–70; cf. TS, 2.1.407–14) and Wormfire (3.3.1–14; cf. TS, 4.1.1–10), and a considerably expanded version by Alfons (3.1.224–49; cf. TS, 3.1.85–90).\(^1\) The two longest soliloquies in The Shrew are thus Petruccio’s, which confers a special status on his ‘taming of the shrew’ and motivations.

Kunst includes largely faithful versions of Petruccio’s soliloquies (2.1.225–46 and 3.5.1–30), but it also has six other characters give soliloquies with no equivalent in The Shrew, namely Wormfire (3.3.1–14), Catharina (3.2.1–12), Fabian (3.2.164–76), Sabina (4.1.9–18), Adrian (4.4.1–9) and Sybilla (4.4.196–205). These soliloquies have a considerable impact on pace, character and plot. The audience of The Shrew, for instance, first meets Vincentio as an unwitting actor in Petruccio’s taming test concerning the sun and the moon (TS, 4.5.1–25). Hilarius’ father Adrian, however, first enters the stage alone, worrying about his son’s whereabouts (4.4.1–9). The first impression of him as loving father is confirmed throughout the last part of the play, setting up the mood for a conciliatory ending.

A similar change is discernible in Kunst’s addition of Catharina’s reflection on her misery and her fear of the mockery

---

\(^1\) The short speeches by Lucentio and Hortensio when alone left on stage (TS, 4.4.103–6 and 4.5.78–80) have no equivalent in Kunst.
she will suffer if Hardman does not arrive at the wedding soon (3.2.1–12). Catharina blames her father for rashly giving her away, and confesses to herself that she has found her match in shrewishness. She admits that she would ‘give [Hardman] the kindest words, and force [her]self to be friendly’ if only he returned (3.2.9–10). This concession, lacking in *The Shrew*, anticipates future taming scenes, including the meeting with the tailor (4.2), where Catharina curbs her impulse in order to allow Hardman to end his raging. Through the soliloquy, *Kunst* thus strategically supports the plot and complicates Catharina’s image, showing that she, who flouts traditional gender conventions, is no less bound by social expectations and reputation than those she scorns.

*Kunst*’s soliloquies provide insights into the workings of the characters’ minds, as well as their feelings. In its astonishing decision to add a soliloquy to Sabina’s part in which she reveals her love for Hilarius, *Kunst* makes her character radically depart from its equivalent in *The Shrew*, showing her as being much more sexually forward. The German play preserves *The Shrew*’s configuration in which the servant disguised as his master hides with the suitor disguised as a tutor in order to witness the flirtatious lesson between a daughter and a poetry teacher (*The Shrew*, 4.2; *Kunst*, 4.1). Into the two sections of hiding and revelation from *The Shrew*, however, *Kunst* inserts a brief speech by Sabina who is waiting for Hilarius. Believing herself to be alone (although Felix and Alfons are in fact on stage), she expresses her love and physical desire:

> Happy hour which will bring my soul to my body. O love, never tried by me before, how great is your sweetness! Everything else in the world is stale and miserable in comparison! True joy and pleasure lie in you alone, pervading all my senses, body and soul. Many things can be found to entertain the body, but the soul cannot find pleasure and contentment but through
another soul, united in sweet love. But where is the comfort that I long for so much? Does his mind not feel the same yearning desire as mine?  

(4.1.9–18)

Sabina remains teasingly vague about what it means to ‘entertain the body’ (4.1.14). The violence of her feelings and their expression, though, as well as her keenness to kiss and touch, even on her own initiative – ‘She kisses him’ (4.1.84 SD) – point towards her awareness, if not necessarily knowledge, of sexual pleasure. Her remarkable frankness in word and deed differs significantly from the arch voice of Bianca. The equivalent scene of The Shrew has the latter exchange merely a handful of quick-witted lines with Lucentio before he, rather than she, confesses his love for her (TS, 4.2.10). And no stage direction in The Shrew alerts us to a kiss between the two.

The German adaptation’s non-judgemental attitude and its greater interest in female desire and sexuality become evident not only in its depiction of higher-ranked characters like Sabina, but also in its remarkable addition of the female servant Sybilla, a character who seems to be an invention by the author of Kunst, although the idea of inserting a female servant into the play may have been prompted by Slobbetje in Abraham Sybant’s Dutch adaptation of The Shrew of 1654, De Dolle Bruyloft (see below, pp. 125–7). As Catharina’s maid, Sybilla provides a female equivalent to Wormfire, Hardman’s servant, filling a comic vacuum in The Shrew. She is first mentioned by Wormfire, after Theobald has agreed to Catharina’s marriage to Hardman. In his soliloquy, Wormfire muses on his flirting with Sybilla, and expresses confidence that she will eventually come around to having sex with him: ‘I have set up my cause well. She is ready on certain conditions. If my lord says yes, and her lady yes, the whore will be mine. I thought my tool would have it my way, but not this time. Such an honourable tree will not fall with one stroke’ (2.2.5–9). In her first speaking scene,
Act 4, Scene 2, in which she and Wormfire feast on leftover food at Hardman’s house, it becomes clear that the couple has now had sex (she is pregnant) and are hoping to get married before the baby is born. They face the situation with jocular acceptance rather than anxiety, and are more interested in the food than in the precariousness of their circumstances (4.2.1–25). As she puts it, their extra-marital sex in fact ‘conforms to courtoisie’ (4.2.14) as practised by socially more distinguished people. This down-to-earth relationship between the two servants thus explores sexual mores, calling into question loftier but ultimately no less appetite-driven models of courtship. Her relationship with Wormfire is robust and frank but never condemned and, eventually, even blessed by marriage.

Later in Act 4, Scene 2, Kunst continues the theme of female sexual experience when Sybilla and Catharina discuss the wedding night (4.2.73–104). Sybilla frankly asks her mistress how the bedding was, and equally frankly receives a negative answer: ‘He has left me all too pure so far’ (4.2.86). The passage is not a soliloquy, but, like a soliloquy, it gives the spectators access to Catharina that is unrestricted by public norms of behaviour or expression, and so shares with them a private moment in which she is genuinely vulnerable. As there is no equivalent confidante in The Shrew, all we experience of Katherina is her starvation and lack of sleep; there is little emotional reflection. Catharina, by contrast, exposes her vulnerability and wonders about her changing relationship with and attitude towards Hardman who, she claims, ‘has bewitched [her]’ (4.2.103).

Sybilla returns to the theme of female sexual pleasure in her own soliloquy (4.4.196–205) which caps the busy final scene of Act 4. Having witnessed the public kiss between Hardman and Catharina, and their promise to be respectful towards one another, a breach of which would be followed by a ban from their shared bed (4.4.179–95), Sybilla humorously reflects on how their improved understanding must reflect a happier sexual
life: ‘Well, I take it she is content with him now. She has had better nights than the first’ (4.4.196–7). Through the soliloquies, therefore, Kunst acknowledges female desire and sexuality with a degree of frankness that is absent from The Shrew. In sum, Kunst treats the female characters’ desires and appetites with equanimity, allowing them to elaborate for themselves what they wish for, untrammeled by male observations about them.

Kunst’s added soliloquies thus help to enhance characterization and function as a tool to control and vary the dramatic pace of the play, slowing it down in order to open up spaces in which characters articulate their emotional states, such as Fabian’s social frustration, Catharina’s fear of mockery, Wormfire’s and Sabina’s sexual desire and Vincentio’s fatherly care. Whereas The Shrew employs soliloquizing chiefly to allow Petruccio to reflect on and rationalize his ‘taming of the shrew’, Kunst opens it up to many other characters, resulting in an introspective heteroglossia that is absent from Shakespeare’s play.

The soliloquy as a dramatic device is closely related to the aside, in that both are only heard by (or even addressed to) the audience, and, indeed, Kunst adds not only many soliloquies to The Shrew but also many asides. The aside is a well-established convention on the early modern stage, although stage directions that render them explicit are rare in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions of Shakespeare’s plays, and The Shrew’s early modern editions contain no instance of it. The early editions of Kunst, however, mark twenty-four speeches as asides (‘beyseits’ in German), almost all of them with material that has no

1 For the prominence of the aside on the early modern English stage, see Dessen and Thomson, 15–16. Note that many of The Shrew’s modern editors mark several speeches as asides, although Barbara Hodgdon, in the Arden 3 series, does so only once (5.1.37 SD), arguing that, on the whole, ‘whether a line is or is not spoken “aside” is best left for performers to work out’ (341).

2 This excludes the rare occasions where two characters speak aside to one another, unheard by others (so-called ‘split asides’).
equivalent in *The Shrew*. It is likely that asides are more pervasive still in the play but have been recorded unsystematically in the early editions. In Act 2, Scene 1, for instance, as Hardman and Sebastian speak to Theobald about their suit to his respective daughters (2.1.82–145), Wormfire makes ten interjectory comments during their conversation, none of which in any way registers with or is responded to by the other characters, and this despite the fact that many of the comments are so provocative that, if heard, they would elicit a rebuke or some other response. Yet the early duodecimos mark only four of Wormfire’s ten speeches as asides. There is nothing about the nature of Wormfire’s comments that would allow us to determine why those four should be spoken as asides and not the other six. Similar patterns can be observed elsewhere in the play (see, for instance, 1.1.17–32, 2.1.196-200). Given that these and similar comments – chiefly spoken by servants, as we shall see – play an important role in the play, we have usually marked them as asides (signalling the editorial intervention by square brackets), even though the early editions do not. It would be possible, of course, to perform many of these asides in such a way as to elicit a non-verbal response by other characters, but we nonetheless consider them to be asides insofar as they fail to register in the other characters’ dialogue.¹

Of the sixty-one (original or editorial) asides in the play, by far the greatest number, thirty-eight, are spoken by Wormfire, and of those that are not, the majority are assigned to two other servants: Veit and Fabian. Indeed, it is noticeable that Kunst frequently inserts asides by servants into faithfully translated passages from *The Shrew*, and it does so as part of a conscious strategy to make the servants reflect on the actions and motivations of the higher-ranked characters. For instance, in

¹ Our understanding of what is usefully considered an aside is here shaped by Morgan, *Turn-Taking*, 105–15.
the following passage, Sebastian tells Hilarius, disguised as Johannes, how to prepare for his teaching of Sabina:

SEBASTIAN [to Hilarius] The next thing I want is that you buy for her the best books about love that you can find. These have great power to enflame the fire of love in the hearts of maidens.

WORMFIRE (aside) But not for you.

SEBASTIAN And they should be bound in the daintiest and prettiest manner. The paper that you use must be well perfumed, for she whom my soul loves is worth more than all exquisite spices. And may I remind you, Johannes, to be as diligent in her service as you can. Your reward from me will exceed even Sir Theobald’s generosity.

WORMFIRE [aside] He looks to me as if he would receive his salary from her without your knowledge or will.

SEBASTIAN But what matters will you treat with her?

(1.3.158–72)

If we compare the passage to *The Shrew*, we notice that it corresponds to a single speech by Gremio, addressed to Lucentio disguised as Cambio, into which *Kunst* has inserted the two acerbic asides by Wormfire:

GREMIO O, very well; I have perused the note.¹
Hark you, sir, I’ll have them very fairly bound
(All books of love, see that at any hand)
And see you read no other lectures to her:
You understand me. Over and beside
Signor Baptista’s liberality,
I’ll mend it with a largess. Take your paper too,
And let me have them very well perfumed,

¹ Ard³ *TS* annotates, ‘bill, account – presumably, for Lucentio’s purchase of books’.
For she is sweeter than perfume itself
To whom they go to. What will you read to her?

(_TS_, 1.2.142–51)

In _The Shrew_, the ‘books of love’ have already been purchased, whereas they have not yet in _Kunst_, but the German adaptation nonetheless preserves all the important elements of Gremio’s speech: the plan to have the books bound and to use them in the teaching to further the wooing, the additional reward, the perfumed paper and the final question. The faithfulness in the adaptation of Gremio’s speech contrasts with the innovation of Wormfire’s comments. Clearly, they are both asides, although only the first is marked as such in the early editions: Wormfire’s second comment anticipates Hilarius’ wooing of Sabina for himself, which is precisely what remains hidden from Sebastian. _Kunst_ thus adds a layer to the passage by having Wormfire comment on the ongoing action, increasing the complicity between the audience and the servant character (who understands Hilarius’ plan), while exposing and undercutting the foolish project of Sebastian.

The same mechanism can be observed on a larger scale in the previously mentioned passage in Act 2, Scene 1, in which Hardman and Sebastian introduce themselves to Theobald as suitors to his respective daughters (2.1.84–143). The passage follows the equivalent dramatic sequence in _The Shrew_ (2.1.39–86), and almost every speech by Petruccio, Gremio and Baptista has its corresponding speech in _Kunst_. What is radically different in the German adaptation, however, are the asides by Wormfire. In _The Shrew_, Grumio is simply absent from the scene; in _Kunst_, Wormfire provides a sarcastic running commentary, inserts daring jokes and exposes to the audience much of what the other characters try to keep hidden from one another, thereby deflating their motives and unmasking their ambitions.¹

¹ One could also point to other passages in which Wormfire (e.g. 1.3.235–7; 2.1.222–23; 3.2.117, 124–5; 4.4.59–60) or, less frequently, Veit (e.g. 2.1.569–70) or Fabian (e.g. 3.2.229) have asides that have been added by _Kunst_ in passages that otherwise closely follow _The Shrew._
The perspicacity and irreverence with which Wormfire frequently comments on and subverts the self-interested projects of the higher-ranked characters arguably make him the protagonist of the German play. This may seem surprising, given the Shakespearean source, but it is less so if we place Kunst in the context of the seventeenth-century theatre companies that travelled across Germany. In many of their plays, Pickelherring was typically the protagonist, and the actor playing him was often the company leader (see Katritzky, ‘Pickelherring’ and ‘A plague’). Indeed, he was so prominent that his name became a generic word designating a fool.¹ Pickelherring, like Wormfire, is a servant figure who owes his importance to the place he occupies in the plays as witty, irreverent commentator and trenchant interrogator. Like Wormfire, the German stock character has a special relationship with the audience, often speaks aside and has a propensity for bawdy innuendos. Nor is Kunst the only early modern German Shakespeare play in which a version of the Pickelherring figure comes to occupy an important role. In Romio und Julieta, Pickelherring is a character himself, an amalgamation of the Nurse, Peter and another Capulet servant in Shakespeare’s play (Erne and Seidler, 76–7). In Der Bestrafte Brudermord, he is called Phantasmo, a name that seems to be unique to this play but whose functions are clearly related to Pickelherring’s (Erne and Seidler, 9–10). Wormfire, then, offers a late instance of a character whose adaptation to the German stage is shaped by the conventions of the Pickelherring figure. In Kunst, he complements several other servant figures, notably Felix, Fabian and Veit, and reinforces the play’s more general interest in servants and their relationship to their social superiors.

¹ For the clown figure in early German professional theatre more generally, see Asper, Hanswurst, 124–230.
Verbal, cultural and dramatic language

Apart from the addition of soliloquies and asides, another important feature of Kunst’s adaptation of The Shrew is its revision of the dramatic writing that makes up Shakespeare’s play. Unlike The Shrew, which combines verse and prose, Kunst is written almost entirely in prose, although it contains two short verse passages during the poetry lesson in Act 3, Scene 1, a song that is performed during the music lesson in the same scene, and two poems that are recited in the last scene. If we compare Kunst and The Shrew closely, we notice that the German adaptation sometimes follows Shakespeare’s play speech by speech and almost word for word. The following excerpt, taken from the passage in which Hardman/Petruchio feigns dissatisfaction with the work of the tailor (‘Fritz’ in Kunst), serves to illustrate the occasional verbal proximity between the two plays. The Shrew reads as follows:

KATHERINA
I never saw a better-fashioned gown,
More quaint, more pleasing, nor more commendable.
Belike you mean to make a puppet of me.

PETRUCCIO
Why true, he means to make a puppet of thee.

TAILOR She says your worship means to make a puppet of her.

PETRUCCIO
O monstrous arrogance. Thou liest, thou thread,
thou thimble,
Thou yard, three quarters, half-yard, quarter, nail,
Thou flea, thou nit, thou winter-cricket, thou!
Braved in mine own house with a skein of thread?

1 See 3.1.46–50, 3.1.67–70, 3.1.143–78, 5.2.224–60 and 5.2.352–79.
Away, thou rag, thou quantity, thou remnant, 
Or I shall so bemete thee with thy yard 
As thou shalt think on prating whilst thou liv’st. 
I tell thee, I, that thou has marred her gown. 

(TS, 4.3.103–16)

Here is the equivalent passage in Kunst:

CATHARINA I say he has worked well. You want to make a rogue of him, and a fool of me. 
HARDMAN You speak right. It’s the rogue who wants to make a fool of you. 
FRITZ She says, my lord, it is you who wants to make a fool of her. 
HARDMAN O, great presumption by the shadow of a man in my own house! You lie, you lie, you thread, you Tom Thumb, you needle tip, you flaky-headed clod of earth, you! I’ll soon measure your mangy back with your mete-yard and make you remember it all your life. You’ve wasted everything that’s been given into your hands. 

(4.2.202–14)

The four speeches occur in the same order, and each has its easily recognizable equivalent. Catharina’s speech condenses and simplifies the first sentence in Katherina’s, but the second sentence remains close, except that it adds the idea that Hardman mocks not only her but also the tailor. Hardman’s first speech closely follows Petruccio’s and relies on the same feigned misunderstanding. Fritz then, like the Shrew’s tailor, corrects Hardman/Petruccio by explaining the misunderstanding. Hardman’s following outrage, or mock outrage, draws on many of the same elements as Petruccio’s. The initial exclamation is followed by an accusation of lying, followed by a series of apostrophes that belittle the tailor through references related to his profession. The (feigned) resentment at being contradicted
in his own house also recurs, though in a slightly different position. *Kunst* omits Petruccio’s order for the tailor to go away, but the two speeches conclude in the same way with the threat of beating the tailor with a yard rule and the charge that he has spoiled the work, although Petruccio’s accusation that he has spoiled the ‘gown’ is more specific than Hardman’s that he has ‘wasted everything’. All in all, then, the relationship between the two passages in *Kunst* and *The Shrew* is close. To the extent that it is a translation, the translation is rather loose, but to the extent that it is an adaptation, the adaptation closely follows the original.

While occasional proximity is one feature of the relationship of *Kunst*’s language to *The Shrew*’s, the German play also contains distinct characteristics that depart from or go beyond Shakespeare’s play. One such feature is its fondness for proverbs, some of which are inevitably lost in translation, although we use the commentary to draw the reader’s attention to their presence in the original and to their literal meaning. In the opening scene, for instance, Catharina taunts Sebastian by telling him, ‘Dann jhr ja nicht könnt einen Hund auß dem Ofen locken’, of which a more-or-less literal translation might be that Sebastian ‘could not tease a dog out from under the oven’. Given that Sebastian is unable even to make a dog move, he will be utterly unable, Catharina implies, to evoke desire in a young woman. Our translation, ‘you couldn’t tease a dog out from under the oven’ (1.1.38–9), preserves the insult to Sebastian and the canine reference, but in the absence of a precise equivalent in English, it inevitably loses something of the colourfully proverbial original.

On other occasions, the German play uses expressions that have at least a proverbial appearance, although they cannot be found in the most comprehensive reference work of German proverbs, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander’s five-volume *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexicon* (1866–80), and may be idiosyncratic coinages by the German author. So in Act 1,
Scene 3, as the suitors are fighting over Sabina, Wormfire comments that ‘where carrion is stinking, there the ravens will gather’ (1.3.359–60), a characteristically irreverent comment that tropes Sabina as rotting flesh over which the suitor-ravens fight. The German text contains many such vivid expressions, often rooted in references to the animal world, in particular but by no means only spoken by Wormfire. In line with this feature of Kunst’s language is its proliferation and amplification of sexual allusions, often channelled through outspoken servants (notably Wormfire, Sybilla and Veit) but also through characters of higher rank, like Catharina. All these linguistic features contribute to making Kunst an earthier and more exuberant play than The Shrew.

While using many distinctly German expressions and proverbs, the author of Kunst also goes beyond this linguistic adaptation by fitting geographic and cultural references to the German context. For instance, Hardman is from Worms (1.3.249), not Verona, and he claims to be planning a trip to Frankfurt, not Venice, to purchase ‘gorgeous robes and jewels’ for the wedding (2.1.539–40). Wormfire affirms (perhaps fancifully) that he and Hardman served in the military at ‘Bautzen’ (1.3.310) in east Saxony, associated with various events during the Thirty Years’ War, including a siege in 1620 and the town’s destruction by fire during occupation by the Catholic imperial army in 1633. His interjection ‘Leipzig surrenders’ (2.1.128) likely alludes to another event in the Thirty Years’ War, the Battle of Breitenfeld (1642), during which Leipzig surrendered to the Swedish forces. Elsewhere the same character refers to ‘a market in Hanover’ (2.1.112–13), in northern Germany, and to ‘Bacherach wine’ (3.2.250) from the wine-growing region of Bacherach in the Rhine-Palatinate. Geographic references thus range from west to east and from north to south, though what may well be the most regionally-specific reference, ‘Bacherach’, is compatible with the opinion of several German scholars that certain linguistic
peculiarities point to western central Germany as the homeland of the play’s anonymous author (see below, p. 143).

A specific instance of cultural translation may be observed in Act 3, Scene 1. In its endeavour to make the English play recognizable to German culture, the translator replaces the Ovidian Latin lesson with a tutorial on dactylic composition in German while keeping the romantically suggestive content and context of *The Shrew*. The line-by-line translation of Latin (to ‘conster’ is Bianca’s word for it – *TS*, 3.1.30, 40) was a staple activity of humanist education and would have playfully activated school-time memories of many male readers or audience members (see Maurer). The Latin passage is from Ovid’s *Heroides*, and the part on which Lucentio has Bianca focus is from Penelope’s letter to Ulysses, recounting her difficult situation as wife left behind in their kingdom, beset with unwanted suitors. Shakespeare toys with the obvious inference that Bianca’s suitors are just as unwelcome as Penelope’s, and are, for the moment at least, rebutted by her translation. Elite references to classical literature are thus embedded in *The Shrew*’s scene in specific cultural practices that have implications for plot and characterization.

*Kunst*’s adaptor realizes the particularity of the passage and adapts it to German literary culture of the seventeenth century in which use of the dactyl was rare.\(^1\) The complex layers of intertextuality between Ovid and Shakespeare are sidestepped for a more straightforward situation-based adaptation that focuses on the flirtation between student and tutor. The German stresses the potentially sexual relationship between teacher and pupil by having Hilarius explain the dactyl in terms that suggest

\(^1\) Martin Opitz (1597–1639), the leading theoretician of German literature of the seventeenth century, did not advocate use of the dactyl, but his contemporary and successor August Buchner (1591–1661) did. The author of *Kunst* may well have been aware of Buchner’s posthumously published *Anleitung zur deutschen Poeterey*, sigs F10r–G6r (‘Instructions for German Poetry’, Wittenberg, 1665; VD17 39:121087A).
the male sexual organs (one long syllable and two short ones, for which the standard notation was —○○—), and its composition in terms suggesting sexual intercourse: ‘Although it may appear to you a little sour the first time, afterwards it will seem so sweet that your appetite will not be stilled’ (3.1.49–51). The passage thus combines wit and daring at the same time as Kunst adapts it to its own cultural context.

Though Kunst thus eliminates The Shrew’s Latin lesson, it includes many Latin words and phrases elsewhere. It does so far more than Shakespeare’s play, making the presence of Latin snippets another characteristic feature of Kunst’s language that distinguishes it from The Shrew’s. This presence might be thought to pull the language of Kunst over towards sophistication and sober learning, but given the barely veiled mocking or suggestive undertone of many of the Latin words and phrases, it does not. Although its appreciation presupposes some learning, the Latin with which the play is peppered usually serves a comic or satiric purpose, such as the exposure of pretentiousness or the conveyance of mock formality. In Act 1, Scene 2, for instance, Fabian mocks Felix’s newfound noble status through bragging in French and Latin: ‘How now, my brand-new lord, avec permission, may I interrogate you and receive report through my quaestiones?’ (1.2.40–2). In Act 2, Scene 1, as Hardman is getting ready to meet Catharina for the first time, he sends Wormfire away on the grounds that he ‘need[s] to think’, an idea his servant mocks by using Latin: ‘I can well believe you: there will be brave lectiones, you will receive the contra’ (2.1.248–51). Sebastian’s pompous and self-righteous quotation from Ovid’s Fasti, ‘Magna fuit capitis quondam reverentia cani’ (‘in the past there used to be great reverence for the white head’), is immediately countered by

1 For Latin in The Shrew outside the Latin lesson, see Grumio’s ‘Inprimis’ and ‘Ergo’ (4.1.59, 4.3.129), the Tailor’s ‘Inprimis’ (4.3.133) and a phrase by Tranio (1.1.161) and by Biondello (4.4.91–2).
Veit’s acerbic comment, ‘Even if you gather all the maxims from Cicero and Seneca, you will not convince a pretty maid that you are more suitable for her than a fresh young gentleman’ (2.1.613–17). In the tailor passage, Fritz reads out Wormfire’s written instructions to defend himself against Hardman’s accusations of professional incompetence (4.2.236–97), and the comedy of the passage partly relies on the note’s combination of pompous diction, convoluted syntax and repeated use of Latin (and French). Latin is pervasive when, during the second part of the trial scene, Wormfire confesses that Sybilla is pregnant and requests permission to marry her (5.2.73–192). Struggling to come clean about Sybilla’s pre-marital pregnancy, he hides his embarrassment in confusing syntax and Latin, with the result that his onstage (see 5.2.81) as well as his offstage audience find it hard to understand him.

In other passages, characters use Latin to give bawdy allusions a veneer of respectability, or mock respectability. Disappointed that his first close encounter with Sybilla has not led to full sexual intercourse, Wormfire rationalizes his disappointment by stating that ‘one stays in atrio [i.e. in the entrance hall] the first time’ and only later gets to ‘drift into the Netherlands’ (2.2.21–4). When Sybilla, in her soliloquy, concludes that Catharina, since her wedding, ‘has had better nights than the first’ (4.4.197), she attributes the change to the ‘instrumentum pacis’, the instrument of peace, that is, the male member. In the music lesson, Alfons presents to Sabina his method of gamut teaching by using several Latin words that contain sexual innuendos: ‘Here is the scala which I have devised in a perfect new manner. Women usually conceive better of b flat major than b flat minor, so I will first instruct you in the ascendendo, and then in the descendendo which teaches itself’ (3.1.112–16). The German text reads ‘dur’ for ‘flat major’, that is, Latin for ‘hard’, and ‘scala’, ‘ascendendo’ and ‘descendendo’ allude to the erection and detumescence of the male sexual organ. Examples could be multiplied, but the point
has been made: Latin, in Kunst, is not the language of learning but comedy. It serves to expose pretension, to deflate ambition or to give bawdy puns an air of (mock) respectability. It usually suggests pseudo-learning. That said, there is nothing pseudo-learned about the play’s implied audience or readership which should be educated enough to appreciate the comic function of these Latin passages. Kunst might share this feature with a play like Love’s Labour’s Lost, but does not share it with The Shrew. The place of Latin in the play, in other words, is another feature through which the German play distinctly emancipates itself from the language of The Shrew.

In terms of stage action, by contrast, Kunst stays closer to The Shrew and usually follows the English play in the passages they share. For instance, both Katherina and Catharina, in Act 2, Scene 1, strike Bianca/Sabina (TS, 2.1.22 SD / 2.1.10 SD), and while Petruccio ‘pulls [Grumio] back and forth by the ears’ (1.3.15 SD), Hardman similarly ‘wrings [Wormfire] by the ears’ (TS, 1.2.17 SD). At other moments, however, the German play is more specific in what it records in stage directions. In particular, several characters who simply enter in The Shrew do so in Kunst in ways that are specified. So when Fabian enters and discovers that Hilarius and Felix have swapped clothes, he ‘Looks at both in dismay’ (1.2.12 SD; cf. TS, 1.1.219 SD). Alfons, when Hardman and Wormfire have arrived at his house, enters ‘hastily’ (1.3.22 SD; cf. TS, 1.2.19 SD). Felix, upon discovering his master’s father, is ‘all aghast’, and Adrian, seeing Felix in his son’s clothes, looks ‘shocked’ (4.4.143–4; cf. TS, 5.1.57–8). Such additional information can often be derived from the dialogue text, as when Hardman arrives before his wedding ‘strangely dressed’ (3.2.85 SD; cf. TS, 3.2.83 SD) or when Sebastian, after the same wedding, enters ‘laughing’ (3.2.176 SD; cf. TS, 3.2.147 SD), but these directions may well have been added for the benefit of readers who are thus allowed to apprehend the information at the same time as spectators would, rather than belatedly, through the dialogue.
Of particular interest are passages in which *Kunst* clarifies stage business that may – but does not have to – be implicit in *The Shrew*. During the forced engagement in Act 2, Scene 1, for instance, stage directions in *Kunst* clearly indicate that Hardman first ‘extends his hand to [Catharina]’ and then ‘takes her hand and presses it into his’ (2.1.543 SD, 546 SD). Petruccio encourages Katherina – ‘Give me thy hand’ (*TS*, 2.1.318) – but what stage action follows these words is not made clear. Something similar may be observed when the couple departs after their wedding in Act 3, Scene 2. In *The Shrew*, since Katherina is unwilling to leave, Petruccio claims to defend her against the dangerous advances of her friends and family: ‘Grumio, / Draw forth thy weapon, we are beset with thieves; / Rescue they mistress, it thou be a man’; turning to Katherina, he pretends to reassure her: ‘Fear not, sweet wench, they shall not touch thee, Kate; / I’ll buckler thee against a million’, at which point an unspecific ‘Exeunt’ stage direction indicates that the couple leaves the stage (3.2.236–40), without clarifying how they do so. *Kunst*, by contrast, chooses to pinpoint the action: ‘He carries her out in his arms’ (3.2.328 SD). A similar instance is the conflict between the two tutors at the beginning of Act 3. In *The Shrew*, Lucentio calls Hortensio a ‘Preposterous ass’ (3.1.9) and provokes him by belittling the importance of music. Hortensio threateningly responds that he ‘will not bear these braves’ at which point Bianca interrupts them: ‘Why gentlemen, you do me double wrong / To strive for that which resteth in my choice’ (*TS*, 3.1.15–17). Is Hortensio’s threat followed by aggressive action, or does the conflict remain purely verbal? In *Kunst*, Hilarius responds to Alfons’ threat and ‘starts to beat him’, prompting Sabina’s intervention: ‘Hold, my lord. It’s strange that you should quarrel about what lies in my choice alone’ (3.1.19–20). In these cases, the German play spells out stage action that is left unclear in *The Shrew*, but is not incompatible with it.

In the passage dramatizing Hardman’s arrival at his house, *Kunst*’s stage directions indicate a whole series of actions
which *The Shrew* does not render explicit. In *The Shrew*, Petruchio objects to all his servants do and showers them with abuse, but the early editions add no stage directions concerning his physical treatment of them. As Barbara Hodgdon has pointed out, ‘Most modern editions, following Rowe, introduce SDs at 134 (“Strikes him”), 141 (“Strikes Servant”) and 154 (“He throws the food and dishes at them”), and ‘performances often incorporate such stage business’. Yet, as she adds, ‘the scene has also been played without some or all of the traditional physical action’ (Ard³, 248); her edition therefore refrains from adding stage directions to this passage. The early editions of *Kunst*, unlike *The Shrew*’s, are perfectly explicit in directing Hardman’s treatment of his servants. Shortly after their entrance, he first ‘strikes them’ (3.3.104 SD), and a short time later, ‘He strikes the [Second] Servant’ (3.3.127 SD) who tries to take off his boots. Another servant who has brought a bowl of water is beaten with the bowl itself (3.3.133 SD, 136 SD). Later in the scene, Hardman ‘beats’ a servant whom he accuses of spilling the broth, and shortly before the end of the sequence he also ‘strikes’ Wormfire (3.3.146 SD, 176 SD). Whereas the absence of stage directions in *The Shrew* leaves open the possibility that the abuse in the scene is purely verbal, *Kunst* has determined that it is also, and repeatedly, physical.

While the stage directions in *Kunst* are often similar to or at least compatible with *The Shrew*, there are passages where the German play adds stage business that has no equivalent in Shakespeare’s play. In the scene just discussed, Petruchio, amidst the abuse he hurls at his servants, turns to Katherina and bids her ‘welcome’ (4.1.128) to his house. Hardman also does so – ‘Be welcome, dearest darling’ (3.3.119) – but follows up on his words with a kiss: ‘He kisses her, while she stands still’ (3.3.119 SD). Similarly, after their wedding, and shortly before carrying her out in his arms, Hardman turns to Catharina and ‘kisses her’ before telling her, ‘You are my all, my nothing, my life and death depend on you’ (3.2.315–16). No kiss accompanies Petruccio’s
equivalent words, and they are addressed, significantly, not to Katherina, but to the other men: ‘She is my goods, my chattels . . . my anything’ (TS, 3.2.231–3). Another case in point is the conflict between the two sisters in Act 2, Scene 1. In Kunst, Catharina not only beats Sabina once, as Katherina does Bianca, but Catharina then ‘binds her hands’ (2.1.24 SD), after which she ‘beats her’ (2.1.28 SD) again, suggesting a degree of (partly playful?) violence absent from the sisters’ conflict in The Shrew. Beating and kissing are actions that are characteristic of comedy and, in particular, farce, and it seems significant that they figure prominently in Kunst. They contribute to stage action which the play scripts with greater frequency and precision than Shakespeare’s play, a difference that can inform alternative and additional ways of understanding the dynamics among characters.

To conclude, the linguistic, dramatic and structural changes of Kunst über alle Künste reveal an incisive reconsideration of The Taming of the Shrew. At a time when we have become all too familiar with Shakespeare’s play and the issues it raises, its seventeenth-century German adaptation offers untapped insights into the potential of the English comedy to signify anew when meeting a different cultural and yet still early modern context. Kunst allows us to witness complexities of intercultural exchange, in particular in its creative exploration of gender and social issues, adopting, adapting, omitting from, adding to and embracing the Shakespeare play it so aptly reconfigures.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW IN GERMAN IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The early history of The Taming of the Shrew is bound up with a similar play, The Taming of a Shrew, performed in c. 1592 and published in 1594 (Hodgdon, 12–14). Theories concerning the
relationship between the two plays include: one, that *A Shrew* is an early draft by Shakespeare; two, that it is an anonymous source play that Shakespeare adopted and elaborated; three, that it is an adaptation of Shakespeare’s play; and, four, that it is a memorial reconstruction that derives from and tries to record (a version of) Shakespeare’s play (Hodgdon, 20). Unlike *The Shrew*, *A Shrew* returns to Sly at the end of the play (as he awakens from his supposed dream) and thus treats as a frame what editions of *The Shrew* call an Induction. While *The Shrew*’s Katherina plot is close to *A Shrew* (in which the character is called ‘Kate’), the Bianca plot is not. *Kunst über alle Künste* clearly follows *The Shrew*, and we have found no evidence to suggest that its author may have been aware of *A Shrew*.

*The Taming of the Shrew* is assumed to have been written in or around 1591 (Taylor and Loughnane, 499–503). It first reached print in the First Folio of 1623, followed by a quarto reprint in 1631. It is unknown how the text found its way abroad. Its first appearance on the Continent is recorded in the Netherlands: a Dutch version of *The Shrew*, *De Dolle Bruyloft* (‘The Mad Wedding’), was performed in 1654 at the Amsterdam Theatre and published the same year (Wiggins, 3.159; Hoenselaars and van Dijkhuizen, 55; Nassau-Sarolea, 44). The translator-adaptor, Abraham Sybant (c. 1620–60), was associated with several Anglo-Dutch companies of itinerant

---

1  For a close analysis of the relationship between *The Shrew* and *A Shrew*, see Miller, 12–31, 127–43.

2  It has been argued that the Sly material in *The Shrew* and *A Shrew* received separate adaptations in two mid-seventeenth-century Dutch farces, the anonymous *Pots van Kees Krollen, hertogh van Pierlepom* (‘Farce of Kees Krollen, Duke of Neverland’, Leiden, 1649) and Melchior Fockens’ *Klucht van dronkken Hansje* (‘Farce of Hans the Drunkard’, Amsterdam, 1657) (Helmers). See also Gstach, 428–30.

3  The play received four performances in 1654 (9, 12, 16 and 19 November) and a total of three more in 1655 (4 February and 1656 (24 February, 7 August) (Wiggins, 3.158).
players, which may have given him access to texts from England (Hoenselaars and van Dijkhuizen, 55). Neither *De Dolle Bruyloft* nor *Kunst* refer to Shakespeare or an English original, but, while the title page of *Kunst* mentions no author and the play’s anonymous author acknowledges in a note the text’s status as a translation-adaptation (see below, pp. 140–1), it is Sybant’s name that is mentioned on the title-page of *De Dolle Bruyloft* and in three short celebratory verses preceding the play proper. The Dutch play is composed in rhyming hexameter couplets throughout. Unlike *Kunst*, Sybant generally retains the English names though he gives the servants Dutch names. Among these, he invents a female servant called Slobbetje for whom there is no precedent in the English. She has a brief speaking role at the beginning of Act 4, taking over a handful of lines from one of Petruccio’s servants. The brevity of her role means that Slobbetje does not qualify as the source on which *Kunst*’s Sybilla is based, although it is possible that the presence of a named female servant in *De Dolle Bruyloft* gave the author of *Kunst* the idea for the character.¹

Like *Kunst*, *De Dolle Bruyloft* slightly rearranges *The Shrew*’s act division and condenses parts of *The Shrew*’s first scene, notably Lucentio’s falling in love with Bianca. Unlike *Kunst*, however, the Dutch play omits the Widow and the wager in the last scene, nor does it include the Induction, or any other prologue. This has been taken to suggest that the English copy Sybant was working from – perhaps a copy of the 1631 quarto – may have been damaged at its two extremities (Nassau-Sarolea, 55), as easily happened to unbound quarto playbooks. Ton Hoenselaars and Jan Frans van Dijkhuizen have argued,

¹ Another possible hint of the acquaintance of *Kunst*’s author with *De Dolle Bruyloft* is the description in the List of Roles of Matz Trumper’s function as ‘well-established oven-raker and firekeeper’. Sybant amplifies Curtis’ name to Curtus Stookebrant, literally ‘the one that stokes the fire’, a detail the author of *Kunst* may have remembered.
however, that the text of *De Dolle Bruyloft* suggests a conscious and deliberate reworking of the entirety of Shakespeare’s play (56–7). What is clear, in any case, is that the author of *Kunst* did not work from *De Dolle Bruyloft* but from a text, no doubt a German text (see below, pp. 141–2), that was closer to Shakespeare’s, although it is possible that he was familiar with the Dutch version or a German derivation from it.¹

Although *Kunst* is the earliest text of a version of *The Shrew* in German, there are records of earlier performances that are likely to be related to Shakespeare’s play. We owe the earliest such record to Johann Christoph Gottsched, the leading German literary scholar of the mid-eighteenth century. Gottsched compiled an overview of German drama from 1450 to his time, *Nöthiger Vorrath zur Geschichte der deutschen Dramatischen Dichtkunst* (Leipzig, 1757), in which he mentions four plays that were performed ‘auf dem Zittauischen Schauplatze’, that is, in the theatre in the Saxon town of Zittau, from 5 to 7 March 1658. The fourth play is ‘Die wunderbare Heurath Petruvio, mit der bösen Catharine’ – ‘The Wonderful Wedding of Petruvio with the Bad Catharine’ (210).² ‘Petruvio’ might be assumed to be the result of a simple copying error, but the name’s reappearance in a later record (see below, p. 129) suggests that it is a conscious adaptation of the name in Shakespeare’s play. Gottsched derives his information about the performances from

¹ For *De Dolle Bruyloft*, see also Helmers, 125–8.
² The titles Gottsched gives for the other three plays are ‘Androfiolo oder göttliche Wunderliebe’, ‘Sylvia, oder wunderthätige Liebe’ and ‘Der klägliche Bezwang’. The first two were written by Sigmund von Birken and jointly published in 1656, *Androfiolo oder die Wunderliebe* and *Silvia oder die Wunderthätige Schönheit* (Lüneburg, 1656, VD17 23:284204W). The second is not known to survive, but it is likely to have been a translation of Lope de Vega’s *La fuerza lastimosa* (Köhler, xii), produced by Georg Greffinger, who announces a forthcoming play of his called ‘Der beklägliche Zwang’ (sig. *2v) in a preface to his translation of Pierre Corneille’s *Le Cid* (*Die Sinnreiche Tragi-Comoedia genannt Cid*, Hamburg, 1650, VD17 1:627142D). See also Gärtner, 135.
a now lost programme by Christian Keimann (1607–62), headmaster of the Zittau grammar school from 1638, suggesting that the performance was a school production (see Köhler, x).¹ Keimann is known to have produced plays from 1638, usually based on biblical material (Pescheck, 348). These included plays he translated and adapted, such as Samuel by Johann Förster (1646, originally published in Latin in 1604, VD17 39:139726E) and Susanna by Nicodemus Frischlin (1648, also originally published in Latin, VD17 7:710222Q) as well as plays he wrote himself, notably Junger Tobias (Freiberg, 1641, VD17 3:308439H) and Der neugebohrne Jesus, den Hirten und Weisen offenbahret (Görlitz, 1646, VD17 23:236006T).² Keimann was crowned poet laureate, ‘Poeta Laureatus Caesareus’, in 1651 (Flood, 973–8; see above, pp. 65–6). It is known that ‘englische Komödien’ had been publicly performed at the Zittau town hall by the ‘kurfürstlich sächsische Comödianten’ (‘Elector of Saxony’s Comedians’) from 14 to 25 July 1650 (Pescheck, 348). Perhaps this offered an opportunity for Keimann to see plays of English origin or even to secure texts of some of them.³

Keimann’s 1658 programme is lost, but a later programme made for a production in 1678 probably gives us information about the play that was performed under Keimann. The programme is for a school production in Görlitz, some twenty miles from Zittau, overseen by the headmaster Christian Funcke (1626–95).⁴ Its title page mentions two plays that were to be performed ‘auff öffentlicher Schau-Bühne zu einer nützlichen und erbaulichen Schul-Ubung’ (‘on a public stage as a useful

¹ Gstach’s mention of further Zittau performances of the play in 1661 (523) relies on a misunderstanding of a confusing footnote in Köhler (x–xi). See also Junkers, 249.
² The last of these plays has received a modern reprint (Markus).
³ For Keimann, see also Kühlmann, 340–1.
⁴ The programme is extant at the Oberlausitzische Bibliothek der Wissenschaften in Görlitz (call number Mil. II/131.60). It has been digitized and can be accessed at http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id1667619160.
The first is Christoph Kormart’s *Polyeuctus*, a translation of Pierre Corneille’s *Polyeucte*, published in Leipzig in 1669 (VD17 23:239720M). *Polyeuct* was to be performed, the programme continues, ‘nebst der Wunderbahnen Heyrath PETRUVIO mit der bösen KATHARINEN’ (‘alongside the Wonderful Wedding of Petruvio with the Bad Catharine’) (sig. A1r). The fact that the title is the same as that of the Zittau production of 1658 and includes the surprising spelling ‘Petruvio’ offers strong evidence that the two plays were identical.

The 1678 programme contains no information about the contents of the plays, but, as well as giving the dates of the performances (20 and 21 October), it includes a list of roles with the names of the actors (sig. A2v).¹ The character names in the list suggest considerable proximity to Shakespeare’s play: ‘Baptista Minola’, ‘Catharina, Baptistae älteste Tochter’ (‘Catharina, Baptista’s oldest daughter’), ‘Bianka, Baptistae jüngste Tochter’ (‘Bianka, Baptista’s youngest daughter’), ‘Lucentio, ein junger Edelmann von Pisa’ (‘Lucentio, a young gentleman of Pisa’), ‘Petruvio, Edelmann von Verona, der Catharinen Liebhaber’ (‘Petruvio, gentleman of Verona, suitor to Catharina’), ‘Hortensio, ein Junger Edelmann in Padua’ (‘Hortensio, a young gentleman in Padua’), ‘Vincentio, Lucentii Vater’ (‘Vincentio, Lucentio’s father’), ‘Vermummeter Vincentio’ (‘disguised Vincentio’), ‘Grumio, alter Bürger zu Padua’ (‘Grumio, old citizen of Padua’), ‘Die Wittib’ (‘the widow’), ‘Curtas, Petruvii Diener’ (‘Curtas, Petruvio’s servant’), ‘Tranio, Lucentii Diener’ (‘Tranio, Lucentio’s servant’), ‘Bondello, Lucentii ander Diener’ (‘Bondello, Lucentio’s other servant’), ‘Grumio, Petruvii Diener’ (‘Grumio, Petruvio’s servant’), ‘Martinus, Baptistae Kammer-Diener’

¹ The address to the reader, which concludes the programme (sigs A3r–A4v), contains no information about the *Shrew* production. It is signed by ‘Joh. He[i]nrich Oder, von Torau auß Nieder-Laußnitz’ and dated 19 October 1678 (sig. A4v).
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(‘Martinus, Baptista’s valet’), and ‘Der Schneider’ (‘the tailor’). We note the occasional departure in spelling, not only ‘Petruvio’ for ‘Petruccio’ (or ‘Petruchio’), but also ‘Grumio’ for ‘Gremio’ (no doubt an error given the recurrence of ‘Grumio’ later in the list), ‘Curtas’ for ‘Curtis’ and ‘Bondello’ for ‘Biondello’. On the whole, however, the names are close to Shakespeare’s. The list excludes the smallest parts, such as attendants and some of the servants. It also excludes the haberdasher, as does Kunst, perhaps an unsurprising omission given that his role is easily omitted or conflated with the tailor’s. On the other hand, it adds ‘Martinus, Baptista’s Kammer-Diener’ (‘Martinus, Baptista’s valet’), probably the name given to Baptista’s servant who, in Shakespeare’s play, speaks three lines to Bianca to interrupt the music lesson (see below, p. 131). The list further shows that the Sly material was omitted and replaced by a ‘Vorredner’ (‘Prologue’), again as in Kunst. Unlike Kunst, the play also had an epilogue, or even two, by a ‘Schluss-Redner’ (‘Epilogue’) and an ‘Allgemeiner Schluss-Redner’ (‘General Epilogue’).

The list of roles in the Grömitz programme of 1678 shows in fact a number of parallels to the list of roles (called ‘Personaadjen’, sig. A2v) in Sybant’s De Dolle Bruyloft. The spelling of ‘Catharina’ and ‘Bianka’ is identical and slightly differs from the spelling in The Shrew. The descriptions in the programme of Lucentio as ‘ein junger Edelmann von Pisa’ (‘a young gentleman of Pisa’), of Hortensio as ‘ein junger Edelmann in Padua’ (‘a young gentleman in Padua’), of Petruvio as an ‘Edelmann von Verona’ (‘a gentleman of Verona’) and of Gremio as an ‘alter Bürger zu Padua’ (‘old citizen of Padua’) largely correspond to those of the same characters in Sybant, where Lucentio is an ‘Edelman van Piza’

1  Nicholas Rowe’s 1709 edition of Shakespeare’s plays is the first English edition of The Shrew that contains a list of roles.
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(‘gentleman of Pisa’), Hortensio an ‘Edelman te Padua’ (‘gentleman in Padua’), Petrutio (note the spelling) an ‘Edelman van Verona’ (‘a gentleman of Verona’) and Gremio a ‘Burger tot Padua’ (‘citizen of Padua’). Moreover, Lucentio’s fake father is ‘Vermummeter Vincentio’ in the programme and ‘gemomde Vincentio’ in Sybant, both meaning ‘disguised Vincentio’. Most compellingly, not only the programme but also Sybant give a name to Baptista’s unnamed servant in Act 3, Scene 1 of The Shrew, which is virtually the same: ‘Martinus, Baptistae Kammer-Diener’ in the programme and ‘Martijn, Dienaar van Babtista’ in Sybant. The evidence need not suggest that the play performed in Görlitz in 1678 (and, by extension, also the play performed in Zittau in 1658) are wholly derived from De Dolle Bruyloft. Indeed, the widow is absent from Sybant’s play and list of roles, whereas she is mentioned in the 1678 programme, a clear indication that whoever produced the Zittau/Görlitz play knew The Shrew and not just De Dolle Bruyloft. Nor does the programme mention some of the other named characters in Sybant’s play, notably ‘Claas Slikom’, ‘Keen Partinentie’, ‘Pieter Zuykerzop’ and ‘Slobbetje’ (Petrutio’s servants). What can be said at the very least, though, is that some of the designations in the list of roles in the 1678 programme go back to the list of roles in Sybant’s play. The

1 Martijn is not named in Sybant’s play beyond the list of roles. The characters appear in the list of roles in the order of their appearance, and the location in which ‘Martijn’ occurs in the list makes it clear that the name must designate Baptista’s servant who, in Shakespeare, interrupts the music lesson to tell Bianca, ‘Mistress, your father prays you leave your books / And help to dress your sister’s chamber up; / You know tomorrow is the wedding day’ (TS, 3.1.80–2). In Sybant, an unnamed ‘Dienaar’ appears at the same moment and speaks the equivalent of the first two of the three lines in The Shrew (Dolle, sig. B8v). The point is worth making since the existence of a named servant of Baptista’s in Sybant and the 1678 programme might otherwise wrongly suggest that Theobald’s servant Veit, one of Kunst’s fairly prominent additions to The Shrew, originated in Sybant’s play or in the version performed in Zittau in 1658.
other conclusion that can be drawn is that, judging by the programme of 1678, the Zittau performance of 1658 was of a German version of The Shrew that stayed reasonably close to Shakespeare’s play.¹ That Kunst derived from it, however, as Bolte (‘Schulkomödie’, 128) believed, is not made clear by the extant evidence.

On 3 March 1663, the Saxon court of Dresden saw the performance of a ‘Komödie’, called ‘Amphitrione’, and several ‘Possenspiele’ (farces), including ‘die erste tolle Hochzeit, die andere tolle Hochzeit’ (‘the first mad wedding, the other mad wedding’) (Fürstenau, 215–16). This raises several questions: is one farce here referred to or two? The title of Sybant’s version of The Shrew is De Dolle Bruyloft, that is, ‘The Mad Wedding’, so was the Dresden performance (or were the Dresden performances) related to the Dutch play? What is implied by the generic designation ‘Possenspiele’ (as opposed to ‘Komödie’)? The difference may be partly one of length, a ‘Komödie’ being the main performance at an entertainment, with a ‘Possenspiel’ serving as an afterpiece, as was sometimes the case. If so, is it possible that De Dolle Bruyloft was adapted to serve as two ‘Possenspiele’ (perhaps for performance on subsequent days), the first leading up to Petruchio and Katharina’s wedding, the second focusing on Lucentio and Bianca’s? The evidence is too inconclusive to allow for clear-cut answers.

What increases the likelihood that the 1663 record is of a two-part play is a performance of ‘der erste und zweite Theil “von der bösen Katharina”’ (‘the first and second parts of “Bad Katharine”’) (Fürstenau, 251–2) among several other comedies at the Saxon court of Dresden in May 1678. Another play

¹ Bolte (‘Schulkomödie’, 125–8) did not notice the connections between Sybant’s play and the 1678 programme and therefore argued that the Zittau ‘Wonderful Wedding’ of 1658 and De Dolle Bruyloft derived from Shakespeare’s play independently.
performed in early 1678 was ‘die Komödie “von Amphitryone”’ (Fürstenau, 251), which may suggest that this and the two-part play may have belonged to the same repertory both in 1663 and in 1678. The later performances were by a company led by Johannes Velten, and, indeed, a repertory list of Velten’s company of 1679 includes ‘Die böse Catharina’ (‘Wicked Catharina’), although the list makes no mention of its being a two-part play (Gstach, 651).

Other records that can confidently be associated with a German version of Shakespeare’s Shrew date from 1667. A company led by Johann Ernst Hoffmann and Peter Schwartz, the ‘Churfälzische Compagnie Comoedianten’ (‘Elector Palatine Company of Comedians’), performed at the court of Charles Louis, Elector Palatine (1617–80), in the spring of that year. A list of their repertory has survived, listing fifteen plays, including ‘Die tolle Hochzeit von der böß Katharina’ (‘The Mad Wedding of Wicked Katharina’) (Gstach, 646). They were back at the Mannheim court in December of the same year, when they are known to have performed several plays from their repertory, including ‘Die tolle Hochzeit von der böß Katharina’ on 20 December (Gstach, 647). It is notable that the title of the play performed in 1667 by the Elector Palatine’s Company of Comedians includes an element of the title of the 1663 ‘Possenspiele’, namely ‘tolle Hochzeit’, but also anticipates the title of the play in the 1679 list of Velten’s company, ‘Die böse Catharina’. Another record of a performance prior to the publication of Kunst in 1672 dates from 6 July 1668, when the prolific German poet Sigmund von Birken, who lived in Nuremberg, noted in his diary that he had seen a performance of the ‘Comoedie von der bösen aber frommgemachten Br[aut]’ (‘Comedy of the Bad Bride who was Made Pious’), quite possibly another reference to a German

---

1 For Hoffmann and Schwartz’s company connections, see Rudin, ‘“Zwei Mal”’. 
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version of Shakespeare’s play (Kröll, 1.381; Gstach, 523). The performance record is patchy and the relationship of the different titles ultimately inconclusive, but what seems clear is that in the years prior to the writing of Kunst, a German version of The Shrew could be witnessed in various theatres.

Kunst über alle Künste appeared in 1672, probably in Frankfurt (see below, pp. 147–9). Whether it was ever performed and if so, where, is not known. It would have required at least fifteen actors, a reasonably large cast (see the Appendix). Little can be inferred from the stage directions about any implied performance space, as most characters are simply said to enter and exit. When Hilarius’ real father, Adrian, meets the fake father, Blasius, the latter appears at a ‘window’ (4.4.101 SD), like the Merchant in The Shrew (5.1.14 SD), but Blasius later simply runs out, not down, to the main stage (see 4.4.132 SD and note), which may imply that no second level ‘above’ is involved. There is one stage direction, however, that might suggest that Kunst’s author imagined performance in a fairly specific theatrical space. Early in Act 4, Scene 1, Sabina enters and ‘sits down at a table on the inner stage’ (4.1.8 SD, ‘setzet sich bey einen Tisch in der inneren Scene’). At the equivalent moment in The Shrew (4.2.5 SD), Bianca simply enters, and no inner stage is mentioned or implied. Inner stages are referred to in a number of contemporary German plays (see the note to 4.1.8 SD), and it has been suggested that their usage may ‘derive from the practice of English companies touring in Germany’ (Brandt and Hogendoorn, 34). Kunst’s anonymous author relates in an address to the reader that he had seen the play from which he adapted his Kunst (see below, p. 141) in the theatre, so it is possible that Sabina’s appearance on the inner stage corresponds to what he had seen performed.

The documentary record of the seventeenth-century German reception of The Taming of the Shrew starts in the town of Zittau, and ends there, too, with Christian Weise’s play Die böse Catharina (‘Bad Catharina’). Weise (1642–1708) was
headmaster of the Zittau grammar school from 1678 to 1708, as Keimann had been from 1638 to 1662. Formerly a pupil of Keimann’s in this same school, Weise had probably witnessed and may even have acted in the 1658 ‘wunderbare Heurath’, and so may have returned to the material later in his life. Weise’s output was vast: apart from poetry and satirical novels, he wrote some sixty plays for performance by his pupils of which about two-thirds have come down to us (Watanabe-O’Kelly, ‘Early Modern’, 136–8). Die böse Catharina was not printed but survived thanks to two manuscripts which are now at the Christian-Weise-Library in Zittau (call numbers 4° Mscr. 47 (B) (1) and 4° Mscr. 50a (B); see Keller et al., 648–50). The play is dated between 1689 and 1702 by Ludwig Fulda (lxxiv), its first modern editor (Fulda, 103–272). 1 Fulda (lxxii) speculates that the unnamed comedy performed in Zittau on 28 October 1693 in honour of the Elector of Saxony, John George IV, may have been Weise’s Böse Catharina, but there is no evidence to confirm this. The play follows the basic outline of Shakespeare’s play but significantly departs from it by adding subsidiary plot strands and characters. It has none of the dramatic intensity and verbal wit of Kunst. Weise replaced most of Shakespeare’s names with German equivalents, except for Baptista, Bianca and Catharina. It is noteworthy that the Petruccio character is called Harmen, which closely resembles Kunst’s Hardman, suggesting that Weise was familiar with Kunst über alle Künste.

The first faithful translation of Shakespeare’s Taming of the Shrew, by Johann Joachim Eschenburg, appeared in 1775, and its title testifies to Kunst’s legacy more than a century after its publication. Die Kunst eine Widerbellerin zu zähmen (‘The Art of Taming a Back-Barking Woman’) adopts the first key word of the title of the seventeenth-century adaptation by

1 For a more recent but unannotated reprint, see Roloff and Kura. As Fulda shows (lxxi), Köhler’s suggested date, 1705 (xiii), relies on a misunderstanding.
conceptualizing the taming as an art (Eschenburg, 147). The Schlegel-Eschenburg translation (1810–12, 18 vols) essentially reprinted Eschenburg’s text but changed the title to Zähmung eines bösen Weibes (1811, vol. 14, p. 1). While the new title eliminated the word ‘Kunst’, it introduced part of the subtitle of the seventeenth-century adaptation: ein bö s Weib gut zu machen (‘to Make a Bad Wife Good’). The title in the famous Schlegel-Tieck translation (vol. 6, 1831), Der Widerspenstigen Zähmung, still current today, finally eliminated any echo of the title of Kunst and no doubt accelerated the play’s descent into the oblivion from which the present edition aims to raise it up.

TEXTUAL INTRODUCTION

The early editions and their contexts: publication, paratext and authorship

Kunst über alle Künste was published in duodecimo format in 1672. The title page of the first edition (see p. 150) reads:


1 Eschenburg mentions Kunst in the appendix to his translation and quotes from it extensively (397–409).
2 For a list of translations of The Shrew, see Blinn and Schmidt, 219–22.
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The English translation reads:

An Art beyond All Arts, to Make a Bad Wife Good, formerly composed by an Italian knight, but now happily imitated by a German gentleman and presented in a very amusing comedy full of merriment. With an appended singing-jig, in which the unnecessary jealousy of a husband is prettily deceived. Rapperschweyl, at Henning Liebler’s, 1672.¹

The printed title page, with which some extant copies start, appears in fact on sig. A2r, and it was originally preceded by an engraved title page, which was pasted onto the otherwise blank sig. A1r, of which some copies are extant (see below, pp. 156–7). At the top of the copper engraving, the following title appears: ‘Kunst über alle Kunst, Ein bosweib [sic] / guth Zu machen’. Below it, the background shows a house on a cliff and windy clouds. In the foreground there is a woman to the left with snake hair and bare breasts, who is being tickled in the mouth with a fox tail by a man who stands to the right with his back to the viewer. He has thrown the noose in his left hand around her neck, and holds a club in his right hand. With his left foot, the man stands in a circle on a checkerboard floor made of a Latin inscription in capital letters: ‘In verbis et herbis et lapidibus magna consistit virtus’ – ‘there is great power in words, herbs and stones’.

The engraving shown in Fig. 6 depicts a scene of the taming of a fury-like female by a well-dressed male; its relationship to the play is clear. The relevance of the Latin inscription, however, is not immediately obvious. It derives – as does the second half of the play’s title, ‘ein bös Weib gut zu machen’ (‘to Make a Bad Wife Good’) – from a Shrovetide play by Hans Sachs, printed

¹ The final ‘n’ in ‘Lieblern’ is a dative flexion.
in the third volume of his works, *Das dritte Buch. Sehr Herrliche Schöne Tragedi, Comedi vnd schimpff-Spił, Geistlich vnd Weltlich* (Nuremberg, 1588, VD16 S 151; ‘The Third Book: Very Delightful, Beautiful Tragedies, Comedies and Farces, Religious and Secular’): *Das böß Weib mit den Worten, Würtzen, vnd Stein gut zu machen* (sigs 3 H6r–I2v; ‘To Make a Bad Wife Good with Words, Herbs and Stones’). In Sachs’s play, a man complains to his neighbour about his bad wife, who remembers the advice King Solomon gave to someone who had the same complaint, namely to use the wholesome effect of words, herbs and precious stones to cure her. The man tries all three, to no effect, before throwing stones at her until she drops to her knees and swears to improve.

At the end of the duodecimo volume appears a twelve-line poem called ‘Erklärung dess Kupffer-Tittels’ (sig. K12r), ‘Explanation of the Copper-Title’.

To rule a woman you must use your *status ratio*
Act like a man who plays a flute and let the notes you blow
Be sometimes harsh and rough and coarse, then soft and sweet-refined,
You must see everything, and yet with open eyes be blind.
Your ears too must be firmly closed and yet hear every sound.
Then, *hocus pocus*, change your tactics when the time comes round.
Mix bad words with the good ones if you want your bride to dance;
With Hercules’ Club and Reynard’s tail you’ll stand a better chance.
Outside you’d take me for a fool, within I’m shrewd and smart;
My noose is ready; club and tail are poised to play their part
In catching this bad cat at last. You bet they’ll serve
my turn;
If you seek wit and daring, this is the place to learn.¹

The German poem is in octameters, whereas the English
translation, produced for us by Anthony Mortimer, is in
fourteeners. The translation is not literal, but it conveys the
sense and manner of the original. It provides a kind of Epilogue
to the play from the position of the male tamer figure and, like
the Prologue, comments on its ability to teach readers the ability
to apply its insights.

The play’s anonymous author (‘a German gentleman’
according to the title page) seems to have assumed that the play
was of Italian origins (‘by an Italian knight’), probably for the
simple reason that the setting and the names in Shakespeare’s
play are Italian.² This is suggested by an address to the reader,
printed after the end of the play, in which the anonymous
author’s voice is clearly audible:

Favourable reader, I can say of this comedy that it is
someone else’s, but also my own. It is someone else’s,
not only because it was often performed in the theatre
by comedians, but also because it is an invention whose

¹ The original reads:
Jst auch wohl in einem ding Status ratio von nöthen
So ist es im Weiber-Zwang: Man muß wunderlich die Flöthen
anzusetzen und zu blasen wissen, bald starck, bald gelind,
grob und rein: bald muß man sehen, bald mit ofnen Augen blind
Gleichsam seyn: Das Ohr muß nicht hören, und doch alles hören:
Man muß, hocus pocus gleich, alles nach der Zeit umkehren
Gute Wort mit bösen mischen, Herkuls Keul’ und Reinckens Sch[w]antz,
so man gantz polit gebrauchet, führen offt die Braut zum Tanz.
Aussen Narr, von innen klug, steh’ ich jetzt im Zirck umkreiset
Meine Schlinck’ ist zugericht, Keul’ und Schwäntzchen sich auch weiset,
meine böse Katz zu fangen. Was gilts, es gelinget mir,
Wer Witz und auch Kühnheit heget, folge nach und lerne hier.

² Given the reference to a ‘gentleman’, we assume that Kunst was written by a man,
but the author’s anonymity means that it is impossible to be certain.
old names and ways of speaking indicate to those who have already seen and heard it that it is of Italian origin. I can call it mine because, in view of its pleasant manner, I have recomposed it, altering and writing what I liked, with quick inventions that easily came to me. The jig is known to anyone who knows actors, and is attached as a coda, according to current fashion. Enjoy yourself with it, as I enjoyed myself in watching it, and fare well until things get better.1

(For the appended jig, see below, p. 144.) This address answers some questions, but raises others. The play which formed the basis of the anonymous author’s adaptation had been frequently performed, in German, and had been witnessed in performance by the author. But where the play was performed and by whom remain obscure. The process of adaptation seems to have involved both copying and original composition, but the details of this process are not clarified. It may well be that the version the author witnessed in performance was essentially a German translation of Shakespeare’s *Taming of the Shrew*, but just how close the translation was to the original and how often the author

1 The original reads:
Gunstgeneigter Leser.

(sigs I12v–K1r)

The word ‘Schauplatz’ could refer to any theatre. There is no reason to believe, pace Gstach (522), that there is any reference to the theatre in Zittau.
of Kunst simply followed it are unclear. Nor do we know anything about the process of textual transmission: did the author of Kunst have access to a manuscript, perhaps thanks to the actors who performed the play, as has been assumed by Ellinger (267)? Or did the author work from a (now lost) printed text, as conjectured by Bolte (‘Schulkomödie’, 124–7)? Or might another form of transmission, such as shorthand, have been involved?

Little is known about the anonymous author, but we do know that he can be credited with two other playbooks. One of them contains another address to the reader which also comments on Kunst:

To this and the preceding jig, esteemed reader, the same applies as to Kunst über alle Künste, ein bös Weib gut zu machen: I saw them performed by actors in the theatre, preserved them because of their pleasantness, and have written them down for your useful amusement, as they please me according to my judgement. I see no point in racking my brain over new inventions, and thereby losing time that is better spent on something else, and so here only inventis addo [add inventions]. Whoever else has seen or heard them will notice the difference between the old and the new, and will profitably recognize that, with such grotesquery, I show the world and its vanity (whose change and improvement I, and all of us, heartily desire).  

The anonymous author thus on at least two occasions adapted dramatic texts of plays or jigs he had seen in the theatre, but the precise nature of the adaptive process remains obscure. A lot depends on what the author means when writing that he ‘preserved’ (in German, ‘behalten’) the playtexts. It may imply that he got his hands on manuscripts which provided the texts he adapted, but in the absence of further evidence, it is impossible to be certain.

The author of Kunst addresses his readers in each of his playbooks, but he consistently refrains from revealing his identity. In one of them, he makes a point of commenting on his deliberate anonymity: ‘The reader has no need to know my name, for it does not matter whether a kitten be called Mignon, Weinzchen, Heinz, Murner, Novazemblisch or Australisch, provided it catches mice.’ While his name thus remains unknown, it can be gathered from linguistic features in his plays that he was probably from Hesse or an adjacent part of Germany (see Köhler, xxv–xxvi; Bolte, ‘Görlitzer Schulkomödie’, 128; Ellinger, 267). His writings also reveal considerable learning, and show that he was steeped in German literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century (Ellinger, 267; Scheitler, 1056–7).

In keeping with the author’s deliberate anonymity is the fake imprint at the bottom of the title page: ‘Rapperschweyl, at Henning Liebler’s, 1672’. No information about a printer or bookseller called Henning Liebler has come down to us, and no printing press is known to have existed in the Swiss town of Rapperswil (to which ‘Rapperschweyl’ seems to refer), nor is there a plausible connection to the Alsacian town Rappoltsweiler. As we shall see below, the place of publication was probably Frankfurt.

A version of the same fake imprint was used for the anonymous author’s other dramatic publications. In the year after Kunst, Der Pedantische Irrthum des überwitzigen doch sehr betrogenen Schulfuchs(es) (The Pedantic Error of the would-be clever but much deceived Schoolfox) was published in duodecimo: a satirical play in three acts about bad, pedantic schoolmasters (see Ellinger, 268–74). The imprint reads, ‘Rappersweil, Bey Henning Lieblern, Im Jahr 1673’ (VD17 23:252481T). This was followed two years later by Alamodisch Technologisches Interim (Fashionable Technological Interim), also in duodecimo, a satirical three-act play about clerical abuse and hypocrisy (see Ellinger, 274–8), with an analogous imprint: ‘Rappersweil, Bey Henning Lieblern. Im Jahr 1675’ (VD17 23:235914D). Many of the characters in Irrthum reappear in Alamodisch, and a minor character in Alamodisch is ‘Blasius Nasenweis . . . Rector paganus’ (sig. A4r), who also appears in Kunst as the character who corresponds to the Merchant, that is, Lucentio’s fake father, in The Taming of the Shrew. Stylistically, the three plays are closely related, characterized by the same rough, often bawdy and typically proverbial or proverbial-sounding language, although the plots of Irrthum and Alamodisch, unlike that of Kunst, recede for much of the time behind dialogues whose relevance to the plot is tangential.

Each of the three plays is followed by a jig, reflecting the performance practice of (or in the tradition of) the itinerant English players (Ellinger, 278). The play appended to Kunst (sigs K1r–11r) is called Singendes Possenspiel Die doppelt betrogene Eyfersucht vorstellend (Singing Jig Presenting Doubly Deceived Jealousy). Fearing to be made a cuckold, Pickelherring, before leaving on a journey, tells his wife to say ‘no’ to all wooers. She turns away the first two accordingly, but the third, the ‘Kavalier’, cleverly asks her whether she would turn down his presents, to which she responds ‘no’ and gives herself up to him. Different printed versions of this jig survive in German, Dutch and Swedish (Wiggins, ‘Jig of a Miller’,
vol. 4, pp. 6–7). The jig appended to *Irrthum* (signs L11r–N11r) is *Die seltzame Metamorphosis der Sutorischen in eine Magistrale Person* (*The Strange Metamorphosis of a Shoemaker into a Teacher*). Its central character is good-for-nothing Jan Pint who escapes from his shoemaker’s apprenticeship, marries a prostitute and, despite his ineptness, is offered a position as a teacher by a headmaster who is interested in seducing his wife (in which he succeeds). The jig appended to *Alamodisch* (signs 2B7r–2E4v), finally, is *Der viesierliche Exorcist* (*The Peculiar Exorcist*). It deals with an adulterous relationship that is witnessed by a friar who, upon the cuckolded husband’s return, pretends the lover is a devil using a would-be exorcism to allow him to escape. Versions of this material are well known (Ellinger, 284–6), including one from the fifteenth-century comic poem *The Friars of Berwick.*¹

Apart from the three closely-related playbooks of 1672, 1673 and 1675, only one other publication is known to have a similar imprint, and it contains what we believe is a false lead concerning the author’s identity. *Donum nundinale oder Meß-Gaabe; allerhand merkwürdige Lähren, Fragen u. scharfsinnige Beantwortungen* (*Donum Nundiale, or Fair Stuff: All Kinds of Strange Instructions, Questions and Shrewd Replies*) appeared in 1673, also in duodecimo, and was, according to the imprint, ‘Gedruckt zu’, that is, printed at, ‘Rapperschweyl, bey Henning Lieblem [sic]’ (VD17 1:642505G). ‘Lieblem’ is clearly a misprint for ‘Lieblern’, and ‘Rapperschweyl’ is identical in spelling with the place name in the imprint of *Kunst.* *Donum nundinale* is not a play but a collection of anecdotes about ancient and more recent historical figures in which Socrates and Xanthippe – who feature prominently in the Prologue to *Kunst* – make several appearances (e.g., signs A10r–v, B9r). The straightforward prose of *Donum nundinale* differs stylistically

¹ For the three jigs, see Bolte, *Singspiele*, 110–37.
from the rougher style of the plays, but we do not think that the differences are such that they preclude common authorship. Also, linguistic features and geographical references in Donum nundinale point to the author’s origins in or near Hesse, as is the case with Kunst and the other two anonymous plays (Bolte, ‘Schulkomödie’, 129). This along with the fake imprint suggest that the author of Donum nundinale may well be the author of Kunst.

Unlike the three plays, Donum nundinale contains a pseudonymous authorship attribution on the title page – ‘Von dem Freygebigen’ – followed by the Greek letters mu, beta and chi. It is unclear what the Greek letters designate. ‘Von dem Freygebigen’, which might be translated as ‘by the generous one’ or ‘by the munificent one’, has been interpreted as a reference to the Count Ulrich von Kinsky, a member of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft (the Fruitbearing Society; Latin, societas fructifera), a German literary society, founded in Weimar in 1617, whose chief purpose it was to promote German as a literary and scholarly language (see Ball). Members adopted pseudonyms, among them Ulrich von Kinsky, who went under the name ‘der Freigebige’. He had joined the Society in 1658 and died in 1687, so he was alive and active in the first half of the 1670s when Kunst and the other ‘Rapperschweyl’ publications appeared. Based on the coincidence of the title-page reference to the ‘Freygebigen’ and von Kinsky’s pseudonym, VD 17, the standard short-title catalogue of seventeenth-century printed titles published in Germany, attributes Donum nundinale to von Kinsky. Yet there are good reasons to be sceptical about the attribution. Von Kinsky belonged to a distinguished Bohemian family that had been elevated to the rank of nobility in the early seventeenth

---

1 Bolte (‘Schulkomödie’, 129) reads the small initials on the duodecimo title page as ‘M. B. K.’, but after analysis with a magnifying glass, we think they are more likely to be the Greek letters mu, beta and chi.
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century. He occupied important positions in the Electorate of Saxony, and is known to have been the commander of the Königsstein Fortress near Dresden (Akademie). He was a member of the Saxony-Weimar branch of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft.\(^1\) Nothing connects him to Hesse or other western parts of Germany, and what is known about the dialectal features of the works with the fake ‘Rapperschweyl’ imprints is difficult to reconcile with the assumption that he wrote them. The ascription to the ‘Freigebeige’ on the title page of Donum nundinale is thus probably a false lead put in place by someone who was determined to preserve his anonymity.\(^2\) The author of Donum nundinale may well have written Kunst and the other anonymous plays, but it seems unlikely that the author is Ulrich von Kinsky. In the absence of further discoveries, it thus remains impossible to identify the author of the German adaptation of Shakespeare’s Taming of the Shrew.\(^3\)

The place of publication of Kunst has repeatedly been assumed to be Hamburg (Weller, 22–3; Hayn, 134, 138), and VD17 conjecturally agrees with this assumption (VD17 32:677848D). Thanks to a bibliographic accident, however, it can be shown that the place of publication was probably Frankfurt. Three copies (of which one is now lost; see below, pp. 157–8) of the second edition of Kunst feature a copper engraving which has no relationship to the play. It contains a

---

\(^1\) The Weimar archives of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, extant in three volumes at the Thüringische Hauptsstaatsarchiv Weimar (Kunst und Wissenschaft: Hofwesen 11817.1 and 2, and 11818), contains no document by or addressed to von Kinsky. We are grateful to Andreas Herz for this information.

\(^2\) There is one other German society of the seventeenth century whose members took on similar pseudonyms, the Deutschgesinnte Genossenschaft. The member directory published in volume 12 of the works of Philipp von Zesen suggests that this society had no member who used the pseudonym ‘der Freigebeige’ (van Ingen).

\(^3\) It should be noted that none of the playbooks with the ‘Rappersweil’ imprint is listed in any of the Frankfurt or Leipzig book fair catalogues; Donum nundinale, however, is mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogue of autumn 1672, as published by ‘Henning Lieblem’ (sig. B4v).
view across a gate onto an alley of poplars with a coach drawn by horses. Above the gate are a naked woman and a skeleton holding a wreath that surrounds the following text: ‘Die wieder kommende ANGELICA’ (‘the returning Angelica’; see Bolte, ‘Kunst’, 446). This is the title of a short anonymous novel, conjecturally dated c. 1680 on VD17 (23:665989F) but in fact mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogues in 1671 (Catalogus Spring 1671, sig. C3v; Catalogus Autumn 1671, sig. B3v). Two copies of Die wieder kommende Angelica, a slight duodecimo, are known to survive, and both contain the copper engraving.\(^1\) As has been pointed out, ‘The simple and probable explanation is that the Angelica novel and the Kunst über alle Künste were printed about the same time at the same print shop . . . Some careless workman confused the two copper plates’ (Jantz). The catalogues contain the following information about the publication of Die wieder kommende Angelica: ‘Frankfur[t] bey Joh. Hoffmann’ (Catalogus Spring 1671, sig. C3v) and ‘Franckfurt bey Jac. Gottfr. Seylern’ (Catalogus Autumn 1671, sig. B3v). Based on the evidence in the Leipzig book fair catalogues, it thus seems likely that Kunst (and thus probably also the other ‘Rapperschweyl’ publications) appeared in Frankfurt. This place of publication squares well with dialectal features in the anonymous publications (see above, p. 143). It may be added that Frankfurt is one of the rare place names mentioned in Kunst: in Act 2, Scene 1, Hardman intends to ‘travel to Frankfurt now, and buy the most gorgeous robes and jewels’ (1.2.469–70) for Catharina. All things considered, then, Frankfurt is a plausible place of publication for Kunst über alle Künste.

What complicates matters is that of the two publishers mentioned in the Leipzig book fair catalogues, only one, Jakob

\(^1\) Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, call number QuN 943 (2), and Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, call number Serin A/1613, the third item in a Sammelband.
Gottried Seyler, can be associated with Frankfurt. Johann Hoffmann, a known publisher whose activities have been thoroughly researched and documented (see Deneke; and Benzing, 1173), was in fact based in Nuremberg. In the *Catalogus* of spring 1671, three lines below Hoffmann’s mention as the publisher of *Angelica*, appears a title that is correctly said to have been published in ‘Nürnberg bey Johann. Hoffmann’ (sig. C3v). What is likely to have happened, then, is that the information regarding Hoffmann’s publication of *Angelica* is erroneous and resulted from eye-skip. The manuscript from which the spring book fair catalogue was printed probably mentioned Seyler as *Angelica*’s publisher, as the autumn catalogue did, but the compositor’s eye accidentally turned to Hoffmann’s name slightly further down in the list when setting the type.

Independently of what happened in the printing of the spring 1671 Leipzig book fair catalogue, there is no reason to doubt the information in the autumn catalogue according to which Jakob Gottfried Seyler was the publisher of *Angelica*. By extension, given the *Angelica* engraving, he is also likely to have been involved in the publication of *Kunst*. Seyler was active in Frankfurt as a publisher from 1667 until 1683 and is known to have published at least 129 titles there during that period (Benzing, 1268). Although he seems to have moved some of his business to Kassel in the course of the 1670s, he kept a bookshop in Frankfurt at least until 1678 (Paisey, 172). In the absence of information about the play’s author, he is the one and only person we can associate with some confidence with the origins of *Kunst*.

*The order of publication of the two editions of 1672*

There are two early duodecimo editions of *Kunst*, both dated ‘1672’. The title pages of the two editions are identical in text and font, and the layout is very similar. The easiest way of telling the title page of the first (see Fig. 7) from that of the
second (see Fig. 8) edition is that at the end of line nine, the slash (‘/’) that follows the word ‘nachgeahnet’ is followed by a blank space in the first edition, whereas it is not in the second where the bottom of the slash almost touches the lower part of the final ‘t’. Both editions have some misnumbered pages,
especially towards the end, and the last page number in what we will show below is the first edition (‘D1’ short for the first duodecimo edition; VD17 32:677848D) is ‘138’ (instead of ‘238’), whereas the last page number in the second edition (‘D2’; VD17 23:236440V and VD17 23:252479X) is ‘337’ (instead of ‘237’).
It is unclear from the title pages which is the earlier of the two editions, so bibliographic analysis is needed to establish the order. Typographic arrangement turns out to be an important source of information, since it points to one edition trying to replicate as far as possible the line breaks and page breaks of the other. On sig. A4r, for instance, the compositor of D2 falls slightly behind in line 3 (D1 ends with ‘An-’, for which D2 lacks space). In the next few lines, we see the compositor of D2 trying to catch up, or at least not fall behind further. In line 4, the last word is printed as a two-letter word (the second letter seems illegible), although the equivalent word in D1 is ‘daß’. There are various contractions in D2 (and none in D1), ‘eyerbissigê’ (line 6), ‘dē’ (line 9) and ‘gestochê’ (line 10). When it becomes apparent to D2’s compositor that his line breaks will be before D1’s despite the contractions, he seems to have stopped using contractions and resigned himself to using an extra line of type at the end of the page (D1 has twenty lines of text, not counting the catchword and the signature, whereas D2 has twenty-one). As he is approaching the end of the page, D2’s compositor has actually not fallen behind quite enough (i.e., not quite a whole line), which means he decides to waste space, as shown by the large spaces before and after ‘Hosen’ in the penultimate line. At the end of the last line, D2 has ‘an Beseeli-’. D1, however, only has ‘an’, with ‘Beseeli-’ following on the next line as the catchword. D2 fails to have a catchword on a separate line and, even more surprisingly, also omits the signature present in D1, ‘A jv’. The following page then starts identically, ‘Beseelingungsstatt’, D2 thus repeating not the catchword but the last word on the last line of text on the preceding page. All these oddities in D2 are clearly attempts to keep the printing process as simple as possible by making it a line-by-line or, when that fails, at least a page-by-page reprint of D1.

Something similar may be observed on sig. A4v. From the first line, we see D2’s compositor use a contraction, ‘vō’, to have the same line break as D1. The same happens in the next
line, with D2’s ‘welchē’. D2’s compositor nonetheless falls behind in line 6, which ends with ‘lassen/’ in D1, but with ‘las-’ in D2. But the difference remains small for much of the page, and a series of contractions close to the bottom of the page (‘vō’, ‘Jungē’, ‘ūn’ (for ‘und’) and ‘Dāck’) allows D2’s compositor to catch up with D1’s line breaks. D1, by contrast, uses no contractions, nor any extra-large spacing, suggesting that its compositor, unlike that of D2, is not trying to work to line and page breaks imposed by an earlier edition.

Similar evidence could be adduced from later in the book, but the important point has been made: recurrent space-wasting and space-saving devices in D2 and the absence of such devices in D1 show that D2 was set up from D1. D1 is thus the first of the two editions dated 1672; D2 the second.

D1 collates A-K12. Leaf A1 is blank, with the engraving pasted onto sig. A1r. The title page is on sig. A2r. After a blank verso follows the List of Roles (‘Personen dieses Freuden-Spiels’, sigs A3r–v) (see Fig. 9). The text of Kunst (sigs A4r–I12v; for a sample page, see Fig. 10) is directly followed by the address to the reader (‘Gunstgeneigter Leser’, sigs I12v–K1r) which is in turn directly followed by the jig, whose title appears at the bottom of sig. K1r, followed by a List of Roles (‘Personen dieses Possen-Spiels’) and a short argument in verse (‘Einhalt’), both on sig. K1v. The text of the jig (sigs K2r–K11v) is followed by the ‘Erklärung des Kupfer-Tittels’ (sig. K12r). The last page is blank (sig. K12v). Several pages are mis-signed: sigs B7r ‘Bvj’, H5r ‘Hiij’, K2r ‘Kiij’, K3r ‘Kij’ and K4r ‘Kv’. Sig. H4r is unsigned. Page numbers start on sig. A3r (‘5’), and, with the exception of ‘218’ lacking on sig. K1v, follow consecutively until ‘230’ (sig. K7v). The page number then jumps to ‘331’ (sig. K8r), then follows consecutively until ‘337’ (sig. K11r) and ends with ‘138’ (sig. K11v). There are no page numbers on leaf K12.

The make-up of D2 corresponds to that of D1, with a few exceptions. The text of the jig is made to fit on sigs K2r to K11r, with the ‘Erklärung des Kupfer-Tittels’ printed on sig. K12r.

Sig. B7r is mis-signed ‘Bvj’ and sig. H5r ‘Hiij’. Sigs A4r, E4r and H4r are unsigned, and, after K1r, the last sheet is entirely unsigned. Page numbers are at first identical with those in D1, except that 164 is misnumbered ‘184’. As in D1, ‘218’ is lacking on sig. K1v, and the numbering jumps from ‘331’
Hartmann. Ich scheue wohl wir sehn
hier mit Schelmene und Dieben besetzt/die
wollen uns den Pas sperren. Hilf deiner
Frau retten/mein treuer Diener/wosfern
du Herz im Leibe hast.

Bürmbrand. Das ist leider sehr
wenig.

Hartmann. Fürchte dich nicht mein
liebstes Kind/es soll dir keine Sache schade
den thun/du bist in meinem Schutz sicher
(Er trägt sie im Arm hinaus.)

Bürmbrand. Der Teufel dancke
meinem Herrn dass er so eine traurige
Hochzeit hält. Der Salage möchtest ihn be-
herbergen/hinterliefe er mich nur zum
Pfande hier. (Geber ab.)

Sabina Das ist mir ein tolles Wölk-
chen/es steht aber über aus übel/dass wir
zum wenigsten die Braut nicht sollten auff
der Hochzeit haben. Es wäre doch gut
wann man sie noch ausschielt.

Fel. Dieses halte ich nicht für gut/zu
dem würde sich auch sein eigensinniger
Kapff hicher nicht bändigen lassen.

Theobald. Wir müssen sie mit ein-

(sig. K8r) to ‘337’ (sig. K11r). Since the text of the jig ends on sig. K11r, not on sig. K11v as in D1, the final page number is ‘337’. The page with the ‘Erklärung des Kupfer-Tittels’ has no page number, as in D1.

**Extant copies of the early editions**

There are five extant copies each of the two 1672 duodecimo editions of *Kunst über alle Künste*:

First edition (D1):

- Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek Weimar (call number O 9: 246). Lacks the copper engraving. The bottom-right corner of the title page is missing, with some loss of text.¹
- Russian State Library, Moscow (call number MK IV-нем. 8°). This copy was previously in the Saxon State Library in Dresden (call number Lit. Angl.A.661), from which it disappeared after the Second World War.
- Staatsbibliothek Bamberg (call number: 14 N 2#2). With the copper engraving.
- Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Yale University (call number Zg17 G88 672r). Lacks the copper engraving. The second of three titles in a

¹ It is from this copy that our German text (see above, p. xvii) has been prepared.
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Sammelband, preceded by anon., Malus Mulier, Das ist Neue Böser Weiber Legenden (n. pl., 1671, VD17 1:668937W) and followed by Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, Rathstübel Plutonis oder Kunst Reich zu werden (Samarien: 1672, VD17 12:653071C).¹

Second edition (D2):

- Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (call number QuN 847 (1)). With the copper engraving. Bound up with Der Pedantische Irrthum (1673; see above, p. 144) and Der seltzame Springinsfeld by Hans Jakob Christoph von Grimmelshausen (1670, VD17 23:233338F).
- Privately owned. Previously on loan at the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle (call number AB 40 19/h, 19) but returned to its owner in 2010.
- Austrian National Library, Vienna (call number 23387–A). With the copper engraving and, before it, the Angelica engraving (see pp. 147–8).
- Landesbibliothek Coburg (call number Rara / Cas A 2532). With the copper engraving.²

¹ We are grateful to Sara Powell from the Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Dr Stefan Knoch from the Staatsbibliothek Bamberg and Kerstin Schellbach from the Saxon State and University Library in Dresden for information about these copies.

² We are grateful to Gerd Schramm from the Landesbibliothek Coburg and Bettina Lampel from the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt, Halle, for information about these copies.
A copy of the second edition previously known to exist at the Landesbibliothek Kassel (call number Fab. Roman. Duodez 114) almost certainly burnt in a fire in 1941. It included both the *Angelica* and the *Kunst* engraving (Bolte, ‘Schulkomödie’, 129).

**Editorial history**

The modern editorial history of *Kunst* is very brief and confined to the edition published by Reinhold Köhler in 1864. Köhler’s text is mostly a faithful reprint, although spelling and punctuation are somewhat modernized. Köhler followed the original division into acts and added no scene division, or any stage directions. The major exception to his otherwise conservative editorial policy is that he omitted from his text what he considered a few ‘particularly dirty passages’ (‘besonders schmutzige Stellen’, xxxviii). The first is from Wormfire’s soliloquy at the end of Act 2 (‘One . . . better’, 2.2.19–23), and the other three are from the final scene (5.2.110–40, 146–54, 345–93). Köhler also bowdlerizes a couple of other passages (see 2.2.7–8, 17–18 and notes) by changing ‘die Hure’ (‘the whore’) to ‘sie’ (‘she’). He prints some of the corresponding Shakespeare passages at the bottom of the page and provides a scholarly introduction (v–xliii) and commentary (213–60). Cohn did not include an edition of *Kunst* in *Shakespeare in Germany*, but he devoted a number of pages to it in the introduction (cxiv–cxxx) and printed three short passages, with English translation (cxxvii–cxxxix). Prior to the present publication, no translation of the play had been undertaken.

---

1 We are grateful to Heike Homeyer from the Universitätsbibliothek Kassel-Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel for this information. Attention was drawn to the Kassel copy by Bolte, ‘*Kunst*’, 446.
A NOTE ON THE TRANSLATIONS

The translations in this volume have been undertaken by the three editors, with extensive help from Anthony Mortimer, whose vast experience in translating from various languages into English (including Petrarch and Michelangelo from Italian, Villon from French, and Silesius from German) has been invaluable. The translation of the verse passages in *Kunst über alle Künste* (see below) is essentially Mortimer’s, and he also much improved the prose text.

Like any translation, ours needs to steer a course between a literal, word-for-word version, which would come at the cost of readability, and a more free approach which would not preserve enough of the linguistic and semantic make-up of the original. Our edition is particularly concerned with the relationship between the German adaptations and the Shakespearean originals, and this can only be revealed by a reasonably close translation. On the other hand, we have tried to arrive at a text that feels natural and is easily readable in English, and that occasionally entails a departure from what the German text literally says. When such departures are significant, we draw attention to our translation choices in the commentary.

Of the two previous translations of *Tito Andronico*, one (see below) adopts now archaic second-person familiar pronouns (thou, thee, etc.) and corresponding verb forms. There may be good reasons for this: the English playtext of which *Tito* is a translation and adaptation included those linguistic features, and so a retranslation that reproduces them may reflect a significant aspect of the relation between German adaptation and English original. Yet any attempt to translate a text into early modern English or an approximation thereof also comes with a series of problems. Early modern English is a language
no one now speaks, and its supposed recreation runs the danger of coming across as pastiche. Many early modern terms would need notes since they are not familiar to all readers, and it seems more sensible to translate into a language that does not sound alien to modern readers. Other words have changed their meaning since the early modern period, and a translation into pseudo-early-modern English would raise the question of which meaning is intended and create the need for more notes. The decision to translate a text into the English language of another period would also raise the question of which period to choose: the late sixteenth century, when *Titus Andronicus* and *The Taming of the Shrew* came into being; the early seventeenth century when *Tito* was printed; or the later seventeenth century, when *Kunst* came into being? Any one of these options would be hard to justify and even harder to maintain in any consistent and coherent fashion.

We have therefore decided to translate the texts into modern (British) English. Yet while we have tried to steer clear of the awkwardly archaic, we have also favoured options that do not feel aggressively modern. Given the origins of the texts we have translated, we think there is a limit to how modern the translations should sound. We also make an exception in our avoidance of early modernisms by using ‘exit’ and ‘exeunt’ in stage directions, in keeping with Arden Shakespeare practice. Apart from this exception, we have striven for diction that is neither recognizably archaic nor specifically of the twentieth and twenty-first century.

We use contracted verb forms (don’t, isn’t, he’ll, etc.) when there seems to be a good reason to do so. For instance, short forms may indicate a more relaxed mood, a class difference or a certain absence of emphasis, and of course they impact the overall rhythm of a sentence. The German text of *Kunst* has a fairly colloquial feeling throughout, and contracted forms thus often seem appropriate. In *Tito* the short form is reserved for Morian (it suits his sardonic nature) and the midwife (as a
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matter of class difference). We similarly used short forms for Pickelherring in the translation of Romio und Julieta.

The translation of Kunst comes with challenges over and above those of the other seventeenth-century German Shakespeare adaptations. The language is often idiosyncratic, with passages that are hard to make sense of, and many phrases sound proverbial but are not recorded and explained in any of the standard reference works (see pp. 116–17). Even the play’s only previous editor, Reinhold Köhler, a well-known German scholar in his time, who was the head librarian of the Duchess Anna Amalia Library in Weimar, was repeatedly left nonplussed by the text (e.g. pp. 215, 220, 224, etc.), though, in the 1860s, he was still considerably closer in time to the German of Kunst than we are today. Translating Kunst thus occasionally involves conjectures, as acknowledged in the commentary.

Tito is exclusively in prose, but Kunst contains several passages in verse (3.1.46–50, 3.1.67–70, 3.1.143–78, 5.2.224–60, 5.2.352–59), which we have translated as verse. The first two passages, dactylic compositions by Felix and Sabina during the poetry lesson, have been translated so as to preserve the dactylic metre. In the third, Alfons’ song performed for Sabina during the music lesson, the translation preserves the original’s iambic trimeter couplets. The fourth, Felix’s hunting poem, has rather rough iambic octameter couplets in the original, which our translation renders as fourteeners to convey the impression of a fairly rudimentary verse technique. In the last verse passage, a poem by Fabian, our translation preserves the original’s (rather awkward) iambic trimeter couplets. We have rhymes where the German does, although we make occasional use of half rhyme where the German has full rhyme (e.g., 3.1.143–6).

Kunst has not been previously translated, but there are two earlier translations of Tito into English. We have benefited from them but have also tried to improve on them. Moritz Lippner’s translation in Cohn’s Shakespeare in Germany (1865) is
generally reliable, although its English is partly archaic, not least in its adoption of second-person familiar pronouns (thou, thee, etc.) and corresponding verb forms. The translation by Ernst Brennecke in *Shakespeare in Germany 1590–1700* (1964) is considerably less formal than Lippner’s and sometimes rather loose. We have tried to avoid the former’s archaisms and the latter’s looseness, striving for a text that combines readability with conservative modern English.
A NOTE ON THE COMMENTARY AND COLLATION

The commentary and collation located below the text of the two plays in this volume have several purposes. An important aim of the commentary is to shed light on the relationship between the German adaptations and the texts of *Titus Andronicus* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. The commentary on each scene begins with a short note that synthetizes correspondences to and differences from Shakespeare’s play. Other notes comment on local similarities and dissimilarities between *Tito Andronico* and *Titus Andronicus* or *Kunst über alle Künste* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. In instances that seem significant, we also annotate *Tito*’s relationship to other early (English and Continental) Titus texts, in particular the English ballad, the English chapbook and Jan Vos’s Dutch play *Aran en Titus*.

While an important part of the commentary relates the German adaptations to Shakespeare’s plays, another part situates them within their cultural, theatrical, literary and linguistic contexts in the German-speaking territories of the seventeenth century. Although our texts are English translations of the German *Tito Andronico* and *Kunst über alle Künste*, we sometimes find it necessary to comment on features of the German text. In notes where the German word or phrase is important, we insert it between parentheses after the English headword. To explain early modern German, we often draw on the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* initiated by Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm (hereafter, ‘Grimm’), the most comprehensive dictionary of the German language. Its examples from primary sources reach back to the fifteenth century, making it the closest equivalent to what the *OED* is for the English language.
The language of *Kunst über alle Künste* is sometimes idiosyncratic: there are many proverbs and idioms, or passages that at least sound proverbial or idiomatic, even though the most comprehensive reference work of proverbs in the German language, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander’s *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexicon* (hereafter, ‘Wander’), does not always contain them, or records the passage in *Kunst* as the only known occurrence. The approximate meaning of the passages in question can often be inferred from the context, but our translation usually makes no attempt to render them literally. Instead, we often try to explain in the commentary how the passage works in German by providing its literal meaning, thereby striving for readability in the translation while conveying a sense of the characteristically proverbial-sounding German via the commentary.

The chief purpose of the collation is to provide our sources in instances where our text does not simply translate but departs from the first edition of *Tito Andronico* (1620) and *Kunst über alle Künste* (1672). At the end of Act 2, Scene 1 of *Tito Andronico*, for instance, the 1620 edition provides no exit stage direction for Morian, Helicates and Saphonus. Brennecke is the first editor to change this, so our collation note reads: ‘108 SD1 *Exeunt* Brennecke; not in 1620’. (We have made no attempt to record in the collation readings in later editions of *Tito Andronico* that have not been adopted in the present edition.) Similarly, at 3.3.79 of *Tito Andronico*, we add the following stage direction to clarify whom Aetiopissa addresses in the last part of her speech: ‘[to Saphonus]’. This stage direction is not in the text of 1620, nor in any of the later editions and translations of the play. Accordingly, we have a collation note that reads: ‘79 SD] *this edn; not in 1620*. In the case of *Kunst über alle Künste*, we slightly depart from this policy, for the following reason: the play has not been translated before and has been edited only once, by Reinhold Köhler (1864). Köhler often modernizes spelling and punctuation but otherwise adheres
closely to the original text. What this means is that almost all editorially added stage directions (there are well over a hundred) and parts of stage directions (there are over thirty) as well as all explanatory additions to the ‘List of Roles’, marked by brackets, have been added by us. We have also divided the play into scenes (the early editions are divided into acts but not scenes) on the understanding that a new scene begins when the stage is cleared and the action is not continuous. On all these occasions, we have considered it unnecessary to mention in the collation that the editorially added text or scene division, in brackets, originates with us. In other words, when a change to the original text is marked by brackets and there is no collation note accounting for its origins, the material in brackets has been added by us. When, on the other hand, a stage direction or speech heading in brackets substitutes for material in the early editions or when a stage direction or emendation originates with Köhler, then that change is recorded in the collation.

We standardize names in stage directions and speech prefixes, and our collation does not record the many instances where this standardization takes place. The standardized name appears in small caps in speech prefixes and entrance directions, in keeping with Arden 3 policy, and it does so even when the name does not appear in the equivalent speech prefix or stage direction in the original German text. So, for instance, the name ‘TITO’ is editorially supplied in cases where the 1620 text only has ‘Andronicus’, as is sometimes the case. In Kunst über alle Künste, to give another example, Alfons is referred to as ‘Musicus’ (i.e., Musician) in stage directions and speech headings when in disguise. In stage directions, we clarify the character’s identity by adding his name in brackets: ‘[ALFONS as] Musician’ (4.1.0 SD). In the speech prefixes, we systematically opt for ‘ALFONS’. Significant variations in speech headings are discussed in the notes accompanying the ‘List of Roles’.
TITO ANDRONICO IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

A VERY LAMENTABLE TRAGEDY OF TITO ANDRONICO AND THE HAUGHTY EMPRESS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VESPASIANUS</td>
<td>[son of Tito Andronico]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman EMPEROR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITO ANDRONICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRONICA</td>
<td>[daughter of Tito Andronico]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETIOPISSA</td>
<td>Queen of Ethiopia, [later Roman] Empress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORIAN</td>
<td>[servant and secret lover of Aetiopissa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELICATES</td>
<td>elder son of Queen of Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPHONUS</td>
<td>other son of Queen of Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andronica’s HUSBAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIADIES</td>
<td>[brother of Tito Andronico]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Two] MESSENGERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SOLDIER]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ROMANS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Attendant, Servants, Soldiers]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Roles

**List of Roles** In 1620, headed ‘Personae’, and in the identical order to that reproduced here. The order of the main characters is close to the order of appearance but does not quite correspond to the order of their first mention in SDs (Tito is named before the Emperor, and Andronica after Aetiopissa, Morian, Helicates and Saphonus), nor to the order in which they first speak (Andronica does so after Aetiopissa, Morian, Helicates and Saphonus). The material in brackets has been added in the present edition. The first edition of TA with a list of ‘The Persons’ Names’ was Ravenscroft’s (1687). For characters who appear only in TA, see Introduction, p. 2.

**VESPASIANUS** Lucius in TA. Lippner and Brennecke have ‘Vespasian’, but this edition follows the original spelling.

**Roman emperor** Saturninus (sometimes ‘Saturnine’) in TA. Tito does not give this character a proper name. Although the opening SD has ‘the emperor also enters, but at this time he is not yet the Roman Emperor’ (1.1.0.3–4), the first speech delivered by this character nevertheless has the SP ‘Emperor’ (1.1.14).

**TITO ANDRONICO** Titus Andronicus in TA. In 1620 the SPs vary between ‘Titus’, ‘Titus Andron.’ and ‘Titus Andronicus’. This edition follows the form of the name used in the title of the German play.

**ANDRONICA** Lavinia in TA.

**AETIOPISSA . . . EMPRESS** The ‘Personae’ list indicates both of her titles: Queen of Ethiopia and Empress (‘Königin auß Mohrenlandt. Käyserin’). Grimm defines ‘Mohrenland’ as the land where the Moors live, namely Mauritania and Ethiopia, which is supported by Aetiopissa’s name in this instance. However, some seventeenth-century German texts use ‘Mohrenland’ to refer to the Northern African coast (see Schuster, sig. A1r). Her SP is ‘Ætiopis.’ (for ‘Aetiopissa’) before she is crowned, and usually ‘Keyserin’ or ‘Käyserin’ (‘Empress’) thereafter, although on two occasions (3.3.51 and 3.3.63), when she addresses her sons, her SP is ‘Mutter’, i.e. mother; we regularize to ‘AETIOPISSA’. The name is linked to Ethiopia, whereas Tamora’s name does not mark her out as a Goth. Despite being Ethiopian, Aetiopissa is described as ‘lovely and white’ (‘schön und weib’ in the opening SD (1.1.0.5), suggesting that, unlike Morian, her part is not to be performed in blackface. See Introduction, pp. 20–3. In Thomasius’ 1661 German adaptation of Vos’ *Aran en Titus*, Thamera becomes ‘Tomyris’, in reference to the Scythian queen.

**MORIAN** Unlike ‘Aaron’ in TA, Morian’s name (from the German ‘Mohr, Moriane, Morianer’ for ‘Moor’) marks him out as a black African. This is supported by the opening SD, which identifies him as black (‘schwartz’). While Aaron is not located in a specific African country, Morian reveals that he was hailed as the ‘Thunder and Lightning’ of Ethiopia on account of his martial prowess (1.1.111–12). In the chapbook and the ballad, the equivalent character is referred to simply as ‘Moor’.

**HELICATES** Demetrius in TA. ‘Helicates’ has classical Greek connotations and suggests ‘follower’ or ‘agent of’ the sun (from ‘helios’ for ‘sun’ and the -της suffix, which is used to form agent nouns). Aetiopissa’s sons are presumably white, like their mother, although there are no explicit comments on their whiteness as in TA (e.g. 4.2.99–100, 118–20, 156).

**SAPHONUS** Chiron in TA.

**ANDRONICA’S HUSBAND** (Andronicæ Gemahl) This character differs considerably from Lavina’s husband Bassianus in TA; he has no proper name (which is also the case in the chapbook and the ballad), and there is no evidence that he is the brother of the Emperor. After the Emperor rejects Andronica in favour of Aetiopissa in 2.1 there is no mention of her subsequent marriage, yet she appears with her husband in 3.3 (see Introduction, p. 10). In the chapbook (39) and the ballad, Titus’ daughter is betrothed to the son of the Emperor, which is also the case in Thomasius’ adaptation *Titus und Tomyris* (1661).

**VICTORIADES** The ‘Personæ’ list has ‘Victeriados’, but the spelling in the dialogue and the SPs is ‘Victoriaides’. Corresponds to ‘Marcus’ in TA.
List of Roles

MESSENGERS In Tito, 5.1 and 5.2, one of the messengers performs largely the same function as the Clown in TA, 4.3 and 4.4, who delivers ‘Titus’ insulting letter to Saturninus. In both cases the bearer of the message is punished by death. The other messenger in Tito (8.1) has no equivalent in TA. The ‘Personae’ list in 1620 mentions a single ‘Bote’, i.e. messenger.

MIDWIFE The ‘Personae’ list in 1620 and 1624 have ‘Weise Wächter’, which Lippner mistakenly translates as ‘White Guards’, while Brennecke corrects to ‘Midwife’. ‘Weise’ is best translated as ‘wise’, not ‘white’ (German: ‘weiß’). ‘Wächter’ means ‘guard’ or ‘guardian’ but is used here to refer to a guardian or carer in a broader sense. The SP in 6.1 is ‘Weise Mutter’ (literally, wise mother), a designation occasionally used for a midwife (see Grimm, ‘Hebamme’). The SD introducing this character calls her ‘weise Muhme’ (‘Muhme’ usually referring to a female relative; Grimm). This character corresponds to TA’s ‘Nurse’. ‘Cornelia the midwife’ (4.2.143) is mentioned in TA but does not appear onstage.

SOLDIER Not mentioned in the ‘Personae’ list in 1620 or 1624. In 7.1, he delivers Morian and his child to Vespasianus as his prisoners.

ROMANS An unspecified number of ‘Romans’ are addressed in the opening scene by Vespasianus (1.1.1), the Emperor (1.1.16–17) and Tito (1.1.20), and they ‘ALL’ (1.1.34) acclaim the Emperor when he is crowned. Not in the 1620 ‘Personae’ list.

ATTENDANT This non-speaking part is required in 5.2. Not in the 1620 or 1624 ‘Personae’ list.

SERVANTS An unspecified number of non-speaking servants who prepare the banquet at the beginning of 8.2. Not in the 1620 ‘Personae’ list.

SOLDIERS The play requires two non-speaking soldiers in 7.3. Not in the 1620 ‘Personae’ list.
1.[1] VESPASIANUS enters, the Roman crown in his hand. Enter TITO ANDRONICO wearing a laurel wreath, the EMPEROR also enters, but at this time he is not yet the Roman Emperor. Also enter AETIOPISSA, the Queen of Ethiopia, who is lovely and white, with her two sons HELICATES and SAPHONUS, and MORIAN, who is black and has a humble cloak pulled over his magnificent clothes, being a servant to the Queen and her secret consort. The last four to enter are the prisoners of Tito Andronico. Also enter ANDRONICA and ROMANS.

VESPASIANUS Noble Romans, you are aware that our imperial throne is now empty and unfilled, and so to
avoid great discord and strife among the people, we must soon elect another Emperor. Because I know of no other man to whom this honour is more due than Tito Andronico, who is now the most distinguished and most eligible candidate, and since no-one in this city of Rome has achieved more than him in bloody and perilous combat, and also as everyone proclaims that the crown of Rome is his by right, so let us all wish him good fortune, place the Roman crown upon his head, and for all time hold and honour him as our most gracious Emperor.

EMPEROR What? Shall Tito Andronico wear the crown upon his head, and not I? No, that must never be! I am

Vespasianus agrees to ‘receive the crown in the presence of all’ (8.2.75–6). For the importance of Vespasianus, see Introduction, pp. 14–15, 39–40.

0.2 laurel . . . wreath In TA, in his first speech, Titus mentions that he is returning to Rome ‘bound with laurel boughs’ (1.1.77). Laurel is the foliage of the bay-tree, used as an emblem of martial victory in Rome.

0.3–4 at . . . Emperor For the narrative and descriptive nature of some of the SD in Tito and elsewhere in the Leipzig volume, see Introduction, pp. 69–70.

0.5 white (‘weiß’) Lippner and Brennecke translate this as ‘fair complexion’, but ‘white’ seems significant in the context of the play’s treatment of race (see Introduction, pp. 19–28).

0.9 secret consort Nothing in the subsequent dialogue allows an audience to identify Morian as Actiopissa’s secret lover until he reveals it at 1.1.89–90. In TA, the relationship between Aaron and Tamora is also revealed late in the first scene (1.1.512).

1–13 Noble . . . Emperor It is unclear how Vespasianus’ position puts him in charge of the election of the new Emperor. Brahman suggests that the speech is ‘wrongly ascribed’ to Vespasianus and that Victoriades ‘is meant’ (9.48), but there is no evidence for this, and the character of Vespasianus is also foregrounded elsewhere (see Introduction, pp. 14–15). In TA, Saturninus speaks first and Marcus, brother of Titus and Tribune of the people, holds the crown (1.1.18.1). Like Marcus in TA, Vespasianus attempts to influence the process by advocating the election of his kinsman.

2 imperial throne (‘Keyserthumb’) Lippner has ‘Empire’, but we follow Brennecke, which is supported by Bassianus’ reference to the ‘imperial seat’ (1.1.14) and Tamora’s comment on Saturninus being ‘but newly planted in your throne’ (1.1.449). The chapbook also makes mention of Rome’s ‘imperial Throne’ (35).

2 empty and unfilled The first of many hendiadys in the play, the second following later in the sentence: ‘discord and strife’.

4 elect As in TA, Rome is an elective monarchy, although the exact modalities of the succession are not spelled out.
next in line and the crown is rightfully mine. So, Romans, consider well and wisely what you do, so that no rebellion break out among us to trouble and endanger this noble city of Rome.

TITO Romans, you must know that this imperial throne is of no interest to me. I am now an old man and have spent all my life in constant and most perilous wars. Even if all the votes are cast for me, and everyone confers on me the imperial throne, you shall see that for the sake of peace I will give it to another, for it is through concordiam and unity between the Emperor and the council, and also the common people, that Rome has become the head of the entire world. If dissension and strife now arose within its walls, the city would perish. Therefore, I shall cast aside my pride and turn instead to humility. So come together

16 next . . . line (‘der neheste’) literally, the next one. It is unclear if he, like TA’s Saturninus (1.1.5–8), is insisting upon his right of primogeniture.

17–18 Romans . . . us The veiled warning about armed intervention is weaker than Saturninus’ explicit invitations to cause civil unrest: ‘Defend the justice of my cause with arms’ (1.1.2) and ‘Romans, do me right. / Patricians, draw your swords and sheathe them not / Till Saturninus be Rome’s emperor’ (1.1.207–9).

20–1 this . . . man In TA Titus similarly states that ‘A better head her [i.e., Rome’s] glorious body fits / Than his that shakes for age and feebleness’ (1.1.190–1). As in TA, ‘old’ is a recurrent epithet for the protagonist, used both by himself and others.

22 all my life (‘die Zeit meines Lebens’) literally, the time of my life. Compare Titus, who indicates a specific duration: ‘Rome, I have been thy soldier forty years’ (1.1.196). The duration of Tito’s Ethiopian campaign is not specified, whereas Marcus points out in TA that ‘Ten years are spent since first he [i.e., Titus] undertook / This cause of Rome’ (1.1.31–2).

23–31 Even . . . humility Tito foregrounds the avoidance of civil unrest and the common good in his decision to renounce the crown. Titus, by contrast, insists on his age when explaining his decision (1.1.192–5).

26 concordiam Latin: harmony, concord, union.

27 council (‘Rathe’) Lippner and Brennecke translate this as ‘Senate’. Whereas TA mentions the ‘senate’ (1.1.27, 44), ‘the Senate House’ (1.1.66 SD1) and the ‘Capitol’ (1.1.44), which was often assumed to be the site of the Senate House, Tito has the vague ‘council’ (‘Rathe’) and mentions neither Capitol nor Senate House. Nor does Tito mention ‘Tribunes . . . and Senators’, whereas TA does (1.1.0.1–2). Tito’s dramatization of Rome’s political institutions remains very vague.

29 dissension (‘despennation’) a Latinism.
now and let us crown the Emperor, loudly wishing him good fortune and well-being.

*Tito Andronico places the crown upon the Emperor’s head.*

**ALL** (cry) We wish long life, good fortune, and well-being to the invincible and all-powerful Roman Emperor.

**EMPEROR** Well, my dear followers, since you elect and uphold me as your Emperor, I in turn commit myself to favour you with special liberties, to venture life and blood with you for our fatherland, and always to act in good faith. – As for you, Tito Andronico, who have gladly and willingly conferred this imperial throne on me for the common good and peace, I bear you great love and loyalty. Therefore, I desire your lovely daughter, Andronica, as my Empress, and today she shall be crowned as Empress and married to me, if it pleases you.

**TITO** Most mighty and invincible Emperor, it gives me special pleasure that you desire my dearest daughter, Andronica, as Empress, which will establish yet more peace and friendship between us. I hereby give you

---

33 SD *In TA* it is Marcus rather than Titus who crowns Saturninus, presumably during or after his speech at 1.1.234–7 (see Ard1 1.1.237 SD note).

34 **ALL** (cry) *1620* typographically incorporates this passage into the SD that precedes the cry. We derive the SP and the SD ‘cry’ from ‘vnd sagen alle mit lauter Stimme’ (literally, and all say with a loud voice).

41–7 **As . . . you** Like Saturninus (1.1.238–47), the Emperor moves directly from his expression of gratitude (‘I give thee thanks’, 1.1.240) to his desire to marry the daughter of his benefactor (‘Lavinia will I make my empress’, 1.1.244). In both speeches the Emperor ends by asking for Tito’s/Titus’ agreement (‘doth this motion please thee?’, 1.1.247). The Emperor’s desire to marry and crown his Empress ‘today’ is only in *Tito*.

48–51 **Most . . . us** Titus says that he is ‘highly honoured’ (1.1.249) by the match, but only Tito insists (again) on peace (see 23–30).
my daughter and wish you both a peaceful, long, and happy life.

*Presents his daughter to him. The Emperor takes her by the hand.*

**EMPEROR** I shall hold her in great respect and honour. But tell me, please, who are these that stand behind you?

**TITO** Most mighty Emperor, this woman is the Queen of Ethiopia, these two are her sons, and the Moor is her servant, all of whom I have brought as prisoners from Ethiopia.

**EMPEROR** They please me greatly, especially the female creature, and I could wish that they were mine.

**TITO** Most mighty Emperor, since they please your Majesty, I willingly give them to you.

*He takes Aetiopissa and leads her to the Emperor.*

Queen of Ethiopia, I hereby pronounce you free and unyoked from me, and present you to my gracious Lord Emperor.

**AETIOPISSA** Great and mighty Emperor of Rome, I, my sons, and my servant have now been handed over

---

52–3 *my . . . life* The equivalent moment in *TA* has Titus give away not only Lavinia but also a number of other entitlements: ‘My sword, my chariot, and my prisoners, / Presents well worthy Rome’s imperious lord: / Receive them then, the tribute that I owe, / Mine honour’s ensigns humbled at thy feet’ (1.1.253–6).

58 *the Moor* (‘der Schwartz’; literally, the black one). The distinction between ‘her sons, and the Moor’ implies that the skin colour of Helicates and Saphonus, like their mother’s, is considerably lighter than Morian’s.

61–2 *They . . . mine* In *TA*, Saturninus focuses more explicitly on Tamora, ‘A goodly lady, trust me, of the hue / That I would choose were I to choose anew’ (1.1.265–6). This comment is made after Titus bestows the prisoners upon him, whereas in *Tito* the loosely corresponding comment leads Tito to present his prisoners as a gift to the Emperor.

64 SD The early editions of *TA* have no equivalent SD, but Ravenscroft inserted ‘*Presents his Captives to the Emperor*’.

68–72 Tamora does not address Saturninus at the equivalent moment.
as your Majesty’s captives, and we offer ourselves to your Majesty as your humble servants. Do with us as you please.

EMPEROR   Lovely Queen of Ethiopia, I am well disposed towards you and yours. So do not be melancholy and distressed but of good cheer for I shall raise you to great things, and you shall be maintained according to your former status as a high-born queen.

AETIOPISSA   All-gracious and most mighty Emperor, I humbly thank your Majesty for this great favour.

EMPEROR   Well, time flies, so let us all now go inside.

Exeunt. Morian remains.

MORIAN   Let me throw off these old rags now, for I see that my secret mistress holds favour and grace with the Emperor.

He pulls off the old cloak.

I hope she will attain even greater grace and gratia with him, and that she will win his love with her

75–7  I ... queen Titus similarly assures Tamora, ‘for your honour and your state / [Saturninus] will use you nobly and your followers’ (1.1.263–4).

81–130 The equivalent speech in TA is part of the opening scene in Q1, but F introduces an act division before it, which many subsequent editions followed, although Ard includes it in 1.1. Whereas Aaron’s equivalent speech outlines his ambitions for personal advancement at the Roman court via Tamora, Morian’s concerns focus on adultery (his former involvement with Aetiopissa), and on his former military career and the Roman invasion of Ethiopia.

83  SD With this action, Morian reveals the ‘magnificent clothes’ mentioned in the opening SD, which have so far been hidden under his cloak. There is no equivalent SD in TA, although note Aaron’s ‘Away with slavish weeds and servile thoughts! / I will be bright, and shine in pearl and gold’ (1.1.517–18). Morian thus enacts (a version of) what Aaron says. Tito’s presentation of Morian in sartorial finery can be read in the wider context of Continental visual representations of black Africans (see Introduction, pp. 25–6). For the racial coding of Ethiopian dress mentioned elsewhere in the Leipzig volume, see Introduction, p. 26 n. 2.

85–7 and that ... Rome Aaron’s ‘Now climbeth Tamora Olympus’ top’ (1.1.500) follows after Saturninus has taken Tamora as his consort. In Tito, the Emperor has only told Aetiopissa that he is ‘well disposed towards’ (73–4) her, and Morian expresses no more than speculative hopes at this point.
flattery and caresses and become the Empress of Rome. If that happens, I shall truly cuckold the Emperor and have far more pleasure and joy with her than he will. Everyone thought I was merely the Queen’s servant – but no, I was her secret lover and slept more often with her than the King of Ethiopia, her husband, so that at last he noticed the mischief between me and the Queen, and had me closely watched so that I could not go near her. The Queen became very impatient with her husband, for I could not come near her for fourteen days, being guarded so closely, and the King could not pluck her strings half as vigorously as I. Therefore, she took poison and gave it to the King in a goblet of wine so that again I had free access to her. Yes, many who looked with
displeasure on me and my paramour I have secretly killed in their bedchambers by night. I have committed thousands and thousands of villainies and robberies, and yet it seems to me that I have not done enough mischief yet. Yes, everyone, even the King himself, was very afraid of me because of my great, valorous deeds and military might. In battles and perilous wars I fought like a formidable lion – not like a man but like a very devil. Thus, eventually, I became known throughout the whole world for my great, superhuman, manly exploits and was given the title of ‘Thunder and Lightning of Ethiopia’. My fame finally reached the Romans, who armed themselves mightily and came for us in Ethiopia, devastating and destroying the land with unheard-of cruelty. I went out against them with my army and thought they would cause me little trouble and be driven back so that none would return to Rome alive. But when the fight began, I saw how dreadfully old Tito Andronico hit back; he surpassed me and was ten times more fierce. In all my life I had not seen an army more warlike and battle-hardened than these Romans. This frightened me, and

102–5 committed . . . yet Compare ‘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’ (5.1.141–4). Unlike Aaron, Morian does not elaborate on these villainous acts beyond the account of his involvement in the murders at the Ethiopian court.

105–12 Yes . . . Ethiopia This passage, in which Morian portrays himself as a former military champion of his country, has no equivalent in TA, where Aaron’s account of his past life is a catalogue of crimes and not rooted in a geographical location (5.1.125–44).

111–12 Thunder . . . Lightning Compare Aaron’s comment that Tamora is ‘Secure of thunder’s crack or lightning flash’ (1.1.502). In Aran en Titus, Aran declares that he ‘did terrorize the Roman army with the thunderings of my voice, with the lightnings of mine eyes’ (Buitendijk, ll. 176–9; trans. quoted from Fuller, 25).

116 my army That Morian, like Tito, was a military leader establishes a parallel between the two antagonists that TA lacks.

119–20 he . . . me This may provide a motive for Morian to be revenged upon Tito, which is not in TA.
I saw my ranks dissolve, beaten like dogs. Before long, old Tito rushed at me and – something that no man had ever done before – struck me off my horse with his lance so fiercely that I didn’t know whether I were dead or alive. They cut everyone down, so that no-one escaped. They took many spoils, among them me, the Queen, and her sons, and brought us to Rome. But now I shall go and see what comes about. Exit.

[2.1] Enter the EMPEROR, AETIOPISSA with her two sons HELICATES and SAPHONUS, and MORIAN.

EMPEROR Lovely Queen, my desire and lust for you is ten times greater than for Tito Andronico’s daughter.

125 struck ... horse Black Africans were associated with expertise in horsemanship in early modern European culture (see Introduction, p. 25). This detail parallels the chapbook history, where Tottilius, the Goth King, ‘desperately charged by Andronicus’, is ‘thrown from his Horse and much wounded’ (36).

127–8 They ... escaped This account of cruelty in warfare anticipates the ferocity with which Vespasianus’ forces attack Rome (see 7.1.1–15 and 7.2.1–19).

128 many spoils In the chapbook the Goth King ‘caused the Retreat to be sounded’ and ‘left the rich Spoils of his Camp, the Wealth of many plunder’d Nations’ to Andronicus and his soldiers (36).

2.1 The beginning of this scene corresponds to the second half of the opening scene in TA (1.1.304–635), or the end of 1.1 and 2.1 in editions that follow F’s act divisions. In TA, Saturninus has cause to fall into a dispute with the Andronici because Marcus and his nephews support Bassianus’ claim to Lavinia (1.1.280), but in Tito, given the absence of the brothers’ rivalry, the Emperor’s decision to abandon his promise to marry Andronica (3–4) is more unexpected and seems based on his sexual attraction to Aetiopissa. The dispute between Helicates and Saphonus that follows (18–95) generally corresponds to that of Demetrius and Chiron in TA, although Morian’s motivation in appeasing the brothers is different from Aaron’s. Whereas Aaron rebukes Chiron and Demetrius for the danger they run in publicly fighting over the wife of Bassianus, the Emperor’s brother (1.1.545–69), Morian expresses his irritation over their physical violence towards one another and threatens to punish them if they do not desist (96–8). Aaron devises a detailed plan for the brothers (1.1.612–31), but the scene in Tito ends without a plan though Morian gives a general promise to assist the brothers.

2.1 this edn; not in 1620; Act II Cohn 108 SD1 Exeunt] Brennecke; not in 1620

179
I have sent her back and informed him that she does not please me and will not be the Empress of Rome. From now on you shall no longer be called the captive queen but the Empress of Rome. So now I place the crown upon your head, and you shall be my faithful consort, for the goddess Venus has wounded me so much in your favour that I shall have no peace until I have possessed your proud body.

Places the crown upon her head.

AETIOPISSA Most mighty Emperor, I am unworthy of the great honour and dignity your Majesty confers upon me. Although the goddess Venus has likewise roused in me an ardent passion for your Majesty, modesty did not allow me to reveal it.

1–10 This speech seems to follow directly from the opening scene (especially 1.1.73–87), yet the fact that Andronica now has a husband (see 2.1.36–7 and note) suggests that considerable time has elapsed. This inconsistency may be the result of imperfect revision or some form of textual corruption. Compare TA, where Lavinia asserts that Tamora’s ‘slips have made him [i.e. Saturninus] noted [i.e. branded with disgrace] long’ (2.2.86), although Tamora and Saturninus have only been married for one day; this suggests a similar ‘double time scheme’, ‘slip’, or ‘corruption’ (Ard, 214).

3–4 I . . . Rome When Saturninus rejects Lavinia, he does so in response to the perceived dishonour he received when Bassianus, Marcus and Titus’ sons removed Lavinia: ‘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 dishonour me’ (1.1.304–8). By contrast, in Tito, the only reason the Emperor gives for rejecting Andronica is that ‘she does not please me’.

5–6 From . . . Rome The Emperor’s proposal is more assertive than that of Saturninus in the equivalent passage, which is phrased conditionally and leads to a question, ‘If thou be pleased with this my sudden choice, / Behold, I choose thee, Tamora, for my bride, / And will create thee empress of Rome. / Speak, queen of Goths, dost thou applaud my choice?’ (1.1.323–6).

8, 13 Venus the classical goddess associated with sexual desire. See also 3.3.125, 128. 12 dignity (‘digniteten’) a Latinism.

13–15 Although . . . it Tamora makes no mention of any attraction to Saturninus when she accepts his offer of marriage, stating only that she ‘will a handmaid be to his desires, / A loving nurse, a mother to his youth’ (1.1.336–7).
EMPEROR So let us now go in, my lovely Empress, and while away our time in delights.

_He takes her by the hand and they go within._

_Morian follows._

_The two sons Helicates and Saphonus remain._

HELICATES Dearest brother, let us now live in joy and bliss, for this prison of ours holds neither harm nor disadvantage for us, but instead brings us great honour. I ask you, dearest brother, where could our mother have come to greater and higher honours than here, where she has become the Empress of Rome?

SAPHONUS Yes, dearest brother, I cannot rejoice enough at the great cheer in my heart, for in Ethiopia we would never have been as highly exalted as here – thanks to our mother – among these noble Romans who are renowned throughout the world. So I would like to rejoice with you, but one thing torments and sorely pains my heart.

HELICATES Dearest brother, I would like to know the sorrow in your heart.

SAPHONUS O dearest brother, then know that I am so greatly overcome with fiery lust for lovely Andronica

17 **while . . . delights** In the equivalent passage in _TA_, sexual activity is referred to when Saturninus invites Tamora to ascend the Pantheon (a temple in Rome dedicated to all the gods) in order to ‘consummate [their] spousal rites’ (1.1.342).

17.3 **remain** In _TA_, Aaron remains onstage after his soliloquy, and the quarrelling brothers enter to him; in _Tito_, Morian exits at the end of Act 1, and the brothers quarrel alone at the beginning of Act 2, until Morian enters to them (66.2–3). Chiron and Demetrius enter ‘braving’ (1.1.524.1) and their argument over who has the better claim to Lavinia is already underway. In _Tito_, by contrast, their relationship is at first harmonious but then gradually deteriorates.

25 **rejoice** (‘jubiliren’) a Latinism.
that I do not know what to do. What grieves me most is that she is already married to another.

HELICATES Dear brother, I am very sick for the same reason. I will not believe that your love for her is as fierce as mine. Therefore, give up such thoughts; I am the eldest and will possess her body. I must consult with our mother’s servant to think up a secret way of taking her husband’s life.

SAPHONUS How, brother! Though you are older than I, you shall not thwart me. I hope I have as much of what becomes a man as you, and if we should make a wager over who would best acquit himself in the tournament of Venus, truly, I know I would defeat you. Therefore, dear brother, leave this to me and find yourself another, for I will not give her up and no-one shall have her but I.

HELICATES O you poor fool, could you ever satisfy a woman? Indeed not, you are incapable of it! Leave off, brother, leave off. She must be mine and you are much too weak to make me yield. Or shall we fight for her in such a way that dogs may lick up our blood?

36–7 What . . . another It is unclear how much time has passed since 1.1, when Andronica would have been free to marry the Emperor. Either Andronica’s marital status is dramatized inconsistently or her marriage must have taken place since Act 1. There is no indication that she was previously betrothed to a man other than the Emperor, as is the case with Lavinia and Bassianus (1.1.280–90). See 2.1.1–10 and note.

41 eldest Demetrius, as the elder brother, similarly draws attention to his superiority by belittling and insulting Chiron: ‘thy years want wit, thy wits want edge / And manners to intrude where I am graced’ (1.1.525–6). In TA, Demetrius’ argument for the elder brother’s superiority mirrors Saturninus’ (1.1.5–8), a parallel not operative in Tito where the Emperor is not known to have a brother.

41–2 consult . . . servant (‘consuliren’) a Latinism. In TA the brothers have no intention to approach Aaron for help with their undertaking.

44–5 Though . . . me This parallels Chiron’s assertion that ‘’Tis not the difference of a year or two / Makes me less gracious, or thee more fortunate’ (1.1.530–1). As elsewhere, TA indicates a temporal duration, ‘a year or two’, where Tito does not (see 1.1.22 and note).

55 too weak Helicates’ condescension towards his younger brother mirrors Demetrius’ in TA, where Chiron is called ‘boy’ (1.1.537, 544) and ‘Youngling’ (1.1.572).
SAPHONUS   Brother, I say there’s no bigger fool in the world than you! That I would give her up and let you have her? That must never be. But it is true that she can have only one of us, therefore draw and let us fight valiantly for her, since I would rather give my life than yield her to another.

HELCICATES Yes, brother, with pleasure, since one of us must be swept away. And I say likewise that I would rather give my life than let you have her. So let us fight and not hold back. Lay on!

They strike at one another.
In the midst of the scuffle enter MORIAN, who runs between them.

MORIAN   No, no, my lords! By a thousand devils, what are you doing? Are you brothers so incensed that you seek each other’s lives? That simply must not be while I am here. Be content, or else I’ll beat you both so soundly that you’ll think the elements wage war upon you! Once I begin, I’m worse than the devil himself. But tell me, what’s the reason for your quarrel?

HELCICATES My dear Morian, you must know that I am fiercely in love with Andronica; my brother says that

60 draw (‘ziehe vom Leder’) literally, draw from the leather, an expression designating the removal of a sword or other large blade from a scabbard, which was often covered in leather.

66 SD1 They strike In TA, ‘They draw’ (1.1.544 SD). Since Saphonus has just invited his brother to ‘draw’ (60), it may be assumed that the fight in Tito involves a bladed weapon. In TA, Demetrius identifies his weapon as a ‘rapier’ (1.1.553). In Tito 3.3, both brothers have a sword.

66 SD2 enter MORIAN Unlike Morian, Aaron does not leave the stage and witnesses the quarrel between the brothers.

70–2 I’ll . . . you! Aaron does not threaten the brothers with violence but draws their attention to the likely consequences of openly quarrelling over the wife of Bassianus, ‘a prince’s right’ (1.1.563), in the vicinity of the Emperor’s palace: ‘I tell you, lords, you do but plot your deaths / By this device’ (1.1.577–8). The identity of Andronica’s husband is not known, which means that there is no occasion in Tito for Aaron’s concern over Demetrius and Chiron’s desire for someone as distinguished as the Emperor’s brother’s wife.
he also is greatly in love with her, and that’s why we quarrelled. I want to have her, as does he; so he offered to fight me, since she can only be had by one of us.

**Morian** I can only laugh at the two of you fighting over a young lady who already has a husband! But listen to me, Saphonus, I think it would be best if your brother, who is the elder, takes Andronica and you find yourself another – there are Roman women far lovelier than Andronica!

**Saphonus** No, my dear Morian, that’s impossible, for I am far too much in love with Andronica and shall never give her up. So let’s fight.

_Saphonus starts attacking his brother again; Morian intervenes._

**Morian** No, not so! Listen further. What do you think, Helicates, of giving up Andronica and finding yourself another – the best in all of Rome? I’ll help to get her for you.

**Helicates** No, I cannot give her up – I am too much in love with her. So let’s fight and not relent till one of us is killed.

_They attack one another. Morian separates them forcibly._

**Morian** What the devil! Are you so determined to fight? Once more I advise you to be content or, indeed, I’ll beat you both until you howl. Now, listen again to what I have to say, and if you remain unsatisfied, then

---

83 **elder** Morian echoes Helicates’ earlier claim as the elder brother (40–1). Aaron does not favour one brother’s claim over the other’s.

84 **find ... another** This corresponds to Demetrius’ suggestion to Chiron, ‘learn thou to make some meaner choice’ (1.1.572). However, where Demetrius instructs his brother to find a _less_ attractive woman, Morian goes on to suggest that there are, in fact, _more_ attractive women in Rome.

88 SD–95 SD In _T4_ there is nothing to suggest that the brothers attempt to fight one another physically again. The second scuffle in _Tito_ may be for the benefit of spectacle.
I don’t know what else I can do. If neither of you wants to give her up, don’t lose your lives over it. I’ll help you take her husband’s life, and then both of you may have her and satisfy yourselves.

HELICATES My dear Morian, this pleases me; assist us in this purpose.

SAPHONUS I am also content with this.

MORIAN Then follow me, my lords, and let’s consider how to go about the matter. [Exeunt.]

3.[1] Enter EMPEROR and AETIOPissa, also TITO ANDRONICO.

TITO Great and mighty Emperor, I have arranged a fine stag-hunt for tomorrow in honour of your Majesty and your beloved Empress, and I humbly ask your

104–5 My . . . purpose This respectful form of address is markedly different from Chiron’s response to Aaron: ‘Thy counsel, lad, smells of no cowardice’ (1.1.632).

107 let’s consider In TA, Aaron makes his plan known before the stage is cleared: the brothers are to ‘strike [Lavinia] home by force’ (1.1.618) during the hunt the next day. In Tito their eventual attack on Andronica is instigated by their mother, following their chance encounter with her in the forest on the day of the hunt (3.3). Much later in the play, we find out about Morian, Helicates and Saphonus’ unsuccessful plot against Andronica and her Husband (7.1.55–60).

3.1 This very brief scene parallels TA, 1.1.496–9 and looks ahead to TA, 2.1.14–15. In TA the hunt takes place on the day after the opening scene (cf. 1.1.496). In Tito, we later find out that, following 2.1, Morian, Helicates and Saphonus plotted together that Morian was to kill Andronica’s Husband, but that he ‘never had the opportunity to do so’ (7.1.59–60), which suggests that some time elapses between Acts 2 and 3.

1–6 Great . . . pleasure In TA the invitation is offered to Saturninus before the arrangements for the hunt are made: ‘Tomorrow, and it please your majesty / To hunt the panther and the hart with me, / With horn and hound we’ll give your grace bonjour’ (1.1.496–8). The point in the scene at which the offer is made in TA fits in with the conciliatory tone that follows the violence and quarrels earlier in the same scene. It is less clear why Tito should arrange a hunt after the Emperor’s flippant rejection of Andronica. He explains later in the play that he was hoping to ‘increase [his] favour with the Emperor’ (5.1.35).

2 stag-hunt Tito does not have TA’s exotic panthers (1.1.497), which were of course not hunted in the Roman woods (although they may have been imported for the circus; see Barton, 57).
Majesty and the lovely Empress to arrive at the hunt in the early hours and spend the day in joy and pleasure.

**EMPEROR** Dear Tito Andronico, I shall set out at an early hour with my beautiful Empress and be present at the hunt. But tell me, will many Romans ride with us?

**TITO** Yes, most mighty Emperor, there will be a considerable number, including my brother, Victoriades Brutus, and the husband of my daughter, Andronica.

**EMPEROR** Very well then, my dear Tito Andronico. We shall prepare ourselves for the occasion. Exeunt.

---

[3.2] *Morning dawns. The hunting horns and trumpets are sounded.*

**Enter TITO ANDRONICO.**

**TITO** How sweetly and pleasantly the birds sing in the air, each seeking his sustenance; the hunt has begun...
in delight and splendour. Yet my heart is troubled and heavy, for last night I had a most frightening dream and do not know what it may portend. Now I must ride to the Emperor, who attends the hunt. Exit.

[3.3] Enter ANDRONICA, hand in hand with her HUSBAND. Also enter AETIOPISSA, walking towards them. The hunters sound their horns.

ANDRONICA Dearest husband, in all my days, I have never seen a finer and merrier hunt.

HUSBAND I too, my lovely wife, can say in truth that I have been at many hunts but never a merrier or more joyful one. But what extraordinary thing do I behold! The Empress walks alone and comes quickly towards us.

of the birds is commented on by Tamora when she is alone in the woods with Aaron: ‘The birds chant melody on every bush’ (2.2.12); she also refers to ‘sweet melodious birds’ (2.2.27).

3–5 Yet . . . portend Cf. Titus: ‘I have been troubled in my sleep this night’ (TA, 2.1.9). Tito comments later in the play: ‘the frightful dream I had the night before the hunt foretold this misfortune’ (5.1.37–8).

SD The German text adds ‘etc.’ after ‘Gehet weg’ (i.e., exit). The meaning of ‘etc.’ here is unclear. See 4.1.23–4 and 5.2.65–6 and notes.

3.3 largely corresponds to TA 2.2, although there is no equivalent to Aaron’s scheme to blame the murder of Bassianus on Quintus and Martius. Whereas the encounter of Morian and Aetiopissa is placed at the end of the scene, that of Aaron and Tamora occurs early on (2.2.10–50). In TA, Bassianus first addresses Tamora (2.2.55–9), whereas the Husband remains silent in Tito after Aetiopissa has entered, and only Andronica speaks with her. The conversation is quite different in the two plays: in TA, Tamora’s indiscretion with Aaron is brought to light (2.2.67–83), whereas Andronica expresses no awareness of the secret relationship between Aetiopissa and Morian.

0.1 hand in hand The equivalent SD in TA does not provide this detail, although physical intimacy between Lavinia and her husband is suggested in the allusion to the consummation of the newlyweds’ marriage (2.1.14–17).

0.3 The . . . horns See 3.2.0.1–2 and note.
Aetiopissa approaches them.

AETIOPISSA I am amazed, Andronica, to see you walking alone with your husband like this. Have you not a thousand knights and footmen that follow and serve you?

ANDRONICA Fair Empress, I ask you the same: why do you walk alone and have no crowd of servants waiting upon you? But I take your mockery to be nothing but a trifle, and, as it comes from you, I put up with it easily. I trust that if it were necessary I could summon a thousand knights and foot-soldiers as readily as you.

AETIOPISSA Andronica, since you ask so impudently and craftily why I am walking alone thus, let me tell you that it is because I want to do so. But a question for you: how is it that you answer me with such insolence and defiance? Am I not your Empress and do you not know how much you ought to honour me? Do not think that I shall let this rest!

ANDRONICA Indeed, Empress, if one shouts into the woods then one will hear an echo, and as you

8–40 In Tito, Andronica and her husband say nothing of the Empress’ adultery (unlike Lavinia and Bassianus in TA, 2.2.51–88). The present quarrel is, then, necessary to explain Aetiopissa’s later cruelty to Andronica. Fredén (368) argues that in Tito, unlike in TA, the quarrel is poorly motivated, but Aetiopissa’s haughtiness along with her discomfort at being surprised alone in the forest may provide some basis for it.

8–11 I . . . you? The speech recalls Bassianus’ feigned surprise at finding Tamora alone in the forest, having just witnessed Aaron’s departure from the scene (2.2.55–9). In Tito, however, the Husband’s surprise at finding Aetiopissa alone seems genuine. Late in the play, Morian explains to Vespasianus why Aetiopissa was alone in the forest: ‘your father, Tito Andronico, held a great stag-hunt . . . the Empress walked alone in search of me to satisfy her lust’ (7.1.61–5).

15–16 nothing . . . easily In TA it is Tamora who tells Lavinia, ‘Why, I have patience to endure all this’ (2.2.88).

23–5 Am . . . rest Like Aetiopissa, Tamora asserts her rank, calling Bassianus ‘Saucy controller of my private steps’ (2.2.60).

26–7 if . . . echo (‘wie man ins Holz ruffet, also kriegt man ein Wiederschall’) proverbial (Wander, ‘Holz’).
questioned me with a haughty spirit, I will answer you in a similar manner. Although you are indeed the Empress, I shall not grovel at your feet. Remember that you were first my father’s prisoner, and now that you have become an empress you do not know how to control your pride. So continue in your pride, and let me remain as I am. I wonder, what good has this city of Rome received from you and yours? And what benefits from my father and mine? Indeed, had he not fought with his valorous hands as he did, the imperial throne and all of Rome would long ago have been razed. Yet hurt me as much as you like if you can’t help it.

AETIOPISSA  O, my heart will burst within me! Get out of my sight, you damned creature! If I am unable to punish your arrogance, I shall kill myself! I swear by all the gods that I shall neither eat nor drink nor lay

28 haughty  (‘hoffertigen’) echoing the play’s full title, Eine sehr klägliche Tragadìa von Tito Andronico vnd der hoffertigen Käyserin (A Very Lamentable Tragedy of Tito Andronico and the Haughty Empress). The same epithet is used for Aetiopissa by Tito (4.3.10, 19, 79; 8.2.47), Vespasianus (7.1.13, 96) and even Morian (7.1.49). In the chapbook, Attava, the Goth Queen, is called ‘an imperious Woman, and of a haughty Spirit’ (38). The adjective ‘haughty’ is not applied to Tamora.

30–1 Remember … prisoner Lavinia reminds Tamora of her former captivity later in the scene, when threatened with rape, begging her to have pity ‘for my father’s sake, / That gave thee life when well he might have slain thee’ (2.2.158–9).

41 heart … burst a recurrent conceit, used elsewhere by Tito (4.3.61, 5.1.1–2 and 8.2.40) and Vespasianus (8.2.63).

41–6 In TA, Tamora’s last speech before her sons enter (or possibly prompted by their entrance) is simply, ‘Why, I have patience to endure all this’ (2.2.88). Aetiopissa is unaware of her sons’ plan to rape Andronica, whereas Tamora has been apprised of it earlier in the scene, so her smug response makes sense.
my head to rest until I have taken my fill of vengeance and triumphed joyfully over you.

*She steps away.*

*Enter her two sons* HELICATES and SAPHONUS, *who come to her: Andronica speaks aside with her Husband.*

**HELICATES** Gracious mother, we are amazed that you are all alone and wandering away from the others. But we are even more surprised to find you so troubled and melancholy.

**AETIOPISSA** O my dear sons, open your ears, listen to my words, and know that I was walking not far from here, where Andronica was with her husband; she assailed me with scornful and jeering words, enough to drive me frantic and insane. Therefore, come and take revenge on her; be ruthless with her, and, if you love me, kill her husband by her side. If you fail to do

46 SD1 *She . . . away* The German SD reads ‘Gehet ein Schritt sex fort’ (in 1620 and 1624). ‘Sex’ was an accepted spelling for ‘sechs’, that is, six, so translated literally, the sentence means ‘Walks a step six away’, perhaps meaning *walks about six steps away* (Kaufuß-Diesch, 65, 73). Brennecke translates ‘She walks six paces away’, which makes sense of ‘sex’ but seems an awkwardly precise direction. Lippner translated, ‘She walks a little further’.

46 SD2–64 Two conversations take place during this episode on two sides of the stage, one heard by the audience, the other not. Andronica and her Husband, ‘aside’ (46.3), are clearly unaware of what Aetiopissa and her sons are saying, and the two brothers do not even know where Andronica and her Husband are (see 61–2). In *TA* the brothers simply enter to the other characters (2.2.88 SD).

48–50 **But . . . melancholy** Demetrius’ first speech after his entrance ends with a similar expression of surprise: ‘Why doth your highness look so pale and wan?’ (2.2.90).

51 **listen** (*observiret*) a Latinism.

51–5 **O . . . insane** Whereas Aetiopissa gives her sons a biased account of what really happened, Tamora concocts a fictitious story of how she was lured to a dismal pit in the forest and threatened by Bassianus and Lavinia (2.2.91–115). See note at 4.1.5–8.

55–9 **Therefore . . . sons** Tamora’s equivalent speech ends similarly: ‘Revenge it as you love your mother’s life, / Or be ye not henceforth called my children’ (2.2.114–15).

57 **kill . . . husband** There is no explicit command to slay Bassianus in *TA*. Since the Husband in *Tito* remains silent during Andronica’s dialogue with Aetiopissa yet still needs to be disposed of for the sake of the plot, the instruction is necessary to clarify the action.
so, I will curse you and never more take you to be my sons.

HELICATES and SAPHONUS Gracious mother, we are willing to obey you. Only come and show us where they are, so that I can take his life immediately.

AETIOPISSA Well then, follow me, and have no mercy on them.

_They go to Andronica and her Husband. Helicates draws his sword._

HELICATES Here we find you both. You have lived far too long.

_Stabs him._

[HUSBAND] O, murder, murder!

[Dies.]

ANDRONICA Alas! Alas! Will no-one cry out and denounce this murderous deed?

_She goes to sit on the ground with the corpse._

AETIOPISSA Look, you haughty woman! How do you like this? What do you think, have I not kept the oath

---

60 SP 1620 reads ‘Söhne’ (‘Sons’) and so does not clarify how the characters share the speech.

61–2 Only . . . are See note above, 46 SD2–64.

66 SD The elder brother commits the murder, whereas in TA both sons stab Bassianus in turn (2.2.116–17).

67 SP The SP is missing in 1620 and 1624; we follow Lippner in assigning the speech to Andronica’s Husband, although it is possible that Andronica is the speaker.
I swore? Indeed, this is but a trifle! I will tame you so that you will lie at my feet, and I will tread on your corpse. I will murder your entire kin, including your parents and brothers, and shall prevail upon my gracious Lord Emperor with cunning and guile to let them all die a miserable death. I am your mortal enemy, haughty woman, and it is impossible for me to see you live any longer. [to Saphonus] Therefore, my dear son, give me your sword so that I myself may take away her life.

She attempts to take his sword.

SAPHONUS  Dearest mother, I can perform this act, so think about it first.

ANDRONICA  O, you most merciless woman! Is there no spark of pity in you? Should my father learn of this, his vengeance would be grim beyond your reckoning; he would leave no stone upon another but tear down the very earth on which you stand. Alas, you haughty Empress, have pity on me and take

---

74–5 murder ... brothers corresponds to Tamora: ‘Ne’er let my heart know merry cheer indeed / Till all the Andronici be made away’ (2.2.188–9).
75 parents (‘Väteren’) may stand for ‘kin’ more generally, since Andronica’s mother is not mentioned or alluded to elsewhere in the play.
77–8 mortal enemy (‘spinne feindt’) literally, spider enemy, an expression derived from the action of large spiders who devour smaller ones (see Grimm, ‘spinnefeind’).
79–81 Therefore ... life recalls Tamora: ‘Give me the poniard. You shall know, my boys, / Your mother’s hand shall right your mother’s wrong’ (2.2.120–1).
82–3 At the equivalent point in TA, Demetrius and Chiron suggest raping Lavinia before murdering her (2.2.122–30); in Tito, rape is suggested by Aetiopissa later in the scene (101–5).
84 you Here Andronica switches from using the formal form of address (‘sie’) to the informal (‘du’). Her use of ‘sie’ before this point contrasts with Aetiopissa’s insistence on ‘du’ when addressing Andronica throughout the scene.
89–90 have ... now This plea comes before any threat of rape is verbalized in Tito (although Aetiopissa’s later reference to her sons’ ‘great urge for lustful pleasure and ... libidinous sap’ (102–3) may suggest that unscripted stage action is making their

SD] this edn; not in 1620
my life now, for I cannot live on; it brings me infernal anguish.

AETIOPISSA Indeed, I believe it is so. Your father and brothers do not fight in the manner of men but more furiously than devils, and if they knew of this, they would tear down to the ground the whole of Rome, with its imperial palace, and rage like fierce lions. But I must prevent this from happening, and consider how to keep them from finding out. Since I now hear that to live any longer is infernal anguish for you, and that you cannot think of anything more terrible, I shall let you live on for a while. And you, my dear sons, I know you have a great urge for lustful pleasure and are full of libidinous sap. So I give her to you; go with her to the most frightful place in these woods and take your fill of pleasure with her and use her so harshly that she no longer resembles a human being. But if you have mercy on her, remember that my anger will be unleashed on you and promise little good.

[HELICATES and SAPHONUS] Gracious mother, we shall obey your command.

They go to Andronica, attempting to lift her up and take her away.

ANDRONICA O, is there no help? O, is there no pity? I beg you, leave me, and take my life!
AETIOPISSA  No, I shall certainly have no pity on you. Now, sons, take her out of my sight.

They take her away and go into the forest with her.

Enter MORIAN.

MORIAN  I see a wonder of all wonders! What the devil does this mean, Empress, that you walk alone in the forest? The Emperor has ordered me to search for you.

AETIOPISSA  My faithful paramour, do not be amazed and angry because I had a desire to walk alone; I shall return with you to the Emperor presently. But, my dearest paramour, we are now quite alone in this fine and delightful forest, and I have a great appetite for the sport of Venus. So let me sport with you and make merry.

MORIAN  No, lovely Empress, even though the goddess Venus is tempting you to her games, I am ruled and mastered by the god Mars. Therefore, this cannot be, and you may not have my body at this time. So let us now go to the Emperor, who has been waiting for you for a long time.

Exeunt.
4.[1] Enter TITO ANDRONICO, VESPASIANUS and VICTORIADES. They stand, dejected.

TITO O, dearest ones, it troubles my heart that the Emperor has put my sons in prison. I have no idea what the cause may be. I have written to the Emperor, asking him the reason for my sons’ sudden imprisonment; he has answered that my sons are prisoners of the Empress, that they have grossly offended her, insulted her with mockery and libels, and therefore must die a swift death. It would cause me great pain and anguish to see my own flesh and blood executed. But whom do I see coming towards me? The Empress’ Morian!

Enter MORIAN to Tito Andronico.

MORIAN God speed you, old Tito Andronico! Have hope and be of good cheer; I bring you good news.

4.1 The opening speech has no correspondence in TA, where Titus’ sons Quintus and Martius are imprisoned because of their alleged murder of Bassianus, not for allegedly insulting Tamora. The rest of the scene is similar to TA, 3.1.151–206, but Aaron conveys to Titus the Emperor’s request for a severed hand after the mutilated Lavinia has been discovered, whereas in Tito Morian arrives with his message before Andronica is found. Tito does not dramatize the procession with Titus’ bound sons to the place of execution, nor the pleas of the distraught protagonist to the tribunes and senators (TA, 3.1.1–58).

5–8 he . . . death The fact that the brothers are imprisoned and sentenced to death due to Aetioissa’s (presumably untrue) report of their insults contributes to the play’s depiction of her as the principal antagonist. Note that her allegations against Tito’s sons mirror those against Andronica at 3.3.53–5, where Aetioissa goes on to announce that she will eliminate Andronica’s ‘entire kin, including your parents and brothers’ (3.3.74–5). In Aran en Titus, Thamera falsely claims that two of Titus’ sons abused her in the forest, where they pulled her hair and called her a whore (Buitendijk, ll. 761–72). The 1656 programme notes that Aran and the Empress concoct a story about the latter being antagonized by two disguised persons in the forest, whom Aran pursues and recognizes as Titus’ sons (2.7). For the 1699 programme, see Cohn, ‘Breslau’, 280.

12–13 Aaron is more direct in delivering the message: ‘Titus Andronicus, my lord the emperor / Sends thee this word’ (TA, 3.1.151–2).

4.[1] this edn, Actus Quartus 1620
TITO You have my thanks, Morian. Say, what news do you bring?

MORIAN The Empress has sent me to tell you that if you love your sons and want to save them from death, you should cut off your right hand and send it to her by me. Then they shall be sent back to you immediately.

TITO O my dear Morian, what good news you bring me! No, if the Empress desired both my hands I would gladly cut them off. I shall cut off my hand and give it to you.

VICTORIADES Dearest brother, I beg you, let me cut off my hand, for it would be a great shame for you to cut off your noble hand!

16 Empress Aaron claims he is sent by the Emperor (TA, 3.1.151), although his comments later in the play suggest otherwise (5.1.111–20). In Tito the command clearly does come from Aetiopissa (see 5.2.4–10). In the chapbook, Attava is said to have ‘sent the Moor in the Emperor’s Name’ (41).

16–18 if you . . . hand The instruction in TA is less specific: ‘Let Marcus, Lucius, or thyself, old Titus, / Or any one of you, chop off your hand’ (3.1.153–4). There is an unresolved contradiction between Morian’s request for Tito’s hand, and the subsequent argument between Tito, Vespasianus and Victoriades about who is to cut off his hand (in keeping with TA, 3.1.163–86). If Tito and TA both derive from an earlier Titus play (see Introduction, pp. 36–40), then it seems likely that the reason for the argument (i.e. that the protagonist, his son and his brother are left to choose whose hand should be cut off) was in that earlier play but was accidentally removed in the process of adaptation that led to Tito. See also Fredén, 369–70.

21–4 Titus is equally enthusiastic about the proposal: ‘With all my heart I’ll send the emperor my hand’ (TA, 3.1.161). Unlike Tito, TA may have prepared the audience for the protagonist’s response through his earlier affirmation, upon seeing his mutilated daughter, that he is willing to ‘chop off [his] hands too’ (3.1.73).

23–4 give . . . you. The German text adds ‘etc.’ at the end of the speech. The meaning of the expression is unclear here. See 3.2.6 and 5.2.65–6 and notes.

25–7 Dearest . . . hand! In TA it is Lucius who initially offers to sacrifice his hand in place of his father, to which Marcus responds ‘Which of your hands hath not defended Rome / . . . / O, none of both but are of high desert. / My hand hath been but idle: let it serve’ (3.1.168–72). This distinction is important because Marcus is a tribune, and there is no evidence to suggest that he has ever engaged in military combat like Titus and his warlike sons. In Tito it is unclear whether Victoriades holds a civic or military rank, and he does not refer to his ‘idle’ hand.
Tito Andronico

VESPASIANUS   O, dearest father, I implore you, let me chop off my hand, for they are my dearest brothers!
TITO   No, my dearest brother, and my dear son, neither of you shall give up your hand; that is for me to do.

They fall on their knees before him.

VICTORIADES   Dearest brother, we kneel before you and implore you to leave your hand unhurt, and to let me cut off my hand.
TITO   Rise and do not kneel before me. As you plead so earnestly, I must yield against my will. Decide amongst yourselves who shall lose his hand.
VICTORIADES   Yes, dearest brother, let us draw lots for it. Let us go within and fetch an axe. He who gets the lot shall cut off his hand immediately for the sake of us all.

Exeunt Victoriades and Vespasianus.
TITO   No, now I’ll outwit you both, for whilst you draw lots and fetch an axe, I’ll cut off my hand. Exit.

25–41 The passage is quite close to TA, although it is notable that Lucius and Marcus there have four pairs of successive speeches (3.1.163–86), whereas in Tito Victoriades has three speeches and there is only one by Vespasianus.
28–9 Lucius similarly appeals to brotherhood when asking his father, ‘Let me redeem my brothers both from death’ (TA, 3.1.181). On the other hand, Vespasianus does not, like Lucius, comment on the advantage of being younger: ‘My youth can better spare my blood than you, / And therefore mine shall save my brothers’ lives’ (3.1.166–7).
32 SD not in TA. The act of kneeling in Tito is an effective way of condensing and intensifying the pleas.
39 let . . . it This detail is not in TA, where Lucius and Marcus exit the stage without deciding whose hand shall be sacrificed or how the decision will be made.
43 I’ll . . . hand In TA, Titus asks Aaron to help him cut off his hand: ‘Lend me thy hand and I will give thee mine’ (3.1.188). It may be fitting that Aaron severs the hand, given that he is the play’s principal villain, unlike Morian (see Introduction, p. 12).
43 SD Tito cuts off his hand offstage, perhaps because it would have been difficult to stage. In TA, the corresponding SD has Aaron cut off Titus’ hand (3.1.192 SD1), but in Aran en Titus Titus also cuts off his own hand (Buitendijk, ll. 1256–84).
MORIAN  Now, if that’s called deceit, this is how the devil deceives his dam. Yet even though I have a pitiless heart, I pity you, old Tito Andronico, for the Empress tricks you out of your hand so that you’ll be unable to overthrow Rome. When you think you’ll receive your sons, you’ll only get their heads.

Enter TITO with his hand cut off. Also enter VICTORIADES and VESPASIANUS.

VESPASIANUS  Gracious father, I’ve won, so now I may
– Alas! Alas, why have you cut off your hand? This is indeed a piteous sight, dearest father!

TITO  Please say no more, for it is done. – Look here, Morian, take this hand of mine to the Empress and bring my dear sons back to me immediately.

MORIAN  Well, adieu. [aside] I shall indeed bring back something of them.  

Exeunt.

44–5 this . . . devil ‘so pfleget der Teufel seine Mutter zu vexiren’, corrected to ‘Mutter zu vexiren’ in 1624. Literally, ‘this is how the devil is wont to deceive his mother’, which here refers to Tito’s deception of his son and his brother. In TA, Aaron later refers to Tamora as ‘the devil’s dam’ (4.2.67). The devil and his mother (dam) is proverbial in German (Grimm, ‘Teufel’, m. II 3) as well as in English (Dent, D225).

45–8 Yet . . . Rome Morian’s pity sharply contrasts with Aaron’s admission that ‘this villainy / Doth fat [i.e., delight] me with the very thoughts of it’ (3.1.203–4).

48 you (‘du’) When he is alone onstage Morian uses the informal form of address. When he addresses Tito directly he uses the formal ‘sie’.

48–9 When . . . heads The equivalent of Morian’s soliloquy is dramatized in TA as a speech by Aaron addressed to Titus, followed by an aside: ‘Look by and by to have thy sons with thee. / [aside] Their heads I mean’ (3.1.202–3).

50–2 In TA, Lucius and Marcus do not verbalize their reaction to Titus’ severed hand.

54 take . . . Empress Titus asks Aaron to ‘give his majesty my hand’ (TA, 3.1.194).

56–7 I . . . them This is a veiled reference to his earlier mention of the heads (49). In TA, Aaron makes one such reference, also in an aside (3.1.203).
[4.2] Enter HELICATES and SAPHONUS, with ANDRONICA between them, coming from the forest. Having satisfied their lust upon her and horribly mutilated her, they have cut off both her hands and torn out her tongue.

HELICATES This is what a man must do when he has had sex with a beautiful woman to stop her revealing it. He must cut off her tongue so that she can say nothing, and cut off both her hands so that she can write nothing, as we have done with this one. But what shall we do with her now? We must leave her in this wild forest to be torn in pieces by savage beasts.

4.2 parallels TA 2.3. The initial sequence with Chiron and Demetrius (2.3.1–10) has its equivalent in a single speech by Helicates (1–9), while Marcus’ long speech (2.3.11–57) has its equivalent in the much shorter speech by Victoriades (10–16). Tito differs from TA by its lack of reference to classical mythology; it does not invoke Ovid’s tale of Philomel and has none of the poetic language that characterizes Marcus’ description of his niece.

0.1–2 with . . . them In the German text, the SD ends by mentioning that the brothers ‘haben sie zwischen sich’ (i.e., have her between them); we transfer this indication to the beginning of the SD to clarify the staging. Lippner and Brennecke mistakenly believed that ‘sie’ is not the third-person singular feminine pronoun (i.e. her) but the third-person plural pronoun (i.e. them), and that it refers not to Andronica but to her severed hands and tongue.

Lippner: ‘Having also barbarously mutilated her, cut off both her hands, and torn out her tongue, they now bring them with them’; Brennecke: ‘They have cut off both her hands and torn out her tongue, which they carry with them’. However, the next SD (9 SD2) clarifies that when the brothers exit, ‘Andronica bleibt alleine’ (‘Andronica remains alone’), which implies that they earlier entered with her, not just with her severed body parts.

0.4–5 torn out Andronica’s tongue has been ‘torn out’ according to this SD but ‘cut off’ according to Helicates (2). Morian later says that the brothers ‘tore out’ (7.1.81) the tongue.

6–7 We . . . beasts In TA there is no plan to dispose of Lavinia in this way. After Chiron mockingly tells her to go home and wash her hands (2.3.6), Demetrius adds, ‘And so let’s leave her to her silent walks (2.3.8).
Come, dear brother, let us go. – Now farewell, Andronica, farewell.

*Exeunt Helicates and Saphonus.*

*Andronica remains alone, sighing and looking wretchedly up to heaven.*

*Presently enter her uncle VICTORIADES, who sees her; but when she sees him, she flees into the forest.*

VICTORIADES  Alas, alas! What great affliction do I find here! Andronica, but no longer resembling a human being. O, do not hide from me.

*He runs within and brings her back.*

O, you poor creature, who has abused you with such malice and barbarity? Alas, your tongue is torn out; both your hands are cut off. O, alas, this would rouse a stone to pity! O, come with me, do not remain here.

*Exeunt.*

---

9 SD2 *Andronica . . . heaven* This is another SD with no equivalent in *TA*. See Introduction, p. 6.

9 SD3 *uncle* ‘Vater’ (father) in 1620 and 1624 must be a misprint for ‘Vetter’, which today means ‘cousin’ but in early modern German could mean ‘uncle’ (Grimm, ‘Vetter’, 1).

9 SD3 *when . . . forest* In *TA*, Lavinia similarly attempts to flee from her uncle who says, ‘Who is this – my niece that flies away so fast?’ (2.3.11).

12 SD Modern editors of *TA* have suggested that Lavinia ‘turns’ to Marcus (Ard’) or that ‘either he blocks her escape or she is too weak and disoriented to get away’ (*NOS*). But in *Tito*, Andronica does get away; she is pursued by her uncle who ‘brings her back’.

15–16 *this . . . pity* The reference to a stone may anticipate the next scene, where Tito laments to the stone (4.3.63–5). In *TA*, Marcus makes no mention of a stone.
Enter TITO ANDRONICO and VESPASIANUS. Also enter MORIAN, who brings the heads of both sons and Tito’s hand.

MORIAN Behold, old Tito, I pity you, for you have been tricked out of your noble and valiant hand. The Empress sends it back to you. And here are the heads of your sons.

*Lays them down before him.* Tito and Vespasianus are struck dumb with horror and stand as though lifeless.

Now I shall go. If you let this rest, the Empress will destroy you and your kin with affliction and treachery, and thus put you out of the way. Exit.

4.3 Apart from Tito’s long speech, the first part of this scene (1–54) remains close to TA, 3.1.235–301, except that Morian, not a messenger, brings the severed heads. The second part of the scene (55–86), where Andronica is brought in by Victoriades, corresponds to an earlier passage in TA (3.1.59–150). Tito’s order of these episodes is identical with that in the chapbook, which places the mutilation of Titus before Lavinia’s rape and discovery by her uncle.

1–4 In TA, a Messenger delivers the message along with the severed heads, not Aaron. Whereas the Messenger tells Titus, ‘ill art thou repaid’ (3.1.235), without specifying by whom, Morian affirms Aetiopissa’s responsibility for the devious plot, which she later confirms (see 5.2.7–12). In Titus und Tomyris, Aran also delivers the hand, whilst in Vos’ Aran en Titus (and the 1656 programme), it is Aran’s page, Quintus (a Moor), who does so.

5 If ... rest (*‘wirstu aber dieses also darbey bleiben lassen’) Morian’s affirmation that the Empress will punish Tito if he lets things rest may seem surprising. Lippner inserts a tentative emendation: ‘if you rest (not?) satisfied with this the Empress will exterminate you and your stock’. Brennecke emends more confidently: ‘if you will not be content with this ...’. Our translation follows the German text because its reading is defensible. Morian, who was earlier moved to pity by Tito, may be giving sincere advice by warning Tito against inaction. Alternatively, Morian may be provoking Tito to retaliate in the hope of precipitating his downfall. What is at stake in this crux is the conception of Morian’s character, on which there are differing views.

4.3] *this edn, not in 1620*
TITO O, O, O, let there be an outcry for you, bloodthirsty and treacherous woman! Was there ever a more perfidious, haughty, and bloodthirsty woman than this detestable Empress? O, I could spit at myself because I let her live and did not cut her throat when she was my prisoner. – O, you most ruthless and ungrateful woman, how is it that the stars in heaven are not your enemies? Even brute beasts will wail and lament with me. – O you heavenly gods, you cannot suffer such iniquity. Ah, grant me the wit and cunning to consider shrewdly how to take a double vengeance on the haughty Empress. – O you damnable creature, how maliciously you have robbed me of my hand.

Takes the hand up from the ground.

Yes, you valiant hand, how have you been repaid for your faithful service? – O ungrateful Rome, this hand often saved you from cruel enemies. Yes, had it not been so, you would have been razed long ago, and no Roman would still be spoken of. O noble hand, how often did you have to fight against a thousand hands;

---

8 let . . . outcry (‘zeter vnd mordio’) The German expression is a cry for help (Grimm, ‘Zeter’, m. 1), similar to the now archaic English expression ‘hue and cry’.
8–20 This passage is important for presenting Aetiopissa as Tito’s nemesis (see Introduction, p. 12).
8–35 Tito’s long speech, in which he successively apostrophizes Aetiopissa, the gods, his hand, Rome and his sons’ heads, has no equivalent in TA, where the protagonist responds with a rhetorical question – ‘When will this fearful slumber have an end?’ (3.1.253) – and laughter: ‘Ha, ha, ha!’ (3.1.265).
12 cut her throat proleptically announces his killing of Aetiopissa’s sons in 7.3.
16–19 O . . . Empress Tito does not dramatize the protagonist’s shooting of arrows with messages to the gods, but the present appeal to the gods resembles the following passage in that scene: ‘We will solicit heaven and move the gods / To send down Justice for to wreak our wrongs’ (TA, 4.3.51–2).
21 how . . . repaid TA’s Messenger who brings Titus his hand expresses a similar sentiment: ‘ill art thou repaid’ (3.1.235).
22 ungrateful Rome Titus uses the same phrase in the arrow-shooting scene (TA, 4.3.17). See the note at 16–19 above.
26 a . . . hands Hand synecdoches are frequent in TA but much rarer in Tito, so the present instance, with no equivalent in TA, is exceptional.
you were victorious in the most perilous, bloody wars. – Ah, my dear sons, what anguish and pain it gives me to see your heads lying in front of me like this. O, never shall you be laid to rest until I behold my enemies’ heads in front of me in the same way. Alas, alas, you fought valiantly and manfully for Rome, and inherited a brave heart from me. – But you, ungrateful Rome, how have you repaid them? O ungrateful Rome, how swiftly you hasten to your doom.

VESPASIANUS O dearest father, such tyranny and devilish ingratitude have not been heard of since the world began. I would not be worthy to tread upon the earth if I did not avenge it; and I can no longer hold back. Please, let me put on my armour and weapons, and give me a long, warlike sword for each hand, so that I may go to the palace and cut down all that comes in front of me. I shall fight not like a man but like a raging devil. No iron door will be impregnable, for I’ll assail and shatter it, and when I have slain the Emperor and the Empress, I’ll cut down the ungrateful Romans as long as I have strength and will, until I am struck down myself, as I no longer value my life.

29–31 O . . . me Compare the protagonist’s words in TA: ‘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 hath committed them’ (3.1.272–5). Tito speaks to the heads, whereas the heads ‘seem to speak’ to Titus. In Aran en Titus the heads may have spoken onstage (see Fuller, 31; Baldwin, 437; Braekman, 10.46).

36–48 Vespasianus’ fantasy of almost limitless power in solo revenge, which comes before he discovers his raped sister, is followed in the next scene by his pledge ‘by the god Mars’ (5.1.69) to gain revenge after raising an army. In TA, Lucius promises revenge in a soliloquy at the end of 3.1.

38–9 I . . . back In TA, Lucius articulates his desire for revenge in a similar conditional sentence: ‘If Lucius live, he will requite your wrongs / . . . / To be revenged on Rome and Saturnine’ (3.1.297–301).
TITO  No, dearest son, it is impossible, you would not get into the palace alive. You are now my only dearest son. We must consider wisely how to avenge ourselves. Although I have only one hand, I shall do plenty of harm and damage with it. But you, dearest son, you must do your best.

Enter VICTORIADES, leading ANDRONICA.

VICTORIADES  O dearest brother, look at this, the most dreadful spectacle that you ever saw. Here is your daughter Andronica, whom I found in the forest, her tongue torn out and both her hands cut off.

Tito is struck with horror; he shudders and trembles, overcome with distress.

VESPASIANUS  Alas, alas!

He falls to the ground in a swoon. Victoriades approaches the heads and weeps bitterly. Tito falls to his knees.

49  No . . . impossible In TA, Young Lucius (who has no equivalent in Tito) imagines immediate revenge ‘with my dagger in their bosoms’ (4.1.118), and Titus’ tempering response is not unlike Tito’s present answer to Vespasianus: ‘No boy, not so; I’ll teach thee another course’ (4.1.119).

50–1 my . . . son In TA, Lucius is likewise Titus’ only remaining son, although Titus does not point this out in the equivalent scene. In the absence of a character equivalent to Young Lucius, Vespasianus is the character on whom all hope for the future hangs, as these words stress. See also Tito’s words to his son at 5.1.80–1: ‘In you I place all my hope’.

52–3 Although . . . it Titus does not refer to his remaining hand until later, when he is about to kill Chiron and Demetrius: ‘This one hand yet is left to cut your throats’ (TA, 5.2.181).

56–8 Here . . . off Victoriades narrates and describes the spectacle, which contrasts with Marcus’ powerfully simple ‘This was thy daughter’ (3.1.63).

58 SD Tito’s shuddering and trembling has no equivalent in TA, where Titus instead calls Lucius a ‘faint-hearted boy’ (3.1.66) because of his strong reaction.

59 SD He . . . swoon Lucius’ response to the sight of his sister is ‘Ay me, this object kills me’, and in the subsequent line Titus asks him to ‘arise and look upon her’ (TA, 3.1.65–6). According to an added SD in Ard, Lucius ‘fall[s] to his knees’ (3.1.65 SD), whereas NOS comments that ‘Lucius must have sat, fallen, or knelt, or perhaps fainted at the sign of Lavinia’s injuries’. Tito supports the last possibility (see Introduction, p. 7).

59 SD Victoriades . . . bitterly Marcus is onstage when the messenger delivers the
TITO O! O great misfortune, how quickly you overtake me! It is a wonder that my heart does not burst out of my chest. O, murder! O, murder! These barbarous misdeeds! – Alas, alas, I lament to you, O stone, and although you cannot help me, at least you do not chide me and remain silent. I will lie here and will not cease my bitter laments until a great tide of tears pours from me. In winter I will melt the snow and frost with my tears. Alas, alas, these grim and overwhelming thoughts are too dismal!

*Rises and goes to Andronica.*

O you, my dearest daughter, who has torn out your tongue? I may well guess that you have been robbed of your chastity and had your tongue torn out so that you cannot denounce the villain, and your snow-white hands cut off so that you cannot reveal it in writing. Is it not so, dearest daughter? Alas, alas, you can say nothing.

*She sighs and nods her head.*

Perhaps you can tell me with signs that this is so.

heads of his nephews (*TA*, 3.1.235–41), but Victoriades is not and only discovers them at this point. The SD has no equivalent in *TA*.

61 heart . . . burst See note at 3.3.41.
62 murder . . . murder See 3.3.67 and note.
63–5 I . . . silent In *TA*, Titus tells his ‘sorrows to the stones’ (3.1.37) earlier in the play, when Quintus and Martius have been sentenced to death. Titus develops the conceit over a passage of some length (3.1.37–47).
65 I . . . lie In *TA*, Titus prostrates himself as he pleads with the Judges and Senators for his sons’ lives (3.1.11 SD).
67–2 I . . . chastity An implied SD, indicating that visual signs suggest Andronica’s loss of chastity.

70–6 O . . . nothing Tito is more active than Titus in attempting to ascertain the identity of the attacker(s). In *TA*, Lucius is the one who asks his sister, ‘who hath martyred thee?’ (3.1.82).
75 SD–77 SD These SDs are not in *TA*, where Lavinia has no scripted reaction to the questions by her father (3.1.67–8) and her brother (3.1.82, 88).
77 tell . . . signs corresponds to Titus’ observation that he understands her signs (3.1.144), although it is unclear whether the signs in *TA* are wholly imagined by Titus, or whether Lavinia makes some physical gesture or facial expression.
She nods her head once more.

But look, dearest daughter, here are the heads of your two brothers, which the haughty Empress caused to be cut off.

She stands appalled, moans and looks up to heaven, then goes to the heads and kisses them.

VICTORIADES O, this great unhappiness could move stones to pity. But what good does it do to stand here and weep? Let us all go in and consider how we can find out who has abused her thus.

TITO Yes, dearest brother, that is the best advice. Let us go in and have no rest until we have found them out.

Exeunt.

5.[1] Enter TITO ANDRONICO, ANDRONICA and VICTORIADES.

TITO Alas, alas, dearest daughter, my old heart is ready to burst in my breast as I see you so wretched before

SD No equivalent SD appears in the early editions of TA. Shortly after the messenger has set down the heads and Titus’ hand (3.1.241 SD), Marcus says, ‘Alas, poor heart, that kiss is comfortless’ (3.1.251). Editors have interpreted the line by inserting various SDs, suggesting, for instance, that Lavinia kisses Lucius, or Titus (Ard 3, 47), or that Lucius kisses a head (Ravenscroft). Bate suggests that Tito is an important witness to the likely performance of this moment in TA (see Ard 3, 47–8) and inserts a SD that is based on it: ‘Lavinia kisses the heads’ (3.1.250 SD). Note that Capell also had Lavinia kissing the heads, although he does not seem to have been aware of Tito.

weep an implied SD, though who weeps is not clarified. Titus weeps at the equivalent moment, and Lucius asks him to stop, whereupon Marcus offers him a handkerchief: ‘good Titus, dry thine eyes’ (TA, 3.1.139).

5.1 continues the action of the previous scene (see 0 SD n.): 4.3 ends as Andronica’s relatives wonder how to find out who mutilated her, and 5.1 dramatizes the solution. The scene largely corresponds to parts of TA, 4.1 (in which Lavinia reveals the identity of her rapists) and 4.3 (where the Clown is sent by Titus to the Emperor).

0 SD Three of the four characters who exited at the end of 4.3 re-enter (for the only other immediate re-entry, see 3.2.0.3 and note). Tito is an eight-act play, and there may have been a break between Acts 4 and 5.

1–2 heart . . . burst See note at 3.3.41.

5.1 this edn; Actus Quintus 1620
me. I have had such love and esteem for you all my life, I have reared you with such trouble and care! Yes, when I returned to Rome in triumph, my body greatly wounded by the enemy and suffering terrible pain, I would see you run cheerfully towards me with your lute to welcome me, and you would drive out painful sorrow and refresh my old heart with your sweet voice. But how will you pluck the lute now with which you rejoiced me? And how will you speak? You are robbed of all this. O, O, a terrible deed has been done upon you! O, alas, if only I knew who committed it and abused you so barbarously, I would have some peace. But it is impossible for you to reveal it. Look, here comes your brother. – Tell me, what do you bring?

*Enter VESPASIANUS with a basket of sand and a stick.*

**VESPSIANUS** Dearest father, I have some sand here, to enable my dearest sister Andronica to write with this stick and reveal who has maimed her so shamefully.

**TITO** O, dearest son, if she could bring it to light in this way then I would find a little peace for my sick old heart. Now pour the sand on the ground, and give her the stick.

*He pours the sand on the ground. Tito Andronico puts the staff between his daughter’s stumps.*

---

7–8 **see . . . welcome me** This reminiscence of familial tenderness is not in *TA*. Marcus mentions Lavinia’s skilful lute playing when he finds her earlier in the play (2.3.45).

17 **SD In TA no basket of sand or stick are brought in.** Marcus finds a suitable part of the ground on which to write – ‘This sandy plot is plain’ (4.1.69) – a task he carries out with ‘his staff’ (4.1.68.1). Lucius, being banished, is absent from the scene.

18–20 **Vespasianus initiates the revelation of Andronica’s rapists,** whereas in *TA* Lavinia initiates the process by using one of Young Lucius’ books to alert her family to the similarities between her and Ovid’s Philomel (4.1.30–58).

24 **SD In TA, Marcus offers Lavinia the staff** (4.1.73–6), and Titus has no active part in the action.
Look here, dearest daughter, and write with it in the sand the names of those who robbed you of your tongue and hands.

*She takes the stick and writes with it.*

O, dearest daughter, this is enough for me. There is ‘Helicates’ and also ‘hunt’. O, dearest daughter, did Helicates and Saphonus maim you at the recent hunt?

*Andronica inclines her head.*

Show me also, dearest daughter, is the Empress likewise to blame?

*Andronica nods her head.*

O, cursed be this hunt and the day on which it was held! I thought it would be a joyful occasion and that it would increase my favour with the Emperor, but now I see it has caused my greatest misfortune. O, the frightful dream I had the night before the hunt foretold this misfortune. Come now, if we must perish then hear me, dearest brother and dearest

26 **names of those** Earlier references to Andronica’s attacker were in the singular (which corresponds to TA, 2.3.26–50, 3.1.67, 69, 92 and 4.1.36). The present plural has its equivalent in TA, where Lavinia has gestured with her arms to indicate that ‘there were more than one’ attacker (4.1.38). In *Tito* the reason for the shift to the plural is unclear, as she only writes one name. Braekman commented on the passage that ‘the text is very corrupt’ (9.88).

29 **‘Helicates’ . . . ‘hunt’** corresponds to Lavinia’s writing of ‘*Stuprum – Chiron – Demetrius*’ (*TA*, 4.1.78).

29–30 **did . . . hunt?** corresponds to Marcus’ speech after both names have been written and read out: ‘What, what? The lustful sons of Tamora / Performers of this heinous bloody deed?’ (4.1.79–80). In *Tito*, however, only Helicates’ name has been written, and it is unclear why Tito assumes that Saphonus was also involved.

31–2 **Show . . . blame?** Titus does not ask about Tamora’s involvement, but he does demonstrate an awareness that taking revenge on Chiron and Demetrius will incur their mother’s wrath and invite retaliation (*TA*, 4.1.96–100).

38–54 **Come . . . grasp** Tito pronounces a call to arms, which is approved by his brother, whereas in *TA* Marcus calls for revenge and Titus warns him that they must proceed with care (4.1.83–100).
son, and listen closely to my words. We must prepare for perilous, bloody war and raise many soldiers to overthrow Rome and cause such ravage and ruin for them as was never heard before. Not one stone shall be left upon another. So let us all unite here and swear to our gods not to cease bloody, perilous warfare until Rome is overthrown and we have in our grasp the Emperor and the murderous Empress with her two damnable sons. Likewise, let us conclude no peace with them nor have pity on them, but treat them in the most cruel and dreadful way that can be imagined.

VICTORIADES  Dearest brother, I swear by all the gods in heaven not to cease my vengeance until we have the Empress and her sons in our grasp. I shall sell all my possessions and levy warlike men.

TITO  O, my dearest and faithful brother, how it makes me glad that you promise such great and powerful assistance. I will now swear never to cease my vengeance for as long as I live. First, I will swear by the warlike hand that once was mine, then by the heads of my sons, and then by my daughter.

52–5  **Dearest . . . men** While Marcus swears revenge along with Titus and Lucius (TA, 3.1.279 SD), he does not mention a pragmatic means of achieving it.

58–61  **SD I . . . rise** Whereas Tito swears by the various severed body parts and by Andronica, Titus invites his family to form a circle to swear to right their wrongs (TA, 3.1.276–9).

61  **SD** No equivalent SD appears in the early editions of TA. Bate argues that *Tito* may offer an insight into how the oath in TA would have been performed (see Introduction, p. 4, and Ard3, 46).

61.1  **dirge** (‘Klagelied’) a song of lament. While some of the entertainments in the Leipzig volume contain musical notation, there is none for *Tito*.

61.2  **the . . . heads** This suggests that the characters do not form a circle around *Tito*, as is the case in TA (3.1.277).

61.6–8  **approaches . . . others** that is, aligns the severed body parts with Andronica from whom body parts have also been severed.
Tito Andronico kneels and begins to sing a dirge; the others sit down by the heads. He takes up his hand, raises it, and looks to heaven, sighs, utters an oath, strikes his breast, and puts down the hand after having sworn. He then takes up the heads and swears by each of them in turn. Finally, he approaches Andronica and swears by her as before with the others. This done, they all rise.

Now that I have taken this oath and sworn, I shall sell all my property and goods so that my son may raise the bravest and most valiant men. Listen, dearest son, take all the vast store of my treasury; set out with it directly and enlist as many men as you can get.

VESPASIANUS   Dearest father, I am eager for it, and so I swear by the god Mars that I shall not cease my rage and fury until pale Death has triumphed over my heart. Now, farewell, beloved father, I go from here to raise brave men. Before long, you will hear the blast of trumpets and in this way know that I bring ruthless men who shall pillage, burn, and kill, like the god Mars himself. And so, farewell, farewell.

TITO   Dearest son, may the gods favour you. Although I have lost my hand, I hope that my dearest son will fight the better, for in the recent battle with the Moors

62–5 I shall . . . treasury In TA there is no indication of how Lucius is to finance the raising of an army (3.1.286), nor of Titus’ wealth. Tito’s plan to sell his property corresponds to the chapbook, where Titus ‘got together Friends, and sold whatever he had of value to hire Soldiers’ (36). See Introduction, p. 43.

68–76 Lucius’ final speech before he departs from Rome is a soliloquy that concludes the scene (3.1.289–301).

69, 75 god Mars the Roman god of war, previously mentioned by Morian (3.3.129).

70 pale Death a rare personification. The triumph of death was a popular medieval and early modern conceit.

73 blast of trumpets Compare the ‘flourish of trumpets’ (7.1.0.1) as Vespasianus enters on his approach to Rome.

74–5 ruthless . . . kill reminiscent of Morian’s account of the Roman invasion of Ethiopia (1.1.112–15, 120–2).
I saw him fight like a fierce tiger. In you I place all my hope, and if I must end my old life here, I know that you will take vengeance on our enemies. But now I shall send the Emperor word of eternal enmity. – Holla, messenger! Come here.

Enter MESSENGER.

MESSENGER I am here, my lord. Have you any orders for me?

TITO Listen, and mark the words I speak to you. Go to the Emperor and deliver to him this sword with these words: that I am, and ever will be, his eternal enemy, that I will loose my military forces upon him, and not cease until I have him in my grasp, together with the Empress and her two sons. Go now, and deliver this clearly.

MESSENGER Gracious lord, it will be done accordingly.

He takes the sword.

TITO But listen further; when you have spoken this, give him this letter together with its contents.

80 fierce tiger There are several references to tigers in TA, always in relation to the enemies of the Andronicus, notably Tamora (2.2.142, 5.3.194), Aaron (5.3.5) and Rome (3.1.54–5).

80–1 In .. hope See Tito’s earlier comment at 4.3.50–1 and note.

84 Holla .. here No messenger is summoned in TA; instead, Titus mistakenly chooses a Clown as the messenger to whom he entrusts a message for Saturninus (4.3.77–119).

88 deliver .. sword cf. the swords that Young Lucius delivers to the court (TA, 4.2.1–17).

88–9 with .. words Tito sends his message orally, whereas Titus writes it down on paper (TA, 4.3.105).

95–6 when .. contents The letter may seem redundant, since Tito has conveyed his missive orally to the Messenger, but it is necessary because the ‘contents’ alludes to the naked blade within it. Titus writes the letter onstage and asks for a knife to fold into it (TA, 4.3.114–15), whereas the letter seems to have been prepared earlier in Tito, which means that the blade sealed in the letter may not be visible to the audience.
Messenger takes the letter:

Address him roughly, as suits a messenger of the enemy.

MESSENGER

Very well, gracious lord, I shall deliver everything to him.

Exeunt.

[5.2] Enter EMPEROR and AETIOPISSA.

EMPEROR

Lovely Empress, I admire the cunning with which you had the heads of Tito Andronico’s sons struck off, who so grossly sinned against you, as you say. And in order that we may not be harmed by him, you cheated him out of that right hand with which he caused terrible bloodshed all his life.

AETIOPISSA

Yes, gracious lord and Emperor, this is how we must prevent misfortune. I know well that if I had not taken his hand, he would have razed the imperial palace to the ground. But now we may scorn his might and resist it, though he will probably not rest, but wage war upon us.

EMPEROR

Indeed, lovely Empress, Tito shall never more

---

97–8 Address . . . enemy Titus, by contrast, gives instructions to the Clown to make his delivery as polite as possible (TA, 4.3.109–12).

5.2 corresponds to TA, 4.4. Tito conflates the two separate messages brought to Saturninus by the Clown (4.4.39–48) and Emillius (4.4.60–106).

0.1 In TA, Chiron, Demetrius and attendants are also onstage.

5.2] this edn; not in 1620
perform great deeds. Yet I fear his son, Vespasianus, who is said to be his father’s equal in battle.

AETIOPISSA Yes, gracious lord and Emperor, it is true that in Ethiopia, where his father made me his captive, it was said that he fought with a ferocity equal to his father’s. But, gracious lord and Emperor, do not fear him, for I shall contrive a means how to put him out of the way. But what news does this man bring who makes such haste towards us?

[Enter MESSENGER, with an attendant.]

MESSENGER Almighty Emperor of Rome, I am a messenger from Tito Andronico, who sends a sword to signify eternal war between you and him. He will forever seek revenge and be your extreme enemy, and will never rest until he has you, the Empress, and her two sons in his grasp and in his power.

EMPEROR Well now, messenger, you deliver your message defiantly enough. I would never have thought...
that Tito Andronico could wage a bloody war against me. Give me the sword.

\textit{Takes it.}

And tell him roundly, that since strife is what he wants, I shall be enemy enough, and that I shall now resist his insufficient might with ease and shall not honour it.

\textbf{MESSENGER} O almighty Emperor, a great misfortune is in store for you and yours, and although he no longer has his hand, his warlike son even now travels through many kingdoms and raises great, powerful, warlike, and choice men, in order to rage and better assault you. I know for certain that he will soon attack the palace with a powerful force and lay siege to it; he will not stop until he has overthrown it and has you and yours in his grasp. I have a letter here which you must read.

\textit{The Emperor takes the letter.}

\textbf{EMPEROR} You insolent messenger, how dare you address me in so bold and brazen a manner. I swear by all the gods that on account of your brazen words you will never leave this place and I shall give you fitting punishment.

33–6 Whereas Saturninus orders the hanging of the Clown straight after reading the letter (\textit{TA}, 4.4.43–4), Tito’s Emperor does so only after seeing the naked blade (52–3).

37–46 corresponds to the speech of Emillius (\textit{TA}, 4.4.61–7), who brings news about Lucius and the Goths. While the Messenger’s earlier speech (23–8) reflects the message Tito asked to be delivered (5.1.87–93), the present one does not.

39–41 \textbf{travels . . . men} The chapbook mentions that the Roman Emperor ‘raised a mighty Army in Greece, Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and England’ (35). See Introduction, p. 45.
Opens the letter:

What do I find here in this letter but a naked blade! May the gods never help me again if I do not avenge this great outrage and maliciousness. You, messenger, shall be sent away immediately to be hanged on the gallows – Attendant, take him away and deliver him to the hangman, so that he may hang this very minute.

MESSENGER Gracious lord Emperor, I hope I shall not have violence done to me and shall not be entrusted to the hangman, for it would be contrary to the customs of war. I have done nothing but deliver my lord’s message as he asked me to do.

EMPEROR This will not help you, your life is lost. – Do you not hear me, attendant? Get him out of my sight at once.

52–3 What . . . blade! In TA, Saturninus does not remark on the knife inside the letter, but Bate suggests that his strong reaction after opening the letter is ‘provoked by the knife’ (Ard¹, 280).

54–8 You . . . minute This parallels TA, where Saturninus, upon reading the letter, immediately bids an attendant to ‘Go, take him away and hang him presently’ (4.4.44).

59–63 Gracious . . . do Whereas the Messenger draws attention to the Emperor’s lack of regard for the customs of war, the Clown in TA makes a punning response to the announcement that he must be hanged: ‘Hanged, by’Lady? Then I have brought up a neck to a fair end’ (4.4.47–8). See also 7.1.114–15 and note.

61–2 customs of war ‘By the seventeenth century, England had a full system of Articles of War’, and ‘Similar codes existed . . . in Germany’ (Green, 23).

65–6 Get . . . once. The German text adds ‘etc.’ at the end of the speech. The meaning of the expression is unclear here. See 3.2.6 and 4.1.23–4 and notes.

66 SD\ this edn; not in 1620
6.[1] Enter MIDWIFE cradling a black child which has been fathered by Morian on the Empress.

MIDWIFE I search everywhere for Morian, to whom I must present this child, so that he may secretly put it out of the way. This night it was born by the Empress into this world. It was fathered by Morian, her secret paramour. Alas, I cannot find him anywhere and I don’t know where to go with the child.

[Enter HELICATES and SAPHONUS.]

But here come the Empress’ sons, who mustn’t know of this. Alas, I don’t know what to do!

HELICATES Let me see, midwife, what you have there.
- Dearest brother, come and see this great prodigy: here is a young black devil!

SAPHONUS I am amazed at it. But listen, midwife, tell us the truth if you want to leave from here with your life.

6.1 largely corresponds to 4.2.52–182. In TA, Tamora’s sons and Aaron are already onstage when the Nurse arrives, and they remain onstage until after the Nurse’s murder. In Tito, the Midwife enters alone, is joined by the two brothers and eventually Morian, who argues with Saphonus and Helicates and then orders them to leave before murdering the Midwife. The brothers leave, unlike Chiron and Demetrius, who agree to cooperate with him in his efforts to save his child and keep the scandal from becoming public. Unlike Aaron (4.2.100–5 and 118–20), Morian does not deliver a diatribe against whiteness, and less is made of the child’s blackness.

3–4 it was . . . Morian The birth of the miscegenated child is also in the chapbook. It is absent from Vos’ Aran en Titus (and its subsequent German adaptations), although in Vos’ play Aran has a young Moor named Quintus, who serves as his page.

5 cannot . . . anywhere In TA, Aaron is onstage when the Nurse enters, but she does not immediately recognize him, asking instead, ‘O tell me, did you see Aaron the Moor?’ (4.2.53).

7–8 who . . . this There is no indication in TA that Tamora wishes to keep the birth secret from her sons.

11 here . . . devil anticipates Morian’s later remark about the likely response that the infant’s appearance will prompt: ‘men will say “There sits a devil”’ (6.1.112–13). In TA the Nurse similarly describes the infant as a ‘devil’ (4.2.66).
Who is this child’s mother? I see that he is the father, so with whom has our Morian slept?

**MIDWIFE** Gracious lord, I shall readily reveal it to you if you can keep it secret, for no-one knows of it but I. If she should learn that this came from me, I would die a miserable death.

**SAPHONUS** No, midwife, it shall never be made known by us, we shall keep it secret. Confess and tell us the truth, but should you tell us anything other than the truth, expect nothing but a cruel death.

**MIDWIFE** No, I’ll tell you the truth. Black Morian, your mother’s secret paramour, fathered this child, and when she saw that the child was black she was very frightened, and asked me go in secret to Morian and take the child to him, so that he can have it brought up in secret to make sure that no-one knows about it; but I cannot find him anywhere.

They stand, amazed at her words.

**SAPHONUS** Alas, what great shame! A curse on the treacherous villain Morian, who has brought our

---

14 *Who . . . mother?* In *TA*, Demetrius and Chiron know that Tamora is the newborn’s mother. Demetrius remarks upon Tamora’s labour pains; the trumpets then sound, which Chiron interprets as a sign that Tamora has given birth to a son, following which the child is brought onstage (4.2.46–51).

14 *I . . . father* The infant’s black skin makes him easily recognizable as Morian’s offspring, which corresponds loosely to the Nurse’s identification of Aaron’s child as ‘thy stamp, thy seal’ (4.2.71).

25 *this child* This neutral reference to the infant is very different from the Nurse’s description in *TA*: ‘A joyless, dismal, black and sorrowful issue. / Here is the babe, as loathsome as a toad’ (4.2.68–9).

28–9 *that he . . . it* This clarifies the Midwife’s earlier comment in lines 2–3 about putting the baby out of the way. Aetiopissa’s desire to preserve her baby’s life is not to be found in *TA*, where Tamora wishes to have the baby killed (see 84–8 and note).

32–46 *brought . . . us* Unlike Tamora’s sons in *TA*, Saphonus and Helicates are worried about how the discovery of the infant will impact on their own reputations and bring ‘dishonour’ and ‘shame’ upon them. *TA*’s Nurse exclaims ‘we are all undone’ and considers the wider implications of ‘stately Rome’s disgrace’ (4.2.56, 61).
mother to shame, for which we must suffer mockery and scorn. Dearest brother, let us no longer suffer the detestable rogue, but instead kill him miserably as soon as we lay eyes upon him.

HELICATES O, dearest brother, my heart is troubled. I do not know what to do about the murderous and treacherous rogue, who has brought us such great dishonour. He deserves to be boiled in hot oil. But what are we to do with the damnable villain? For if we strike against him, we shall not escape from his hands alive.

SAPHONUS Indeed, I do not know what can be done. If the child remains alive, all will be known and bring shame upon us. Therefore, give me the child, so that I may kill it at once.

*He takes the child from the midwife, draws his sword and is about to kill the child.*

*Enter Morian, who, seeing that Saphonus is about to kill the child, rushes at him and snatches the child out of his hands.*

---

35 **kill him** In *TA*, Demetrius and Chiron do not consider murdering Aaron.

40 **boiled ... oil** Since the Middle Ages, boiling in oil had been used as a form of capital punishment in parts of Europe, usually for the crime of coin counterfeiting (Miethe and Lu, 42). Helicates may be implying that Morian has counterfeited a child, and therefore deserves to be punished in this manner.

46–7 **give . . . once** In *TA*, Chiron states that the child cannot be allowed to live, and, after responses from Aaron and the Nurse, Demetrius offers to murder the infant (4.2.82–8). Since Morian is not present in this scene, the action is condensed.

47 **SD1** There is no indication in *TA* that Demetrius manages to seize the infant when he demands ‘Nurse, give it me’ (4.2.88). Ravenscroft inserted a SD, ‘Aron takes the child from the Woman’, and Hughes comments that ‘Aaron probably takes the child from the Nurse’ (126). The stage action in *Tito* is different and arguably more dramatic, Saphonus taking the child from the Midwife before having it snatched from him by Morian.
MORIAN  No, no, stop, for I see that it is my child; don’t kill it or I’ll give you such a box on the ears that you will not escape alive.

SAPHONUS  O you treacherous villain! What shame have you brought upon us and our mother! How could you be so bold as to take your pleasure with our mother? Did you not know that you would pay for it with your life?

MORIAN  Why, my lords, there is no need to be half so angry with me; it is uncalled-for. But if you insist on satisfying your wrath, you should know that you are bringing an angry devil onto your backs, and that you will thank the gods if you have my friendship once again. I made love to your mother and she bore this son to me. I ask, was I not above all her servant and bound to obey dutifully whatever she commanded? Let me tell you that she urged and compelled me to make love to her because neither your father nor this present Emperor could pluck her strings as vigorously as I. Therefore, make peace, you lords, and be content with me, for I have become your stepfather and this, my son, is your stepbrother. How can you be angry with your father and your brother?

---

48 for . . . child  At the equivalent moment in TA, Aaron appeals to a different kindred relationship: ‘will you kill your brother?’ (4.2.90). It is not until later in the scene that Morian reminds Helicates and Saphonus that ‘this, my son, is your stepbrother’ (68–9).

51–2 What . . . mother!  Demetrius similarly exclaims that ‘By this our mother is for ever shamed’ (TA, 4.2.114). For the sons’ concern for their own reputations, see 32–46 and note.

54–5 Did . . . life?  Saphonus’ sword may still be drawn (cf. 47 SD1) and his words thus accompanied by an appropriately menacing gesture. In TA, no equivalent punishment is considered for Aaron.

61–5 I . . . her  Morian’s feigned innocence has no equivalent in TA, where Aaron is defiant and unapologetic.

66 pluck . . . strings  (‘die Lauten . . . schlagen’) See 1.1.97 and note.

68–70 stepfather . . . brother?  Aaron repeatedly reminds Demetrius and Chiron that the newborn is their ‘brother’ (TA, 4.2.90, 124, 128), but he does not refer to himself as their (step)father.
SAPHONUS   O treacherous villain! You are the devil’s father and not ours. I advise you to stop your insolent words, or else you shall come to harm. It is enough that you have brought such insult and disgrace upon us.

MORIAN   What, you lords, are you getting more and more angry? I swear by all the gods that if you don’t get out of my sight I shall beat you both so soundly that someone will have to come and gather up the pieces.

_Morian begins to speak to the midwife._

_Helicates and Saphonus shake their heads in anger and exeunt._

But listen, midwife. How is it with the Empress? Was she happy to become a mother, and where are you taking the child?

MIDWIFE   Yes, gracious lord, she is well and content, and a happy mother. But she told me to search for you, deliver the child, and instruct you to take it in secret to Mount Thaurin, where your father lives, so that he

71–5 **O...us** Saphonus’ outrage contrasts with the reaction of Demetrius, who peacefully goes along with Aaron’s plan: ‘Advise thee, Aaron, what is to be done / And we will all subscribe to thy advice’ (TA, 4.2.131–2).

77–9 **if...pieces** At the equivalent point in TA, Aaron similarly threatens the two brothers in a conditional clause: ‘if you brave the Moor, / The chafed boar, the mountain lioness, / The ocean, swells not so as Aaron storms’ (4.2.139–41).

80–1 **How...mother** Aaron also talks to the Nurse (TA, 4.2.142–5) but does not enquire about Tamora’s well-being and post-natal condition.

84–8 **But...Empress** Tamora has different plans for the infant: ‘The empress sends it thee, thy stamp, thy seal, / And bids thee christen it with thy dagger’s point’ (4.2.71–2). Aaron’s father is not mentioned in TA.

86 **Mount Thaurin** (‘Berg Thaurin’) Morian is later caught on Mount Thaurin (7.1.16–18) by Vespasianus, who is levying men (see 5.1.71–2). Marti suggests the location refers to Monte Taurino or Pizzo S. Michele, which is part of the Picentini mountain range in the Campanian Apennines, south-east of Naples (384, n. 19). Fredén (377) argues that the implied location is the ‘Taurisani montes’, a designation that goes back to the ‘Taurini’, an ancient Celtic people in what is now northern Italy. Alfred Noe proposes that ‘Thaurin’ designates Turin (Brauneck and Noe, 6.40), but apart from the difference in spelling, it is not clear what ‘Mount’ would refer to.
can raise it; no-one must know that it was born of the Empress.

MORIAN  Very well, I shall do so. But hear me further and tell me, does any other creature know that this child belongs to the Empress? Tell me also, who was in attendance when the child was born?

MIDWIFE  Gracious lord, there is not a creature alive that knows the child belongs to the Empress except myself and the Empress’ sons, who met me when I was searching for you, made enquiries and then threatened to kill me if I did not confess the truth. But let me tell you that when the child was delivered, I was alone with the mistress.

MORIAN  It pleases me ten times over that none but you were there, but you must lose your life for it.

Draws his sword and stabs her.

MIDWIFE  Alas, alas!

Falls dead to the ground.

MORIAN  So, lie there. I know that you will reveal nothing; your death is my guarantee. Had there been more who knew of it, they should also have died by

90–2  does ... born? In TA, Demetrius enquires about the number of women who saw the child (4.2.137), and Aaron repeats the question (4.2.142).

93–4  not ... Empress TA’s Nurse admits that Cornelia the midwife also knows about the child (4.2.143). In TA there are two women who aid Thamora’s delivery: the Nurse and Cornelia the Midwife, who does not appear onstage.

100–1  you ... it There is no equivalent in Tito to Aaron’s farcical jesting at the dying Nurse: ‘“Wheak, wheak!” – so cries a pig prepared to the spit’ (TA, 4.2.148).

103  So ... there Morian makes no plans to dispose of the body, unlike Aaron: ‘Hark ye, lords, you see I have given her physic, / And you must needs bestow her funeral; / The fields are near and you are gallant grooms’ (4.2.164–6). See 3.3.67 and note.

103–4  I ... guarantee a pithier statement than Aaron’s ‘tis a deed of policy: / Shall she live to betray this guilt of ours? / A long-tongued, babbling gossip? No, lords, no’ (4.2.150–2).
But you, my dearest newborn son, did your brothers wish to kill you? No, they must not do it or they will die. You have a shape like my own, except for a sharp nose and chin like your mother’s, but men will say ‘There sits a devil’. You are indeed flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone. I must now consider how to rear you so that you may one day emulate your father. Dog milk and whey will be your food till you can

109–11 But . . . die Morian’s intimate address to the infant calls to mind Aaron’s ‘Sweet blowze, you are a beauteous blossom, sure’ (TA, 4.2.74), which occurs earlier in the corresponding scene.

111–12 a sharp . . . mother’s Aaron does not comment on his son’s facial features, but he does state earlier in the scene that he is ‘myself, / The vigour and the picture of my youth’ (TA, 4.2.109–10).

112–13 men . . . devil This echoes Saphonus’ words in lines 9–10: ‘here is a young black devil!’

113–14 flesh . . . bone This inverts the structure of Adam’s comment about Eve after her creation from one of Adam’s ribs: ‘This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh’ (Gen. 2.23).

116 Dog . . . whey The German text reads, ‘Hundemilch Käse vnd Wasser’. The reference to dog milk may allude to the story of Romulus and Remus, the mythical founders of Rome, who were succoured by a wolf in a cave. The absence of a comma between ‘Hundemilch’ (dog milk) and ‘Käse’ (cheese) raises the question of whether the words form a compound (cheese of dog’s milk) or not (dog milk and cheese). Fredén (378) convincingly argues for a third possibility, namely that ‘Käse vnd Wasser’ is a mistake for ‘Käsewasser’ (i.e. whey; see Grimm), with the implication that the word ‘vnd’ (and) was misplaced in the sentence: ‘Hundemilch Käse vnd Wasser’ instead of ‘Hundemilch vnd Käsewasser’. If so, the implied meaning is neither ‘dog milk, cheese and water’ nor ‘cheese of dog’s milk and water’ but ‘dog milk and whey’, which partly corresponds to the ‘curds and whey’ (TA, 4.2.180) Aaron intends to make his son consume. Marti (385, n. 20) uses the OED to argue that ‘Hundemilch’ is a literal translation of ‘whey’ and that TA’s ‘curds and whey’ correspond to ‘Hundemilch’ and ‘Käse’ (cheese). In the process of making cheese curd, the milk separates into the solid curd and watery whey, which, as the OED suggests, was historically fed to dogs (‘whey’, n. 1a, 1600), probably because of its low lactose content. However, we have found no evidence in Grimm or elsewhere to suggest that ‘Hundemilch’ was used as a synonym for ‘whey’ (Molke) in early modern German.
walk. I will teach you all kinds of exercises so that you learn how to put up with hardship, how to fight and battle bravely, and tear a suit of armour apart with your hands, as I can. I will tutor you in all villainies and bloody business so that you will fear no devil, and, like myself, obtain much grace and favour from high-born ladies, so that in the end they will revere you. – Now, I shall go away from here, and take the child to my father, who is a black devil like myself and lives on Mount Thaurin, to let him raise it and say it is his own, so that nobody will know to whom it belongs. The Empress can now think about another one for next year. [Exeunt.]

116–17 Dog . . . walk Aaron envisages a slightly more varied diet: ‘I’ll make you feed on berries and on roots, / And fat on curds and whey, and suck the goat’ (TA, 4.2.179–80).

117–18 all . . . hardship a loose parallel to Aaron’s desire to have the infant ‘cabin in a cave’ (4.2.181), which implies harsh conditions.

118–19 fight . . . bravely corresponds to Aaron’s intention to ‘bring [his son] up / To be a warrior and command a camp’ (4.2.181–2).

119–24 tear . . . you After a sequence (see 116–19 and notes) with obvious resemblances to Aaron’s soliloquy at the end of 4.2, the present passage (which adds to Morian’s vision of what it means for him to rear his child successfully) has no correspondence in TA.

119–20 tear . . . can perhaps an example of the ‘great, superhuman, manly exploits’ (‘grosse, vnmenschliche Mannliche Thaten’) that Morian mentions at 1.1.110–11.

120–1 I will . . . devil Morian’s intended tutoring may be modelled on his own villainous deeds as described at 1.1.102–5.

124–8 Now . . . belongs not in TA, where Aaron outlines a plan secretly to exchange his son for a white infant born to his countryman (4.2.154–63). However, the proximity of Morian’s father’s home loosely parallels Aaron’s assertion that ‘Not far one Muly lives, my countryman’ (4.2.154).

129 Exeunt] Brennecke (Exit); not in 1620
7.1 corresponds to TA 5.1, although the last part of the scene in TA, with Emillius, the messenger from Rome, has no equivalent in Tito. Morian does not share Aaron’s glee at being a villain (5.1.124–44), and Vespasianus, unlike Lucius, promises to spare Morian’s life only to subsequently break his promise. Whereas Morian is presumably executed immediately after this scene and makes no further appearance in the play, Aaron’s execution is postponed and he is brought onstage again at the end of TA (5.3.175–89).

7.1 this edn; Actus Septimus 1620

Beating of drums and flourish of trumpets. Enter VESPASIANUS advancing on Rome with his army, which has raged cruelly and devastated all the cities of the Romans.

VESPSIANUS I march against Rome with a great and valiant army of choice and seasoned troops. I have sixty thousand horsemen in full armour, and a hundred thousand men on foot, with whom I have marched across the whole of Italy and razed all the cities we came upon, with the result that no stone was left on another. We have unnerved all Italy so that the people run about to no avail, like fugitives. We have already slaughtered a horrendous and vast number, so now they cry ‘oh, no!’ wherever we come. But this is nothing yet, for we shall attack them with ten times greater cruelty. Once more, I swear by all the gods never to withdraw my army until the haughty Empress whereas Lucius’ Goths in TA are motivated by their personal grievances against Rome (cf. 5.1.7–8).

1–15 I . . . now? parallels Lucius’ conversation with the Goth soldiers (5.1.1–19).

3–4 sixty . . . foot In TA, Lucius does not specify the type or number of soldiers at his disposal. The chapbook recounts that the Emperor levied men from different countries when trying to fight off the invading Goths but notes that he lost ‘threescore thousand of his Men’ in the fight (35).

7–10 We . . . come Vespasianus’ indiscriminate slaughter of innocent people contrasts with Lucius’ mission to aid Rome in ousting an unpopular emperor: ‘I have received letters from great Rome / Which signifies what hate they bear their emperor, / And how desirous of our sight they are’ (TA, 5.1.2–4).
and her two sons are in my power. But what wondrous sight greets me now?

Enter soldier, with Morian and his son as prisoners.

Soldier Gracious prince and lord, I humbly deliver up to your highness this Moor, whom I made prisoner on Mount Thaurin.

Vespasianus My dear and trusty soldier, I rejoice at this prisoner, for he is one of our greatest enemies; he is the Empress' attendant, I know him well. – Listen, black devil, you are a welcome guest to me. But tell me, what were you doing on Mount Thaurin? And what kind of a black devil is that in your arms?

Morian Never in my life has a lone fellow so shamefully taken me prisoner as this man. I must say that you and your followers are like devils in battle and combat. I am so madly enraged that I don’t know what to do. I could curse myself for the fact that I am now your prisoner. If you spare my life and show me mercy, I shall fill your ears with wonder and amazement at what the Empress and her two sons have done to your

16–18 Gracious . . . Thaurin The equivalent account of Aaron's arrest by the second Goth is considerably more detailed (5.1.20–39).

18 Mount Thaurin See note at 6.1.86. This is the geographical location of the ‘ruinous monastery’ (5.1.21) where Aaron is captured is not specified.

20 greatest enemies Unlike Lucius, who knows that Aaron ‘robbed Andronicus of his good hand’ (TA, 5.1.41), Vespasianus only knows at this point that Morian was the bearer of the severed hand and heads at the beginning of 4.3.

22 black devil Lucius also calls Aaron ‘devil’ (TA, 5.1.40, 145) though not ‘black devil’. Morian uses the word for himself (and his father) in the preceding scene (6.1.125).

24 black devil echoes the type of response imagined by Morian in 6.1.112–13.

25–37 Morian’s verbosity contrasts with Aaron, who refuses to speak until Lucius threatens to kill his son (5.1.46–8).

31–4 I . . . lives Aaron makes a similar promise (‘I’ll show thee wondrous things’, 5.1.55), but gives a non-specific list of things he will divulge: ‘murders, rapes and massacres, / Acts of black night, abominable deeds, / Complots of mischief, treasons, villainies’ (5.1.63–5).
sister, Andronica, and how your brothers lost their lives. I will also serve you faithfully and help you fight the Emperor; but if you show me no mercy, I shall reveal nothing, for here I am. Having surrendered myself, I can now meet my death.

**VESPASIANUS** Although a prisoner, you do not lack defiance. But tell me everything and speak the truth: say who, in which place, at what time, and for what reason, robbed my sister Andronica of her hands and tongue. Likewise, say how my brothers were taken prisoner and for what reason they were condemned to death. When I have heard all this, then you shall keep your life.

**MORIAN** Then open your ears, and listen to me carefully. Know that I have always been the Empress’ secret lover, when she was the Queen of Ethiopia as well as here. And because she always had a haughty and highly arrogant disposition, she could not suffer a rival, and when she saw that you and yours stood in such great and high renown, and were as mighty and rich as the Emperor, she could not suffer it in her proud spirit, but persecuted you to the utmost at every turn. But the Empress’ sons were overcome with love for Tamora’s sister, Andronica, and how your brothers lost their lives. I will also serve you faithfully and help you fight the Emperor; but if you show me no mercy, I shall reveal nothing, for here I am. Having surrendered myself, I can now meet my death.

**VESPASIANUS** Although a prisoner, you do not lack defiance. But tell me everything and speak the truth: say who, in which place, at what time, and for what reason, robbed my sister Andronica of her hands and tongue. Likewise, say how my brothers were taken prisoner and for what reason they were condemned to death. When I have heard all this, then you shall keep your life.

**MORIAN** Then open your ears, and listen to me carefully. Know that I have always been the Empress’ secret lover, when she was the Queen of Ethiopia as well as here. And because she always had a haughty and highly arrogant disposition, she could not suffer a rival, and when she saw that you and yours stood in such great and high renown, and were as mighty and rich as the Emperor, she could not suffer it in her proud spirit, but persecuted you to the utmost at every turn. But the Empress’ sons were overcome with love...
for your sister Andronica, and instructed me to keep watch on her husband and kill him, so that they could satisfy their lust on her. I waited with all diligence on him so that I could murder him, but never had the opportunity to do so, and could not kill him. Now your father, Tito Andronico, held a great stag-hunt, attended by the Emperor and Empress, her two sons, and also your sister, Andronica, and her husband. And at that time the Empress walked alone in search of me to satisfy her lust. She could not find me but came across Andronica and her husband, who were alone. She addressed them with arrogant words to which Andronica did not submit and answered defiantly. So the Empress left discontentedly, swearing a high oath that she would neither eat nor drink until she had satisfied her rage on Andronica. Her sons happened to meet her, and she commanded them to take vengeance on Andronica, and to stab her husband at her side, or she would not consider them her sons any more. They willingly went with her to the place where Andronica was, and there stabbed her husband to death at her side. Then she commanded them to take Andronica and spend their lust on her, and afterwards to maim her so that she would no longer look like a human being. So they took her away, and afterwards they cut off her hands and tore out her tongue. The Empress then resolved to annihilate your kin, and so had me take your brothers prisoner on

58–60 I ... him The audience has no previous knowledge of Morian’s unsuccessful plot against Andronica’s husband.

60–80 Now . . . away is a condensed version of 3.3.8–109 (but see 64–5 and note).

64–5 the . . . lust Aetiopissa does not spell out in 3.3 that she has gone to the forest in search of Morian, although when he finds her, she does attempt to engage him in an amorous encounter (3.3.120–6).

81 tore out See 4.2.0.3–5 and note.
trivial grounds and beheaded them. To secure herself against future harm from your father, she sent him word that his sons had insulted her roughly and would consequently have to die for it, but if he loved them, he should give up his hand for them, and then they would be returned to him alive. Thus she cheated him out of his warlike hand and sent it back to him with the heads. So now you have heard the entire business from me. You must also know finally that I fathered the Empress’ child, which I was going to take to Mount Thaurin.

VESPASIANUS Your words have filled my ears with wonder upon wonder. – Alas, haughty Empress, may you and your sons never be well; I rejoice because I now know how everything came about and how I may act accordingly, for you shall suffer the same in everything, and ten times worse. [to Morian] I have no need to keep the promise I made you, since the damnable Empress robbed my aged father of his warlike hand, and promised him the lives of his sons but did not keep her word. So, Morian, you must die without any grace or mercy. – Attendant, take him away from here. Deliver him to the hangman, so that he may hang him and his child immediately.

84–91 To . . . heads Whereas Aetioiussa is responsible for devising the scheme in Tito, it is Aaron’s idea in TA (5.1.111–20).
92–3 know . . . child Aaron begins his narrative with the equivalent information: ‘First know thou I begot him on the empress’ (TA, 5.1.87).
96–100 Alas . . . worse There is no equivalent apostrophe to Tamora in TA. It reinforces Aetioiussa’s status as the principal enemy of the Andronici (see Introduction, p. 12).
97 sons The singular ‘son’ (‘Sohne’) in the German text must be an accidental error, perhaps a confusion with Morian’s one son.
105–6 Attendant . . . here (‘Diener nim als hinnen’) is presented typographically as a SD in the German text. The use of the imperative suggests that the sentence is part of Vespasianus’ speech.

100 SD] this edn; not in 1620
MORIAN What now, though the devil sends me to hang, I don’t think it would become me! Is there no mercy? I beg you, spare my life.

VESPASIANUS No, I shall not spare your life nor have the least mercy. – Therefore, take him away so that he may hang, and his child with him.

MORIAN Well now, wait a little. If I am to eat hanging pears, there is time enough for that. If there is nothing else but death in store for me, I shall be willing, for I have long deserved it. But I beg you, pity my child and do not let it die with me, for it has done no evil yet. Just let him be brought up as a soldier and I am certain he will be a brave and valiant hero.

VESPASIANUS I will pity this child and have it brought up to fight and battle; but you, get you away from here. 

Exit.

108–10 What . . . life Cf. 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’ (TA, 5.1.147–50). Whereas Aaron remains defiant, Morian pleads for mercy.

112–13 take . . . him is the first time that a threat is posed to the infant. Cf. Lucius: ‘A halter, soldiers! Hang him on this tree, / And by his side his fruit of bastardy’ (TA, 5.1.47–8).

114–15 If . . . pears (‘sol ich Hangelbeeren fressen’) Creizenach (46) suggests that ‘Hangelbeeren’ refers to a type of pear with a long stem (see Grimm, hängelbirne) and that the expression is synonymous with hanging from the gallows (see also Marti, 389, and Fredén, 146). Lippner’s translation makes the pun on ‘henge’ (i.e. hang) explicit: ‘if I must eat gallows pears’; Brennecke spells out the meaning: ‘If I’m to swing by the neck on the gallows’. Fredén (391–2) argues that Morian’s comic reaction as he finds out that he will be hanged corresponds to the Clown’s similarly comic response to Tamora’s announcement that he ‘must be hanged’: ‘Then I have brought up a neck to a fair end’ (TA, 4.4.46–8). See also 5.2.56–63 and note.

117–18 I . . . me Morian’s show of concern for his son comes late in the scene compared to that of Aaron who repeatedly pleads for his son’s life and makes Lucius swear that the boy will live (TA, 5.1.49, 53–4, 67–8, 70, 78–85).

118–19 has . . . yet Rather than emphasizing the child’s innocence, Aaron insists on his royalty: ‘Touch not the boy, he is of royal blood’ (TA, 5.1.49).

119–20 let . . . hero Aaron asks Lucius ‘To save my boy, to nurse and bring him up’ (TA, 5.1.84). Morian’s desire for the child to have a military upbringing is in keeping with his earlier hopes for his son (6.1.103, 106–8).

121–2 I . . . battle Lucius similarly promises that the boy shall live (TA, 5.1.60, 69, 86).
MORIAN In all my days I never thought I would be hanged in the end. Now, let us go, and hang me quickly before I have time to think more about it.

Exeunt.

[7.2] Enter EMPEROR.

EMPEROR Such great bloodshed and so dangerous a war have never been heard of. Rome has never stood in such fear and peril before. Vespasianus has devastated the city so violently and ravaged the surrounding lands so cruelly that it moves one to pity. We have fought four battles with him, but he has won them all and slaughtered a great host of people. He fights so fiercely that no-one comes near him in battle, all flee before him. Yesterday, he took the whole imperial palace in defiance of me. Yes, all my troops have become so fearful that they refuse to go out against him, saying they witness daily that all who venture

124–6 In . . . it has no equivalent in TA. Since Aaron is gagged following 5.1.151, he is unable to speak at the end of the scene.

7.2 is not in TA, where the action moves from Lucius and Aaron straight to Tamora’s visit to Titus with her sons (5.2). This brief scene confirms that Vespasianus is ravaging the empire (see 7.1.1–9) and sets up the next scene by mentioning the disguises worn by Aetiopea and her sons.

5–7 We . . . people In TA, Lucius does not attack Rome before he is invited for a parley (5.1.156–9).

9–10 he . . . me (‘Mein Keyserlichen Pallast hat er gestriges Tages mir zu trotzle voller Flenten geschlossen’) The German passage is probably corrupt. Freden (370–1) and Marti (389) conjecture that ‘Flenten’ refers to the arrows of TA, 4.3, and propose that ‘geschlossen’ is a printer’s error for ‘geschossen’ (i.e., shot). Yet ‘Flinte’ (‘shotgun’) was not in use before the second half of the seventeenth century (Grimm), and ‘Flenten’ has no separate entry in Grimm. Brauneck and Noe conjecture that it means ‘Klagen’ (lament, complaint). The Emperor’s report of the attack fulfils Vespasianus’ earlier promise in 4.3.41–5. It is not clear where the present scene takes place, since the Emperor may have been forced to flee the palace either before or during the attack.

10–12 all . . . him implies that the troops are otherwise loyal, which is significantly different from Saturninus’ fears that ‘the citizens favour Lucius / And will revolt from me to succour him’ (TA, 4.4.78–9).

7.2] this edn; not in 1620
out against the enemy never return. My heart is so alarmed that I do not know what to do, for my power diminishes day by day, and the enemy grows stronger. So we shall no longer be able to resist his forces unless we weaken him with cunning and treachery, and unless he is deceived by my Empress, who, together with her sons, is disguising herself. Even now they are gone; may the gods favour them and give them grace! I shall leave and eagerly wait to hear what they accomplish and bring about.

Exit.

[7.3] Enter AETIOPISSA, with her two sons, SAPHONUS and HELICATES, in disguise.

AETIOPISSA Dearest sons, now no-one will know us, for we are well disguised. But hear me, and note what you are to do with Tito Andronicus. Lend careful attention to the cunning stratagems he will use in
battle to overthrow the Emperor, so that we can recognise them at once, and be on our guard. So if you see that he continues to rage and ravage, and that this cruel bloodshed against us does not stop, contrive to murder secretly Tito and his valiant son, Vespasianus, so that this perilous war can end in victory. Follow me now, we will go to his palace at once.

They go to the palace. Aetiopissa calls to old Tito.

Holla! Holla, good friend Tito Andronico, come down to me.

[Enter TITO above.] He looks down.

TITO Who are you that call on me like this?
AETIOPISSA Old Tito Andronico, we are your good friends, and the gods have sent me to you with these

8–10 contrive . . . victory This suggestion is not made in TA. Marti (390) argues that this is the only point where the German play dramatizes motivation with greater clarity than the English version.

11 his palace In TA, Tamora and her sons visit Titus ‘at his study’ (5.2.5).

11 SD In TA, Tamora and her sons ‘knock, and TITUS . . . opens his study door’ (5.2.8 SD). Editors since Capell (1767–8) usually indicate that Titus appears ‘above’, as implied in Tamora’s later request for Titus to come down (5.2.33, 43).

13 SD The use of a space ‘above’ is rare in the German plays of the English comedians. Of those in the 1620 Engelische Comedien vnd Tragedien, Fortunato and A King’s Son of England perhaps make use of it, but only Tito clearly does, whereas the other plays do not (Kaufuss-Diesch, 66–7, 69, 74, 76).

15–20 Since Aetiopissa’s plan is to deliver her sons to Titus, it is fitting that she includes them in the introduction, unlike Tamora, who introduces herself as someone who would like to speak with Titus (5.2.16), then presents herself as Revenge (5.2.30–40), and only introduces her sons as Rape and Murder when prompted by Titus (5.2.45–64). Aetiopissa identifies her children as Tito’s ‘good friends’ but does not comment on their disguise. Marti (390) notes that ‘good friends’ may refer to the Eumenides in Greek mythology, whose name literally (and ironically) meant ‘the kindly ones’. In Aran en Titus, Thamera introduces herself as Vengeance (‘Wraakzucht’; l. 1781); the 1656 programme simply states that Thamera and her sons disguise themselves (4.3 and 4.4); in Titus und Tomyris, the Empress disguises herself as Justice, accompanied by Revenge and Mercy (sig. L1v); and the 1699 programme notes that Thamera and her sons disguise themselves as ghosts (Cohn, ‘Breslau’, 281).

16 gods . . . me is not in TA. In her disguise as Revenge, Tamora claims that she has been ‘sent from th’infernal kingdom’ (5.2.30).
fellows so that I may deliver them to you, for they were ordained by the gods to help you with good counsel in these wars, to ensure that the enemy may be speedily overthrown.

TITO O, they shall be most welcome, and be held in great honour. I shall come down to you now to receive them with pleasure.

He goes down, [exit].

AETIOPISSA Now, my hearts, I have presented you to him, farewell. I shall go now.

Exit.

Enter TITO ANDRONICO, below.

TITO Tell me, where is the third?

HELICATES She left after presenting us to you.

TITO Yes, indeed, you shall be the most welcome guests I ever had. – Holla, soldiers, come here, quick!

Enter two soldiers.

Come here and lay hold on them both, steady and fast. – Now, you cursed and murderous villains, do you think I have lost my senses and cannot recognize you?
He takes the masks from their faces.

Are you not the Empress’ sons? And do you not seek to take my life with treachery? Yet now I have means to take my revenge. – One of you, bring me a sharp knife and a butcher’s apron at once.

[Exit first soldier.]

Yes, now I have thought up a secret stratagem whereby I shall ensnare all my enemies and satisfy my rage on you.

Enter [first soldier], bringing a sharp knife and a butcher’s apron. Tito puts on the apron, as if he would slaughter them.

Go and get a vessel, too.

[Exit first soldier.]

[to second soldier] And you, come here with that murderer and hold his throat here, so that I may cut it.

[Enter first soldier,] bringing a vessel.

– And you, come here with your bowl, hold it under his throat and catch all the blood in it.

36–7 bring . . . apron In TA, Titus fetches the knife himself and does not call for an apron. He may wear an apron only in the final scene, when he enters ‘like a cook’ (5.3.25.2).

41 Go . . . vessel In TA, Lavinia enters ‘with a basin’ (5.2.165.2).

43 hold . . . here Titus asks the bound brothers to ‘prepare your throats’ (TA, 5.2.196).

44–5 come . . . in it Titus has Lavinia hold the basin (TA, 5.2.182–3, 196–7), which establishes a link between the blood lost by the ravished and mutilated Lavinia earlier in the play and the blood that she collects from her attackers, a link that is missing from Tito.

45 SD–46 SD These SDs are considerably more detailed than in TA: ‘He cuts their throats’ (5.2.203 SD).

45 SD He . . . stopped Whereas in Tito, the brothers’ mouths are stopped as a reaction to their attempts to speak shortly before they are killed, in TA, once the brothers have been gagged, Titus makes them listen to a lengthy speech about their crimes (5.2.167–205).

37 SD] this edn; not in 1620 40 SD1 first soldier] Brennecke (a soldier); einer 1620 41 SD Brennecke (The soldier goes); not in 1620 42 SD] this edn; not in 1620 43 SD Enter first soldier] this edn; Bringt Gefäß 1620
Helicates is first held down. He tries to speak, but his mouth is stopped. Tito cuts his throat. The blood runs into the bowl. Once the blood has drained, they lay him on the floor, dead.

– Now, the next fellow, bring him too.

Holds his throat in the same way. Saphonus violently attempts to resist death and tries to speak, but they stop his mouth. Tito cuts his throat, and the blood is collected; then they lay him on the floor, dead.

Now I have cut their throats. What I have slaughtered I shall cook myself. I shall mince these heads and bake them into pies, and then invite their mother and the Emperor. A messenger of peace shall be sent to the Emperor at once. – But you, make haste and bring the bodies to me in the kitchen.

*Exeunt with the dead bodies.*

8.[1]  

*Enter* EMPEROR and AETIOPISSA.

EMPEROR   Lovely Empress, pray tell me, was Tito Andronico pleased with your sons when you presented them as being sent to him by the gods?

AETIOPISSA   Gracious lord and Emperor, old Tito was delighted; he came down to them immediately.

47–50 **What ... Emperor** is a condensed version of *TA*, 5.2.186–205. Unlike Tito, Titus shares his plan with his captives before he kills them.

48–9 **mince ... pies** Titus describes this process twice in *TA*, at 5.2.186–9 and 5.2.197–200.

49–50 **invite ... Emperor** In *TA*, the disguised Tamora proposes earlier in the scene that Titus invite Lucius to a banquet while she, as Revenge, will bring all of Titus’ enemies so that revenge may be taken (5.2.111–19).

8.1 This scene, which follows directly from 7.3, has no equivalent in *TA*: Tamora plans the banquet even before Titus kills Chiron and Demetrius (4.4.99–102; 5.1.156–61), so it is not necessary for Titus to send an invitation. The scene dramatizes the Emperor and Aetioissa’s misplaced joy about the apparent success of the disguise scheme.

8.1] Actus Octavus 1620
Meanwhile I departed, trusting that my sons would be held in great honour by him, and that he would follow all their advice. But here comes a messenger; what good news does he bring us?

_Messenger_ Enter _Messenger_, to the _Emperor_.

**Messenger** Fortune, health, and all prosperity to your imperial majesty, almighty and invincible Emperor of Rome. I am a messenger sent from my gracious lord, Tito Andronico, to your imperial majesty to proclaim peace and amity. He will never take arms against your majesty again, but wishes to make a peaceful alliance with your majesty. Likewise, he requests your majesty and your fair Empress to come to a banquet, so that peace and unity may be established all the better.

**Emperor** The message you deliver brings me great pleasure, and it cheers my heart that old Tito Andronico desires to make peace with me. Tell him this from me: I am very pleased and shall immediately come in person with my Empress.

**Messenger** Almighty Emperor, I shall deliver this message faithfully. _Exit._

**Aetiopissa** It is quite certain, gracious lord and Emperor, that my two sons have advised this peace and old Tito has followed their suggestions.

---

6–7 _trusting . . . honour_ echoes the sons’ reflection upon their newfound position at the Roman court in 2.1.18–29.

10–18 _Fortune . . . better_ Tito’s proclamation of peace and his invitation of the Emperor and Aetiopissa to the banquet mean that he has complete control over the circumstances of his revenge. This is unlike _TA_, where Tamora first has Saturninus invite Lucius to a parley at his father’s house (4.4.99–102) and then, in disguise, effectively invites herself to the banquet (5.2.111–19). Tito seems to offer unconditional peace; the message sent to Lucius does not (5.1.159–61).

19–23 _The . . . Empress_ While their belief in Titus’ ‘lunacy’ (_TA_, 5.2.70) explains why Saturninus and Tamora go to Titus’ banquet, the Emperor’s acceptance of the invitation seems comparatively simplistic and naive.
EMPEROR  If they have arranged this for me, I promise to advance them to the highest honours. But, lovely Empress, let us no longer delay but go to Tito Andronico at once.  

[Exeunt.]

[8.2]  Music. Enter servants who dress a table and bring out the pies. Not long thereafter, enter TITO ANDRONICO wearing the blood-stained apron, with a knife in his hand. After him, enter EMPEROR and AETIOPISSA, followed by ANDRONICA, VESPASIANUS and VICTORIADES.

TITO  Almighty Emperor and fair Empress, my greatest thanks for accepting my invitation. Please, your dishes on the table himself (5.3.25.2).

0.3–4  wearing . . . hand  Tito put on the apron at 7.3.40.2, before murdering Saphonus and Helicates. In TA, Titus enters ‘like a cook’ (5.3.25.2–3). The ‘knife’ may be the same as the ‘sharp knife’ (7.3.40.1) with which Tito cut the throats of Saphonus and Helicates. No knife is mentioned in the equivalent SD in TA (5.3.25).

0.6  ANDRONICA  In TA, Lavinia wears ‘a veil over her face’ (5.3.25.3), which Titus presumably removes at 5.3.44–5. There is no evidence in Tito’s SDs to suggest that Andronica is also veiled.

1–23 The issue of sitting down occupies much of the beginning of the scene. Like the opening of the Banquet Scene in Mac (3.4), it follows a hierarchical order, first the Emperor and Aetiopissa (2–4), then Victoriades (8 SD) and Vespasianus (18 SD), the last of these only after his father asks him to do so. Tito is asked to sit down (by the Emperor) or to let his daughter sit down (by Aetiopissa) but refuses. TA does not foreground the action of sitting down, and Ard simply has an added SD: ‘They sit’ (5.3.25.1).
majesty, sit with the Empress, and help yourselves to my offerings.

EMPEROR My good friend, Tito Andronico, I am delighted that this bloody, perilous war has come to an end and that we have arrived at peace and harmony.

_He goes to sit at the head of the table; Aetiopissa sits next to him._

But tell me, why do you wear this apron?

_Victoriades sits down._

TITO Almighty Emperor, I myself have been the cook and have made these pies for your majesty.

EMPEROR Now, this is very good. I say, Tito, come with your son and sit beside us.

TITO No, almighty Emperor, I will not sit down now, but rather wait upon your majesty. – But you, dearest son Vespasianus, go and sit, and keep the Emperor company.

VESPASIANUS Yes, dearest father, I am always willing to obey your command.

_He sits._

AETIOPISSA Dear Tito Andronico, please, let your daughter Andronica also sit.

---

5–7 _I . . . harmony_ is not in _TA_, where Lucius and Saturninus have a hostile exchange and Marcus encourages them to make peace at the banquet (5.3.17–24).

8 Saturninus similarly asks, ‘Why art thou thus attired . . .?’ (_TA_, 5.3.30).

9–10 _I . . . majesty_ In _TA_, Titus does not state that he has baked the pies himself.

19–22 _let . . . you_ Aetiopissa is aware of Andronica’s presence, and it is unclear whether the Empress pretends not to know about her mutilation, or whether its fact is known but Aetiopissa assumes that its perpetrators have remained unidentified. In _TA_, Tamora is presumably unaware of Lavinia’s presence until Titus unveils her immediately before killing her (5.3.44–6).
TITO  No, fair Empress, I cannot do that; she must stand and wait upon you. I beg your majesty, eat and be merry.

*He goes to the pies, cuts portions for the Emperor and Aetiopissa, but Vespasianus eats nothing. Old Tito walks sorrowfully about the table.*

AETIOPISSA  Truly, in all my life I have never eaten better pies than these. I cannot imagine how they have been prepared or what is baked inside them.

TITO  O lovely Empress, please eat more of them if they are to your liking. [*aside*] I’ll tell the Empress later what they are made of.

*He cuts another piece and places it before Aetiopissa.*

AETIOPISSA  But please tell me, my dear Tito Andronico, why are you so melancholy and do not eat?

---

23 SD  *He ... Aetiopissa*  In *TA*, Titus *‘plac[es] the dishes’* (5.3.25.2) as soon as he has entered, and the business of cutting the pie is not mentioned in *TA*’s SDs.

23 SD–29 SD  In keeping with its emphasis on physical action and spectacle, *Tito* emphasizes the point at which Tito’s Thyestean revenge succeeds. In *TA*, Tamora does not comment upon the pie, and it is only after killing his daughter that Titus mentions that Tamora ‘daintily hath fed’ on the pie (5.3.60).

28–29  *I’ll ... of*  (‘worvon er aber gemachet, wil ich der Keyserinnen darnach erzählen’) Brennecke alters ‘Empress’ to ‘you’, but the sentence is probably an aside.

30–8  *But ... afflicted*  In *TA* the dialogue leading up to Titus’ killing of his daughter is between Titus and Saturninus. It is initiated by Titus and is about the legendary slaying of Virginia by her father (5.3.35–42), whereas in *Tito*, it is between Tito and Aetiopissa, is initiated by Aetiopissa and deals with the reason for Tito’s grief. As with Ovid’s tale of Philomel, the reference to classical literature is thus absent from *Tito*.
TITO O lovely Empress, eat your fill. But I am too full of grief for it. Yes, the most distressed in all the world! I do not know what I may do in my anguish.

AETIOPISSA I ask you, tell me, why are you so sad, what has driven you to such grief?

Tito goes to Andronica.

TITO Empress, it is for this wretched creature, for my dearest daughter, that I am so sorely afflicted. [to Andronica] But now it is impossible for me to see you so wretched before me; my heart wants to burst within me! Take this.

Thrusts his knife into her heart. She falls to the ground, dead.

EMPEROR Alas, alas, Tito Andronico, have you lost your wits? Why do you murder your own flesh and blood? Alas, this pitiful creature.

TITO Yes, Emperor, I suffered the greatest pain and infernal anguish because of her. But hear what I say, your cursed and haughty Empress is the sole cause, for she made her sons hew off the hands and cut out

32 eat . . . fill In TA, it is not until after Titus’ killing of Lavinia that Titus asks Saturninus, ‘Will’t please you eat? Will’t please your highness feed?’ (5.3.53).

39–41 it . . . me! In TA there is a similar emphasis on the tremendous pain that Lavinia’s condition causes Titus, but he identifies shame as the principal motive for her murder: ‘Die, die, Lavinia, and thy shame with thee, / And with thy shame thy father’s sorrow die’ (5.3.45–6).

43 Why . . . blood? At the equivalent moment in TA this question is posed twice, first by Saturninus (‘What hast thou done, unnatural and unkind?’, 5.3.47) and then by Tamora (‘Why hast thou slain thine only daughter thus?’, 5.3.54).

47–9 your . . . daughter In TA, Titus holds the Empress’ sons responsible: ‘twas Chiron and Demetrius: / They ravished her and cut away her tongue, / And they, ’twas they, that did her all this wrong’ (5.3.55–7).
the tongue of my unfortunate daughter. – But know, cursed Empress, even now you have feasted on your sons’ heads, which I baked in the pies.

_Aetiopissa shakes and trembles violently in fright._

Now you shall never again afflict any other man as you have afflicted me. Take this for it!

_He attacks her with his knife and stabs her at the table beside the Emperor._

[AETIOPISSA] O, murder, alas!

_Falls to the ground, dead._

**EMPEROR** Alas, shall I suffer such a murder? Impossible!

_Draws his sword, stabs Tito Andronico, who falls dead to the ground in front of the table. Vespasianus leaps over the table at the Emperor._

**VESPASIANUS** Emperor, now you must die, even if you had a thousand lives.

_He stabs the Emperor, who falls to the ground dead._

50–1 _you . . . heads_ Titus tells Tamora that her sons have been ‘both baked in this pie’ (TA, 5.3.59) but only Tito singles out the ‘sons’ heads’.

51 **SD** There is no equivalent **SD** in TA (see Introduction, p. 5).

52–3 **Now . . . me** In TA, Titus makes no equivalent comment to Tamora before stabbing her (5.3.62).

53 **SD** TA’s **SD** is less detailed: ‘He stabs the Empress’ (5.3.62 **SD**). Tito’s knife ties together the key actions in this scene: after entering with it ‘in his hand’ (0.4), he ‘cuts’ the pie with it (23.1, 29.1), ‘Thrusts’ it into his daughter’s ‘heart’ (41.1) and here ‘stabs’ Aetiopissa with it.

54 **SP** The **SP** is missing in 1620 and 1624; we follow Lippner in assigning the speech to Aetiopissa. See 3.3.67 **SP** and note.

54 **murder** (‘mordio’) See 3.3.67 and note.

55 **SD** Ravenscroft (‘Emp. stabs Titus’) and Rowe (‘He stabs Titus’) are the first ones to add a **SD** at the equivalent point in TA, but neither is as detailed as Tito’s.

56–7 Saturninus likewise points out that his killing is retaliatory: ‘Die, frantic wretch, for this accursed deed’ (TA, 5.3.63).

57 **SD** There is no equivalent **SD** in the early quarto and Folio texts of TA; Ravenscroft added ‘Lucius stabs the Emperour’.

54 **SP**] Cohn (EMpress); not in 1620
VICTORIADES  Alas, alas, this wretched and despicable creature. Alas, I will never find peace. – Now, Vespasianus, the empire belongs to you. Set the crown on your head, and rule in peace.

VESPASIANUS  O gracious lord uncle, how can I rule the empire? My heart is ready to burst at this tragedy, the most pitiful that has ever been heard of. I do not know what to do in my wretchedness, so bear the imperial crown upon your head, for your claim to it is the strongest.

VICTORIADES  O, no. I have no wish to wear it. You are the rightful heir to it, and your brave deeds have won you much renown throughout the world; you have no equal. And you know that the empire faces many troubles and enemies, and lacks a strong ruler. So do not refuse, accept the imperial seat, make a universal peace, and rule in harmony and joy.

VESPASIANUS  Then let us go in, so that I may receive the crown in the presence of all, though I shall never be happy again.  

[Exeunt.]

58–9 this . . . creature It is unclear whether Victoriades is referring to the Emperor or to Aetiopissa.

59–77 Now . . . again The ending in Tito is very brief by comparison with the protracted ending of TA (5.3.66–199). See Introduction, pp. 17–18. Tito’s final moments are reminiscent of the conclusion of Lear (5.3.318–25): the imperial crown is offered to two characters; the older one declines and the younger accepts.

68 I . . . it In his unwillingness to accept the crown, Victoriades resembles his brother, Tito, in the play’s opening scene.

69 rightful heir In Act 1, Rome is an elective monarchy, whereas only Vespasianus and Victoriades are involved in choosing the new emperor at the play’s close. In TA, the election of Lucius is legitimized by the ‘common voice’ (5.3.139), and ‘ALL ROMANS’ (5.3.145) acclaim him as their new emperor.

71–4 And . . . joy Similar ideas are expressed by Marcus, ‘O let me teach you how to knit again / This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf, / These broken limbs again into one body’ (TA, 5.3.69–71), and Lucius, ‘May I govern so / To heal Rome’s harms and wipe away her woe’ (TA, 5.3.146–7).

77 SDJ not in 1620
KUNST ÜBER ALLE KÜNSTE, EIN BÖS WEIB GUT ZU MACHER IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION
AN ART BEYOND ALL ARTS, TO MAKE A BAD WIFE GOOD
LIST OF ROLES

PATIENT JOB  
in the trousers of pious Socrates. Speaks the prologue.

THEOBALD  
of Griffingen, gentleman

CATHARINA  
Hurryburly, [his older daughter]

SABINA  
Sweetmouth, [his younger daughter]

VEIT  
Carver, [Theobald’s] servant

SYBILLA  
Fleafur, maid [to Catharina]

HARDMAN  
Madfeather; gentleman, heir and owner of Whirlwind Heights, Catharina’s suitor

Ludolf WORMFIRE  
[his] servant

SEBASTIAN  
of Inability, gentleman, [suitor to Sabina]

ALFONS  
of Nistlingen, gentleman, disguised as musician, [suitor to Sabina]

ADRIAN  
of Liebenthal, the elder, gentleman

HILARIUS  
of Liebenthal, the younger, gentleman, suitor to Sabina, disguised as Mr Johannes

FELIX  
Muchwind, [Hilarius’] servant, acting as [Hilarius of] Liebenthal, the younger

FABIAN  
Apetail, [Hilarius’] servant

Mrs EULALIA  
of Hohunk Wittib, Mr Alfons’ confidante

Magister BLASIOUS  
Noseyparker, Rector paganus, acting as [Adrian of] Liebenthal, the elder

Master FRITZ  
Thimble of Scratch-Hill, artful tailor

MATZ  
Trumper, well-established oven-raker and firekeeper

Three SERVANTS  
who only speak one word [called] Lazypaunch, Alwayswet, and Noosehalter
LIST OF ROLES

Headed ‘Personen dieses Freuden-Spiels’ (‘The Persons of this Comedy’) in D1 and D2, and reproduced here in identical order. In keeping with the play’s relocation, KK’s names are Germanized where TS offers Italianate names. KK thus does not preserve TS’s names with the exception of Catharina, a German name that closely resembles Katherine/Katherina (both names are used of her in TS). Telling names (e.g., ‘Hartman’, ‘Wurmbrand’) have been translated (e.g., ‘Hardman’, ‘Wormfire’).

PATIENT JOB

Character added by KK, perhaps as a replacement for TS’s Induction. Job is the protagonist of the eponymous book in the Old Testament, and is often referred to as an archetype of patience in the face of undeserved adversity. The German describes him as appearing ‘in the trousers of pious Socrates’ (‘in des frommen Socratis Hosen’). Socrates, the ancient Greek philosopher, was famous for having a shrewish wife, Xanthippe; see Prologue, 12–13n.

THEOBALD of Griffingen

‘Baptista’ in TS. The name may be derived from ‘Griffing’ (a village at the Belgian–German border) or ‘finger, pen’ (Grimm, ‘Griffing’).

CATHERINA

Hurluryburly ‘Katherine’/‘Katherina’ in TS. The diminutive ‘Trina’ (‘Trine’) is used by Hardman during their first encounter in 2.1 as a means of belittling her. ‘Trine’ was a generic name for a woman of low rank, represented as common and stupid (see Grimm). The English equivalent scene (2.1) plays on ‘Kate’ and ‘cates’ (food, dainties, OED 1, 2). Catharina’s epithet ‘Hurluryburly’ (‘Hurleputz’) only occurs in the List of Roles. ‘Hurliburli’ is a person who hurries around headlessly (Grimm). It may be derived from ‘to roll’ (‘hurlen’). The second part of ‘Hurleputz’ may come from ‘to tumble’ (‘purzeln’) (Grimm). Similarly spelt words exist in French (‘hurluberlu’, a scatterbrained person) and English (‘hurlburyly’, commotion, OED 1.a). Their connection is unclear (see OED, etymology of ‘hurlburyly’).

SABINA

Sweetmouth ‘Bianca’ in TS. An allusion to the classical myth of the rape of the Sabines may be implied. After declining to marry their daughters into the burgeoning Roman city, the Romans invite the Sabines to a supposedly peaceful festivity. They rob the unarmed Sabines of their unmarried women, a moment often represented in sculpture and painting. The women largely integrate into their new families, and make peace between their husbands and fathers after subsequent battles. The name here is presumably ironic, implying that she will be an obedient wife, while also gesturing towards the surreptitious marriage scheme in which she actually engages with Hilarious. For the classical myth, see Livy’s Ab urbe condita libri 1.9–13. ‘Sweetmouth’ (in German the diminutive ‘Süsmäulchen’) only occurs in the List of Roles. The name has an ambiguous ring, referring both to a pet name like ‘darling’ and to a flatterer, who makes things sweet by talking (Grimm, ‘süßmaul’, 1).

VEIT Carver

Servant to Theobald, a character with no direct equivalent in TS. ‘Carver’ translates the German ‘Schnitzer’.

SYBILLA Fleafur

Maid to Catharina, and lover and wife of Wormfire; there is no equivalent in TS. ‘Old Sibyle’ was a condescending expression for a woman (Grimm, ‘Sibylle’). The name may contain an ironic allusion to the classical Sybils, female oracles in ancient Greece. There are several spelling variations of Sybilla’s name in D1 and D2, including ‘Sibilla’ and ‘Sibylla’. ‘Fleafur’, which translates the German ‘Flöhpeltz’, only appears in the List of Roles and may mockingly refer to a lack of cleanliness (Grimm, ‘Pelz’, 3, for human skin).

HARDMAN . . . Heights

‘Petruccio’ in TS. ‘Hardman’ translates ‘Hartman’, while ‘Madfeather’ is a translation for ‘Dollfeder’, and ‘of Whirlwind Heights’ of ‘Zum Wü rbelwind’. The only other two mentions of ‘whirlwind’ in the play in connection to Hardman are when Wormfire brags about his master’s ability to tame Catharina at 1.3.124, and when Hardman introduces himself as ‘Hardman Madfeather . . . heir of Whirlwind Heights’ (2.1.118–20).
List of Roles

Ludolf Wormfire ‘Grumio’ in TS. ‘Wormfire’ (in the German text ‘Wurmbrand’) is a general insult, perhaps alluding to an illness such as a rash (see Grimm, ‘Wurmbrand’). It could also refer to one who will burn in hell, or indeed to the devil himself (Grimm, ‘Höllenbrand’). The name ‘Ludolf’ only appears in the List of Roles.

Sebastian of Inability ‘Gremio’ in TS. ‘Inability’ translates the German ‘Unvermögen’. The character is reminiscent of the Pantaloon, a stock figure of the Italian commedia dell’arte, often a miserly old man who intends to marry a young woman.

Alfons of Nistlingen ‘Hortensio’ in TS. ‘Nistling’ is a bird of prey caught in a nest, a young and inexperienced person (Grimm). As in ‘Grifflingen’, the suffix may indicate a place name. In 3.1, when Alfons is disguised as a musician, his SPs in D1 and D2 are ‘Musicus’ throughout, which contributes to the play’s interest in being and seeming. Our edition standardizes the SPs.

Adrian of Liebenthal ‘Vincentio’ in TS. The last name could be roughly translated as ‘love dale’.

Hilarius of Liebenthal ‘Lucentio’ in TS. As a poetry tutor, Hilarius takes on the name of Johannes. D1 and D2 consistently call the disguised Hilarius Johannes in SDs and SPs, switching to Hilarius once he reassumes his real identity, thereby perpetuating the play’s interest in being and seeming. Our edition standardizes the SPs.

Felix Muchwind ‘Tranio’ in TS. ‘Muchwind’ is a translation of ‘Vielwind’, referring to a braggart (Grimm).

Fabian Apetail ‘Biondello’ in TS. ‘Apetail’ is a translation of the German ‘Affenschwanz’.

The word may contain a sexual allusion to an ape’s penis or refer to the proverb ‘to lead one on an ape’s tail’, i.e., to mock someone (Wander, ‘Affenschwanz’, 2).

Eulalia . . . Wittib ‘Widow’ in TS. ‘Eulalia’ comes from the Greek and means ‘the one that speaks well’, a rare first name. ‘Wittib’ means ‘widow’, whereas the meaning or origin of ‘Hohunk’ is unclear. The List of Roles calls her Alfons’ ‘confidante’ (‘Vertraute’), though by 5.2.2, the only scene in which she appears, she is his wife.

Blasius Noseyparker a ‘Merchant’ in TS. The German second name reads ‘Nasenweis’, literally ‘nose-wise’, a conceited meddlesome person that seeks to put their nose into everything, here translated as ‘Noseyparker’ (Grimm, ‘nasenweis’). The designation ‘Rector paganus’, i.e. ‘rustic rector’, is not fully clarified by the play.

Fritz . . . Scratch-Hill The tailor in KK is a conflation of the ‘Haberdasher’ and the ‘Tailor’ in TS. The name is a translation of the German (‘Fingerhut vom Kratzenberg’). Calling the tailor ‘Thimble’ makes fun of his profession and connotes something small enough in quantity to be placed in a thimble (Grimm, ‘Fingerhut’, 2).

Matz Trumper ‘Curtis’ in TS. The meaning of ‘Trumper’ is unclear. Perhaps it refers to a ‘drummer’ or a ‘trumpet player’ (Grimm), or originates in ‘to stomp’ (Grimm, ‘trumpeln’). The word ‘oven-raker’ is a literal translation of ‘Ofenschürrer’ (not recorded in Grimm).

Three . . . Noosehalter. ‘Petruccio’s Servants’ in TS. In both plays, the servants are named, though not consistently either in the dramatis personae or in the play itself. The edition translates the German literally, including ‘Faulwamst’ (‘Lazypaunch’), ‘Immernaß’ (‘Alwayswet’) and ‘Schlingenstrick’ (‘Noosehalter’).
AN ART BEYOND ALL ARTS, TO MAKE A BAD WIFE GOOD

[Prologue]

[Enter PATIENT JOB.]

[PATIENT JOB] Multa tulit fecit que sudavit et alsit, most honoured audience, multa tulit, I say it again, the man who has been oppressed by an evil, shrewish wife, and who has been her poor patient martyr all day, stung by her biting tongue, plagued by her murderous mood, and often tortured by her untameable hands; at night, when the cards lie still after many quarrels by day, has this reward – that when the vires corporis has been given to someone else – patience puts horns on his head. Unfortunately, I have experienced a lot of this, and more than a lot, I, patient Job who have

Prologue  KK does not translate TS's induction, but has a similarly meta-theatrical prologue, setting the play within a context of patient men and shrewish wives.

1 Multa . . . alsit Latin, ‘He has suffered and achieved much, he has sweated and frozen’ (from Horace’s Ars Poetica, l. 413). For Latin in KK, see Introduction, pp. 119–21.

3 shrewish (‘eyerbissigen’, literally ‘pus-biting’). See 2.1.403–4 and note.

7–8 when . . . day Proverbial. When a couple quarrels during the day, they will reconcile at night, and lie quietly in bed, much like playing cards that have been mixed and distributed in a game, and afterwards lie calmly next to each other in their box (see Köhler, 214).

8 vires corporis Latin, bodily strength; presumably an allusion to sexual intercourse.

9–10 horns . . . head horns are the proverbial attribute of the cuckold (see Grimm, ‘Horn’, 58).
always worn the trousers of pious Socrates. Rather than being blessed, I have been tortured by a wife who must have been made from a rib without the addition of one ounce of flesh. Her stubborn, sullen behaviour and her deliberate neglect bear ample witness to the fact that she is one of the evil seven. Whether the other six are still alive I do not know. Would to God that in my time there had lived the teacher of morals who will now appear; I would have wanted to go to his school in order to learn how to chase out madness from the obstinate brain of an evil wife, or how to exorcize the devil’s head which she has put on, as she herself admits. You find yourselves in happier times; you can learn from him, because he will show you the best way to go about it. This is especially useful for you young people who have someone young to handle and shape, and are not trying to tame some evil old dog. Understand that art well, and thank me for the good advice and for reminding you of it. But if there is anyone who cannot conceive of such an art or cannot apply it, let him come, and be instructed in patience by me, who have as my symbol perfer perpatienda.

12–13 Socrates . . wife Xanthippe, the wife of the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates, was believed to have been shrewish and cantankerous, giving rise to the stereotype of the recalcitrant wife. Petruccio uses Xanthippe for comparison with Katherina (TS, 1.2.70) in a passage which KK omits.

14 made . . rib According to Genesis 2.22, Eve was created from Adam’s rib.

15 evil seven Perhaps a reference to a satiric poem about seven evil female characters by Joachim Rachel, ‘Das Poetische Frauenzimmer oder Böse Sieben’ (1664; ‘The Poetic Woman, or the Evil Seven’), published in Rachel’s Teutsche Satyrische Gedichte (Frankfurt, 1664; VD17 23:244496T).

29 art the art of wife-taming.

34 perfer perpatienda Latin, you shall suffer what is to be suffered.
1.[1]  

**Enter THEOBALD, CATHARINA, SEBASTIAN, ALFONS and VEIT.**

THEOBALD  To speak frankly with you, my lord, it is to no avail that you continue to make your suit to me. I am determined not to make my younger daughter’s dowry known before the elder is married. Should any of you be interested in the latter, she shall not be denied you, for I know of your good name as well as of your honourable character and wealth.

SEBASTIAN  My good Sir Theobald, may I give you great thanks for such an offer. You know well, however, that my waning forces would be a little too weak to endure her untamed nature. Sir Alfons is younger and stronger, she will not be unsuitable for him.

---

1.1 is presumably set in front of Theobald’s house, although no location is specified. The scene is divided into four parts, a long one followed by three shorter: 1–76 (to Theobald’s exit), 77–103 (to Catharina’s exit), 104–40 (to Veit’s exit) and 141–77 (Sebastian and Alfons alone). The first part starts by following TS quite closely (1–35; TS 1.1.48–66) but then diverges. The second part is largely independent of TS: in Shakespeare, Katherina exits right after Baptista does (1.1.101–4), whereas Catharina remains onstage longer, engaging in an aggressive verbal give and take with Sebastian and Alfons. The third part, in which Sebastian and Alfons discuss with Veit Catharina’s shrewishness and Sabina’s desirability, has no equivalent in TS. The fourth part, except for the first speech, again follows TS quite closely (153–77; TS 1.1.112–44). TS’s opening scene is framed by two passages with Lucentio and Tranio (1.1.1–47, 145–246, joined by Biondello from 1.1.220), who remain onstage, unnoticed by the other characters for the rest of the scene. These two passages have no equivalent in KK.

0 SD TS’s Bianca also enters at this point, whereas KK’s Sabina does not appear until 2.1. In TS, Lucentio and Tranio remain onstage; they ‘stand by’ (1.1.47.3).

1 you, my lord  It is unclear to which of the two suitors Theobald’s first sentence is addressed; Baptista speaks to both ‘Gentlemen’ (TS, 1.1.48).

5–6 she . . . you  In TS, Baptista encourages the two suitors to ‘court’ (1.1.54) Katherina, but only Theobald promises that his daughter shall not be denied them.

8–11 My . . . nature.  The politeness and indirection of Sebastian’s response to Theobald’s offer contrasts with the harsh directness of Gremio’s ‘To cart her rather. She’s too rough for me’ (TS, 1.1.55) in response to Baptista’s invitation to court Katherina.
Kunst über alle Künste

ALFONS Please, sir, mind your own business. I am not your ward, and I am no longer a minor.

CATHARINA Father, I am amazed at your gross negligence, that you will offer me to these fools with such disdain.

VEIT (aside) What the merchant can’t sell needs a bargain like this.

ALFONS As for us, the maid is mistaken: we are not such fools as to take pains over her, and, indeed, I would think twice before buying such stuff as a wife. Though the colour may be good, the worth is small.

CATHARINA My high-ranked lord has no reason to run away from someone who is not in the least eager to follow him. Indeed, I have no intention to be bound with you. But if I were, my greatest care would be to comb your bristles with a three-legged stool, to ruffle your rabbit-beard with the fire tongs, to die your face scarlet with a pan, and to show you around to everyone as the fool you are.

VEIT [aside] Now she’s armed, now blows will rain down! Strike him, strike him!

15–16 TS’s question, ‘sir, is it your will / To make a stale of me amongst these mates?’ (1.1.57–8), becomes an accusatory statement in KK. Katharina’s ‘sir’ (1.1.57) suggests a politely distant relationship to Baptista, whereas Catharina’s ‘Father’ renders her accusation all the more striking.

19–22 we . . . small. The beginning of the speech corresponds to Hortensio’s (TS, 1.1.59–60), but KK adds Alfons’ description of Catharina as goods on the marriage market.

21–2 Though . . . small. Alfons presumably means that although Catharina has beauty (the ‘colour’), her behaviour reduces her worth.

23–5 My . . . him. KK adapts TS (‘I’faith, sir, you shall never need to fear’, 1.1.61) but adds an imaginative insult, ‘Mein hoch-geührter Herr’ (‘My high-ranked lord’), which puns on ‘highly honoured’ (‘hoch geehrt’) and ‘having big ears’ (‘hoch geöhnrt’), like a donkey (see Grimm, ‘geöhnrt’).

25–30 Indeed . . . are. KK is close to TS (1.1.62–5) but adds to the triplet of insults a fourth, threatening to ‘ruffle [Alfons’] rabbit-beard with the fire tongs’ (27–8).

31–2 Added by KK. Veit relishes the increasing tension, characterizing Catharina as being, literally, ‘in the armour’ (‘im Harnisch’) like a soldier. He expects yet more volleys of insults from her, which follow promptly. For our editorial decision to consider this and other speeches of his as asides, see Introduction, p. 110.
ALFONS  Her maidenly modesty will be above such trouble. I will always include her in the litany. May the good Lord protect us from such evil.

SEBASTIAN  Amen.

CATHARINA  You grey-bearded ass, you’d better stay at home with your poor servants; you couldn’t tease a dog out from under the oven. You’re a lame old horse, you can do nothing but neigh. A fine Sir Sebastian, indeed! Touching her with his little stick. Why, you may believe the girls gaze greedily at you, but you will have to run after them. My sister will certainly leave ‘it’ open for you, you know where.

SEBASTIAN  Your sister has better virtues making her lovelier than you. Sir Theobald would be wise to bring her out sooner, since he is acquiring a bad name because of your lack of virtue.

CATHARINA  Your wisdom sits nowhere except in your ass-grey hair. You have not yet been made judge between me and my sister, that silly child. Even if she

34  I . . . litany. (‘Dann ich sie stets mit in die Litaney setze’) TS’s Hortensio quotes from the Litany in The Book of Common Prayer (1559), ‘From all such devils, good Lord deliver us!’ (1.1.66). Alfons presumably means he will pray for protection against Catharina’s assaults.

37–57 A passage with no equivalent in TS, offering more space for Catharina’s eloquent insults, but also reflecting on expected behaviour in young, unmarried women.

37  grey-bearded ass (‘ein graubartiger gEsel’) With its unusual capitalization of the second letter, D1 puns on ‘fellow’ (‘Gesell’) and ‘ass’ (Grimm, ‘Esel’, 15e). D2 reads ‘Esel’.

38–9  you . . . oven (‘Dann jhr ja nicht könnet einen Hund auß dem Ofen locken’), a proverb (Wander, ‘Hund’, 1399) implying that if Sebastian cannot even make a dog move, he will not be able to evoke desire in a young woman.

40–1  A . . . stick. (‘ein feiner Herr Sebastian, grif jhr mit den Spänchen dran’) The German’s rhyming couplet enhances Catharina’s mockery of the old suitor’s lack of virility.

43–5  My . . . where. It is not clear what Catharina (sarcastically?) claims Sabina will leave open for Sebastian. She may mean a window to her chamber or perhaps this is a more directly sexual metaphor. There is no equivalent statement in TS.

52  silly child Katherina mocks Bianca as a ‘pretty peat’ (TS, 1.1.78), a spoilt child.
were not brought out into the open for your pleasure, I would still wish her burnt by the sun, ruffled by the wind or stung by a fly when she’s exposed under the open sky. My father knows better how to watch over her.

THEOBALD Unnatural child, would to God you had a single vein in you like hers. She does not run around the streets like you, but practises all womanly virtues.

CATHARINA (aside) That lazy girl will pay for such hatred towards me when I find her alone.

THEOBALD [to Alfons and Sebastian] I intend to offer her some delight and have her instructed in poetry and music.

CATHARINA This is needed above everything, so that she can please men, for she lacks certain courtly qualities.

ALFONS I would gladly be of use for such instruction.

THEOBALD I fear the gentleman would ask too much for his wages.

SEBASTIAN And I would say no to it.

CATHARINA O, how the fools quarrel about what isn’t theirs, and above all not even worth the trouble.

THEOBALD Gentlemen, make peace. In the meantime, I shall excuse myself. I remain at your service, gentlemen.

Exit.

52–6 Even . . . sky. Young women of rank kept to the house in order to safeguard both their chastity and the whiteness of skin, considered a sign of beauty. Catharina taps into these cultural norms while mocking them as producing someone weak and spoilt. Catharina’s concern with the proper spaces for young women may originate in Baptista’s order that Bianca return to the house, followed by her obedient consent, which evokes Lucentio’s inflamed aside, praising her wisdom (TS, 1.1.75–84). This sequence is missing in KK, which chooses to introduce both the lover and the younger sister in subsequent scenes.

61 lazy girl (‘Schleppsack’, literally ‘a bag to drag around’) a lazy, untidy woman (Grimm, 2.b), or a kept mistress (Wander). There is no indication of a threat in TS at this point, but the elder hits the younger sister in 2.1 of both plays.

63–5 It is Theobald who seeks instruction for his younger daughter, while TS clarifies that it is Bianca who takes ‘delight / In music, instruments and poetry’ (1.1.92–3). Unlike in KK, Baptista tells the men of his request for schoolmasters, encouraging the two suitors to send him possible candidates (1.1.95–7).
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SEBASTIAN We remain ever obedient to your lordship.

VEIT [aside] I’ll listen a little longer, she’s got more in her yet!

SEBASTIAN Will you not follow your father?

CATHARINA This old ape-face is surely called to be the tutor. [to Sebastian] You’re very concerned about what’s not your business; go about your own, if you like, you old vagabond, and let me go about mine. Unless you want to have a good mouthful of what comes from my behind. Pull in your snout, mouse-beard, or else it is going to rain muck, I warn you.

SEBASTIAN I had rather deal with evil spirits than with such a one.

CATHARINA If I were a spirit, I’d torment you.

ALFONS The holy cross is good for protection from that, and he who gets her will have no need to make it himself. She’ll bring it to him soon enough.

CATHARINA You’re much too dishonourable an ass to bear such a cross, and may the devil protect you from it.

76 SD In TS, Baptista leaves the stage at 1.1.101, shortly afterwards followed by Katherina (1.1.104 SD). KK’s Catharina stays for another twenty-seven lines and exchanges abuse with Sebastian and Alfons (77–103). Baptista explicitly allows his daughter to remain onstage, which she understands as an attempt to control her movements (TS, 1.1.102–4), while Theobald simply exits.

77–152 Before reverting to a closer rendition of the original (153–77), KK considerably enlarges the insults between Catharina and the suitors, and the conversation between Sebastian and Alfons in which they seek to use Theobald’s servant Veit as a means to enter the household.

82–3 You’re . . . business Catharina uses an evocative proverb, literally saying ‘you are much occupied with unhatched eggs’ (‘Ihr bekümmert euch sehr um ungelegte Eyer’; Wander, ‘Ei’, 124).

84 old vagabond (‘Staudenhecht’) highwayman (literally ‘shrub pike’, a long thin fish) ambushing travellers on roads. In Germany, as in other European countries, travellers were criminalized as robbers owing to their nomadic lifestyle.

86–7 mouse-beard For another insult mocking beard size, see note at 25–30.

90 you (‘dich’) Catharina’s use of the second-person singular pronoun adds to the impoliteness of her remark, given that Sebastian is her senior in age though probably not in rank.

91–3 Alfons first suggests that a holy cross protects against evil spirits such as Catharina, before alluding to the expression ‘to bear one’s cross’, i.e. accepting the trials of life.
ALFONS I’d rather call upon God.
CATHARINA I’ll waste no more time with this fantastico.
SEBASTIAN And we won’t force you to stay with us.
CATHARINA Hold your tongue, old man, or I’ll pluck off your beard.
ALFONS Be not swayed by anger, maid.
CATHARINA You rude milksop, pull in your pipe, or I’ll give you some food for your snout. Exit.
VEIT [aside] I bet the gentlemen have enough for the time being. That will keep them busy.
ALFONS Let us part now. Sir Sebastian, should you be interested, I will let you have my part of the proceedings, for I know that you are a lover of all that concerns the ladies.
SEBASTIAN Keep what you have, sir, and have my part for free.
ALFONS Thanks, sir. I know well that you are sometimes a little short-winded. Therefore make yourself a poultice for the chest from these spices. – But, Veit, what do you think about the civility of your maid?
VEIT She speaks in a certain manner that I don’t understand, and which is perhaps only familiar to

97 fantastico (‘Fantasten’) raver, fool (Grimm). See also 2.1.434, 496, 5.2.150, 154.
102 milksop Catharina makes fun of Alfons’ youth by calling him a ‘Milchmaul’, literally ‘a milk maw’, which could refer to someone with downy beard hair appearing at puberty (Grimm). For beard jokes, see notes at 25–30 and 86–7.
102 pull . . . pipe (‘ziehe nur die Pfeife ein’) keep quiet (see Grimm, ‘Pfeife’, 1.c, in reference to bagpipes)
103 food . . . snout literally, ‘nose food’ (‘Nasenfutter’). Grimm records no relevant meaning for the German word, but it seems clear that Catharina threatens Alfons with violence.
108 proceedings (‘Traictements’) Alfons may offer to keep Sebastian informed of how he fares in his courtship of Sabina.
113–14 Therefore . . . spices. Alfons may hand Sebastian spices, or pretend to do so in order to provoke him.
114 poultice (‘Umschlag’) A medicinal substance put on the skin and held in place with a bandage.
gentlemen. I am at your service if you seek to insinuate yourself into her company, or to leave something with her. I am more than willing if it is lawful.

SEBASTIAN  My goodness, that lady can go to the gallows and the hangman can insinuate himself into her company.

ALFONS  I ask you nothing except to write my name in the book of exemptions. But if you truly wish to do something, appeal to her mild-mannered sister. Your reward will be good.

VEIT  Ha ha! There’s a cat in the nest! Will she be easier to deal with? I’d rather lodge by her than with the dean, no matter how holy he may be.

SEBASTIAN  Ho, that morsel would be a little too good for you.

VEIT  However delicious it may be, neither you nor I will be allowed to have a little nibble. But I shall be off now. Adieu, gentlemen.

ALFONS  Commend me to my lady.

SEBASTIAN  Commend me first, I am next in line.

118 insinuate (‘insinuiren’) Veit mockingly uses the Latinate word in the sense of wheedling himself into Catharina’s trust, probably with a sexual connotation, especially in the context of his following words, ‘to leave something with her’.

125 book of exemptions (‘Buch der Verschonung’) Meaning unclear. Grimm (‘Verschonung’) paraphrases the expression as ‘if one wants to have nothing more to do with someone’ (‘wenn man mit jemand nichts mehr zu thun haben will’).

128 There’s . . . nest! (‘saß da die Katze im Nest’, literally ‘is that where the cat sat in the nest’) Veit mocks the suitors’ sly-ness. For the proverb, see Wander, ‘Katze’, 988: ‘Da sass die Katze im Nest’, meaning ‘das war der Grund’ (‘that was the reason’).

129–30 I’d . . . be. Meaning unclear. Presumably, Veit would rather commit the sin of fornication with Sabina than receive a blessing from the dean (in German, ‘Superintendent’), an overseer of any larger ecclesiastical unit (Grimm). The term refers to Protestant Church structures.

131 morsel Sebastian warns Veit against his interest in Sabina while equating her with a tasty bit of food (‘Bischen’, literally ‘a little bite’) or a small person (‘Bischen’, literally ‘a little one’).
VEIT  That shall be my work. I will remember one thing, and forget the other. I’ll seek money for my pains. Nothing is free.  

SEBASTIAN  I am glad at heart that the monster’s gone. I wonder greatly that such a fine house has such an evil owner, but more about the difference between the sisters, for their characters are so opposite. What one possesses in virtue, the other lacks, and what one lacks in vice, the other possesses. And the more one makes herself loathed through her disobedience, the more the other makes herself beloved through her fair and commendable behaviour. I am angry that we must forget about modest Sabina because of this savage animal, this raging Catharina. I wish she were out of my sight altogether.

ALFONS  Not so fast, I have good advice on how to open the way to our lady: we need to find a man for the elder sister.

SEBASTIAN  A man? A devil!

ALFONS  I say a man.

139  I’ll . . . pains. (‘Den Danckhabet bring ich nun ein Trinckgelt’, literally ‘I’m carrying a tip to the thanks’) Veit seems to suggest that he may obey the suitors if he is paid for it. One or both of them may hand him money.

140  I . . . gone. After KK’s interpolated flying between the suitors and Catharina, and the dialogue with Veit, KK reverts to TS at the moment Katherina has left the stage (1.1.105). Owing to this textual patchwork, Sebastian’s ‘monster’, adapting ‘the devil’s dam’ (TS, 1.1.105), refers to Catharina rather than to Veit who has just exited.

145  I . . . altogether. The German uses an evocative proverb, ‘Ich wolte daß sie wäre, wo der Pfeffer wächst’, literally ‘I wished she was where the pepper grows’, meaning in foreign countries, as far away as possible (Wander, ‘Pfeffer’, 37).

150–1  Not . . . lady Alfons condenses Hortensio’s speech (TS, 1.1.112–17), offering Sebastian a pact in order to enable the wooing of Sabina. Both KK and TS use the first-person plural pronoun, ‘our lady’ (1.1.154) and ‘our fair mistress’ (TS, 1.1.115).

154–7  we . . . man. Closely adapted from TS (1.1.119–24). KK’s ‘Mann’ exploits the fact that the German word can mean both ‘husband’ and ‘man’.
SEBASTIAN  And I say a devil. What man would throw himself into hell in good faith, and all for the sake of riches?

ALFONS  It seems to me, Sir Sebastian, you still don’t know that nowadays ratio status governs marriage as it does every other thing that follows people’s fancy. Whereas you and I don’t care about the money when someone is peevish and unworthy, there are some who put their need for gold before the bride. Well, God willing, may this succeed.

SEBASTIAN  I don’t object to anyone taking her as long as he’s not one of my friends. I’d marry her for her money as readily as I’d stand on the pillory every morning, whipped bloody with rods. And while I don’t usually waste money, I would be generous with any man who agrees to be joined with her in order to release the younger.

158–60 adapts Gremio’s speech in TS (1.1.122–4), which equates Katherina with ‘hell’ itself.

161–7 Alfons’ speech adapts Hortensio’s (TS, 1.1.125–9), but adds reflections on economic motivations for marriage.

162 ratio status Latin, ‘reason of state’, ‘a purely political ground of action on the part of a ruler or government, esp. as involving expediency or some departure from strict justice, honesty, or open dealing’ (OED, reason, P1 b.). ‘Status ratio’ appears in the poem explaining the copper engraving on the title page (see Introduction, pp. 139–40). Simplicianischer Zweyköpfiger Ratio Status, a tract in the ‘mirror for magistrates’ tradition by the German author Hans Jakob Christofel von Grimmelshausen (best known for his picaresque novel Simplicius Simplicissimus), was published in 1670 (VD17 23:233095F).

165–6 there . . . bride (‘so ist doch manchem der sein bedarf; welcher dieses Samen Metall für, und die Braut nachsetzet’). The German literally says ‘there are some who put their need for this seed of metal before the bride’. The expression ‘the seed of metal’ for ‘gold’ originates in the proverbial concept of God planting metal seeds in mountains for mining (Grimm, ‘Same’, 4.a).

171–4 And . . . younger. The passage contains the gist of lines spoken by Hortensio (TS, 1.1.133–40), but cancels TS’s reiterated affirmations of a temporary support between the two suitors (1.1.134–5), which is in line with Sebastian’s distrust of Alfons elsewhere (see 1.3.190–216 and note).
[1.1].175  

**Kunst über alle Künste**

**ALFONS**  Time will tell. I know that some hungry fellow will come who’ll do the work for us, so let him come, we’ll have liberal hands.  

[Exeunt.]

**[1.2]**  

*Enter felix disguised [as Hilarius] and [HILARIUS] disguised as Johannes.*

**FELIX**  My lord, the more I think about your behaviour, the less I understand it. O, strange effects of love that can change minds in one short moment!  

**HILARIUS**  Remember now, you are none other than myself, and bear yourself as I told you. Your good

175–7 In *TS*, Gremio speaks the equivalent lines (1.1.141–4), including the proverbial triplet ‘woo her, wed her, and bed her’ (1.1.143).  


**1.2** In *TS*, 1.1 consists of three scenic movements: one, Lucentio and Tranio are newly arrived in Padua (1–47); two, they remain onstage, unnoticed by Baptista and the other characters, while Lucentio falls in love with Bianca (48–144); three, their dialogue resumes when the other characters have left, and they are joined by Biondello (145–246). This scene corresponds to the third part of *TS’s* 1.1, but unlike in the Shakespeare play, the characters appear onstage for the first time. Hilarius’ explanation for his disguise is significantly shorter than Lucentio’s (4–12; *TS*, 1.1.185–219). Hilarius has already fallen in love with Sabina, and he and Felix have already exchanged clothes so that Hilarius can woo her. *KK* adds dialogue between the two servants (Felix and Fabian, corresponding to Tranio and Biondello in *TS*) on the (in)ability of clothes to turn a servant into a master (15–31; 60–67). The scene in *TS* ends on a brief dialogue between Sly and two servants (1.1.247–52) which has no equivalent in *KK*.  

0 **SD** Lucentio and Tranio exchange clothes onstage (*TS*, 1.1.205–6), whereas Felix and Hilarius enter already in disguise. For Hilarius’ name in SDs and SPs, see the List of Roles.  

1–3 In *TS*, the audience witnesses Lucentio fall in love with Bianca while she is onstage, and he verbalizes this process when he and Tranio are alone (1.1.147–55), using lavish rhetoric and Petrarchan clichés. In *KK*, Hilarius enters already in love, and Felix’s mystified response to his master’s strange behaviour with which the scene begins mirrors the audience’s initial loss of its bearings.  

4–12 Hilarius recaps his plans to Felix, collapsing the invention of the disguise scheme by Lucentio and Tranio (*TS*, 1.1.184–206) into a summary of the planned proceedings. In *KK* the respective roles are more clearly demarcated than in *TS*: Felix is to ‘do what [he] can’ (10) with the father, and ‘leave wooing’ (12) the daughter to Hilarius. The threat posed by the other suitors is conveyed through the proverbial-sounding ‘Chase away the wasps that swarm around the honey’ (10–11), a passage with no equivalent in *TS*.  
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nature shall not fail you. I will and must aim straight and hit the target. I know no other means than this. I will play my part to my lady in this lowly disguise as best I can. You, meanwhile, present a sumptuous show, and do what you can for me with her father. Chase away the wasps that swarm around the honey. Drive off my fellow suitors, and leave wooing her to me.

Enter FABIAN. Looks at both in dismay.

But here he is, the dull rogue. Where have you been so long?

FABIAN Where have I been? My lord, first tell me where you are? Or where my companion here is going? Circe has effected a wondrous transformation! One who was almost my equal not long ago has become a lord, or rather an ape in disguise, and a noble lord a miserable tutor. It’s a mad world! O, it is my misfortune that I have erred and travelled so long. Had I arrived in time, I might have bettered myself as well.

FELIX That could easily have happened, that a jester becomes a fool.

FABIAN Horres morres it is with you. I see nothing to make me lift my hat but my lord’s garments. A thief
might steal and wear these. I could pretend to be a prince in such a worthy fashion, and I wouldn’t need to borrow your hare’s head for that.

**Felix** Ho, not so fast. Remember who I have become, and what you are.

**Hilarus** There’s no time for such foolery now. Fabian, I order you to obey your formerly equal fellow servant who replaces me as your master. Obey him, and hold your tongue. The reason why we proceed like this is important, as you will learn from him. [*to Fabian and Felix*] For the sake of your real master, behave yourselves well. You will not lack reward.  

**Fabian** Now I am the fool of a fool! Fortune will smile on me from now on. How now, my brand-new lord, *avec permission*, may I interrogate you and receive report through my *quaestiones*? What does this Shrovetide mummery mean?

**Felix** A misfortune has happened to your lord: on his arrival, he quarrelled with a noble gentleman and gave him a deadly wound. That is why he disguises himself to avoid danger. He has given me his best clothes so that I, who am a stranger in this place, may plead his cause.

**Notes:**

26 *lift my hat* a sign of respect  
29 *hare’s head* (‘Hasenkopf’) an insult (see 2.1.288n)  
32–8 Hilarus’ speech follows Lucentio’s (*TS*, 1.1.224–33), particularly the admonition to the servants to behave according to plan. Hilarus delays the revelation of the ‘reason why we proceed like this’ (35), however, and leaves it to Felix to give Fabian an invented explanation. This adds to the swiftness of Hilarus’ exit, conveying a sense of urgency to his scheme. *KK* thus condenses Lucentio’s falling in love and invention of the wooing scheme, but amplifies the servants’ dialogue.  
41–2 *avec ... quaestiones* Fabian mocks Felix’s newfound noble status through bragging French (*‘avec permission’*, ‘with permission’) and Latin (e.g. *‘quaestiones’*, ‘questions’).  
43 *Shrovetide mummery* (‘Fastnachts Mummeren’) Shrove-tide, the three days before Ash Wednesday, designates the carnival season of merriment, which includes dressing up in costumes (‘Mummeren’) and inverting the social order.  
44–9 Felix explains to Fabian the supposed reasons for the identity swap. The speech is closely modelled on *TS* where, however, it is spoken by Lucentio (1.1.226–30).
FABIAN If I had been with him, I might well have become a lord.

FELIX I would willingly let you have that mock power if I were permitted to act as he does with the dear angel. [*aside*] But hands off the vat while the grapes are inside.

FABIAN What are you murmuring to yourself?

FELIX I must remind you to obey your lord’s orders when we are in company. When we’re alone, we’ll make merry as before.

FABIAN And so shall it be, says the fool. Well, I can endure your lordship that way. Should you become too great, it would be over, and we’d fall out of friendship. But you shall let me enjoy your under- or quasi-lordship without harm to your greater prosperity and that of our master.

FELIX I understand you, too, will enjoy the master’s prosperity. All shall be well. *Exeunt.*

50–9 The dialogue between the servants runs roughly parallel to TS (1.1.236–42) but adds proverbial diction characteristic of KK (see Introduction, pp. 116–17).

52 mock power The German ‘Spiel-Herrschaft’ (literally, ‘play rule’) draws attention to the play’s concern with how clothes produce social rank.

54–5 hands . . . inside (‘die Hand von der Bütte, es seynd Weinbeer darinnen’) Having imagined wooing Sabina in the person of his master, Felix chastises himself by saying, literally, that he must ‘take his hands off the wine tub, there are grapes inside’, a proverbial expression, meaning to desist from something (Grimm, ‘Butte’, 1).

58–9 we’ll . . . before (‘so geht es auff den alten Kayser in gutem Vertrauen los’) Felix promises Fabian to behave like the servant he is and drink with him when they are alone, literally living ‘in trust of the old Emperor’. This proverbial expression constitutes an excuse for irresponsible behaviour on the grounds that it occurred during the reign of the former emperor and was therefore expunged with the accession of the new (see Köhler, 219–20).

60–7 has no equivalent in TS.

60 And . . . fool. (‘Es bleib darbey sagt Spalter-Hans.’) literally ‘it remains thus, says Cleaver-John’, an obscure proverbial expression that refers to a rude and loutish person (Grimm, ‘Spalterhans’).

62 it . . . over (‘würde der Hund auff dem A. reiten’) Proverbial (Köhler, 220). The German literally means ‘the dog would ride on the a.’, i.e. ‘arse’, when he is too tired to hunt any longer.

64 your . . . prosperity Felix exploits the ambiguity created by the disguise since ‘master’ can refer both to himself and to their actual master, Hilarius.
This scene closely corresponds to TS, 1.2. It has four main movements: the first shows Hardman and Wormfire’s arrival at Alfons’ house (1–22; cf. TS, 1.2.1–19); in the second, Alfons joins them and recaps the wooing situation, proposing to Hardman the scheme to marry Catharina in order to free up Sabina for the suitors (23–153; cf. TS, 1.2.20–135); in the third, Sebastian and the disguised Hilarius arrive, and Sebastian commits to the scheme (154–316; cf. TS, 1.2.136–216); and the fourth brings onstage Fabian and the disguised Felix, who is accepted as third suitor by Sebastian and Alfons (316–416; cf. TS, 1.2.217–81). KK adds a brief dialogue between Sebastian and Wormfire on the latter’s origins (299–316), and ends on a short exchange of fellowship between Wormfire and Fabian (417–28).

0 SD As in 1.1, KK omits Petruccio’s indication of place (he has arrived at Padua from Verona, TS, 1.2.1–2).

1–22 This farcical passage closely corresponds to TS (1.2.4–19). The humour depends on the now archaic dative in ‘knock me here’ (TS, 1.2.8), meaning ‘knock for me’, which Grumio chooses to understand as ‘hit me here’. The dative is also possible in German grammar, so KK replicates the joke: ‘knock there for me’ (line 9; ‘da schlag mir an’).

6 pro . . . Jauer (‘pro more, vom Jauer’) Meaning unclear, as acknowledged by Köhler (220). Cohn translates ‘according to the custom of Jauer’ (cxxviii) but provides no explanation. ‘Jauer’ might refer to the town of Jauer in Silesia (today Jawor, Poland), to a person (perhaps Nikolas Magni of Jauer, a fifteenth-century Silesian theologian who wrote about superstitious practices and the reform of the Church), or to a Romansh dialect in Switzerland. We have found no evidence to support any of these hypotheses.

8 St Nicholas A fourth-century bishop of Myra in Turkey, St Nicholas was a popular saint in the Middle Ages and the early modern period, and a patron of diverse groups of people. The reference here is probably a general invocation for protection.

9 there KK substitutes a deictic adverb for TS’s ‘at this gate’ (1.2.11). Both versions play with the possibility of referring to the knocking about of Hardman and Petruccio, rather than the door.
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WORMFIRE I knew the song would end on such a note. My master must have noise in his head, hornets must have ravaged his brain. Me knock him? May the devil knock him! Yes, so he may, as long as I am spared.

HARDMAN I see that the bell will not ring, so I shall pull the handle. I’ll pull your ears and see if you can sing fa, sol, la.

*He pulls him back and forth by the ears.*

WORMFIRE Murder, murder! Alarm in all the streets! Help, ho, help! My master has parted with his wits, and wants to lodge with me!

HARDMAN You reckless bird, will you sing now?

Enter ALFONS, hastily.

ALFONS What does this mean? Do my eyes deceive me? Is it my lord, my brother? What does this brawl mean?

---

11 I . . . note. KK adds Wormfire’s musical metaphor which anticipates Hardman’s subsequent speech.

12–13 My . . . brain. KK turns Grumio’s ‘My master is grown quarrelsome’ (TS, 1.2.13) into two related metaphors for madness, anticipating Grumio’s ‘My master is mad’ (1.2.18) slightly later in the scene.

18 fa, sol, la ‘sol-fa’ in TS (1.2.17). Syllables in the solmization system in which each syllable indicates a note in the scale.

18 SD The corresponding SD in TS plays with the preceding musical conceit: ‘He wrings [spelt ‘rings’ in F] him by the ears’ (1.2.17 SD). KK adds the vivid detail of Hardman who ‘pulls’ Wormfire ‘back and forth’ like the handle of a bell.

19 Murder, murder (‘Mordio, Mordio’) derived from ‘Mord’ (‘murder’). A call that proclaims murder and encourages pursuit of the perpetrator (Grimm).

22 SD Hortensio simply ‘Enter[s]’ (TS, 1.2.19.1), whereas Alfons does so hastily (‘Springet heraus’, literally ‘jumps out’).

23–4 Do . . . me? KK amplifies Alfons’ surprise by adding this question (cf. TS, 1.2.20–2).

24 Is . . . brother? KK omits TS’s greeting of Grumio (1.2.20–1). Whereas Hortensio and Petruchio address each other by their first name, Alfons and Hardman repeatedly call each other ‘brother’ (cf. 29, 52, 68, etc.), here a term of address rather than an indication of consanguinity.
HARDMAN [to Wormfire] I’ll spare you the reckoning until later, you rogue.
WORMFIRE May that time never come.
HARDMAN [to Alfons] I beg your pardon, brother, I am sorry that you find me in such labour.
WORMFIRE [aside] May the hangman pay you for it.
HARDMAN [to Alfons] How do you like this life?
WORMFIRE I am weary of such a life. May the devil take the master or the servant.
HARDMAN I still hear you, you marmot.
ALFONS Hush, Wormfire. I will help to settle this quarrel.
WORMFIRE Then you should have come before I received the blows. The hangman thanks the arbitrator after the broil. If I had knocked my mad master soundly, perhaps I would not have been knocked at all.
HARDMAN You brainless villain! I said you should knock on the door, but I could not get this service from you, you deaf thick-skinned ass.
WORMFIRE Knock on the door, o mon dieu! Knock here, knock there, knock soundly. Is this what knock on the

26–7 Hardman delays his punishment of Wormfire with a proverbial saying (‘Ich will dir Schelmen bis zu ander zeit die Zeche borgen’, literally ‘I will lend you, knave, the tap until some other time’, i.e., I will let it pass (Wander, ‘Zeche’, 5)). Wormfire develops Hardman’s conceit, wishing to postpone the punishment indefinitely (‘Der Teuffel hole solchen Wirth’, literally ‘May the devil fetch such a host’).

30 Proverbial (Wander, ‘Henker’, 30). The first of Wormfire’s many asides in the play, with no equivalent in TS, demonstrating KK’s interest in how the servants reflect on the play’s themes (see Introduction, pp. 103–4, 107–8, 110–13).

35 Hardman likens Wormfire’s interruptions to the murmuring sounds made by a marmot (a large ground squirrel), which may have given rise to its German name (Grimm, ‘Murmeltier’, literally ‘murmuring animal’).

37–9 Then . . . broil. KK substitutes this passage for several lines from a speech by Grumio on the legitimacy of leaving service due to bad treatment by the master (TS, 1.2.28–33).

38–9 The . . . broil. Proverbial (Wander, ‘Henker’, 54). Wormfire alludes to his earlier proverb (31), suggesting he (the hangman) would only thank Alfons (the arbitrator) if he had done his duty of judging. The meaning is opaque: Wormfire may intimate that a quarrel and a death sentence would be good business for a hangman, but since Alfons has arrived too late to prevent him from getting hit, he will not thank him.

44 o mon dieu French, ‘oh my God’. TS has ‘O heavens’ (1.2.39).
door means? My master’s wits run away from him, and he means to find them by knocking me, but he’ll sooner chase away my own wits too.

HARDMAN  Do I hear you still? I shall have to go back to where I left off.

WORMFIRE  No need, my lord, you may save the labour.

ALFONS [to Hardman]  Brother, accept my plea for your entertaining servant. Release him from blows, and instead tell me what good wind brings you here.

WORMFIRE (aside) A stormy, whizzing wind.

HARDMAN  The same wind that spurs so many young people around the world. My father is dead, and I am heir to all his estate. I lack nothing except a fitting wife. Until I get one, I have put a hundred ducats in my purse to go out into the world and see what is lacking in my fatherland.

ALFONS  I would be happy to help my brother to a wife who is young and rich enough, but –

HARDMAN  Give me your hand on these words. An honest man keeps his word.

46–8 My . . . too. Wormfire develops his earlier conceit at lines 19–21. Neither passage has an equivalent in TS.

50 left off Our translation relies on Köhler’s emendation of ‘gewendet’ (i.e. turned) in D1 and D2 to ‘geendet’ (i.e. ended, left off).

54 here TS provides geographical locations at this point (‘to Padua . . . from old Verona’, 1.2.48) and elsewhere (e.g., 1.1.2 and 1.2.2), while KK is careful to omit them.

55 whizzing wind (‘Sausewind’) perhaps an allusion to Hardman’s title, ‘heir and owner of Whirlwind Heights’ (‘Erbsas zum Würbelwind’); see List of Roles.

56–61 The speech follows Petruccio’s (TS, 1.2.49–57) but adds Hardman’s insistence on his status as lord over his lands. KK does not mention the father’s name (‘Antonio’, TS, 1.2.53), which is in keeping with its omission of names elsewhere (see 2.1.104–5 and note).

59 hundred ducats Cf. ‘Crowns in my purse I have’ (TS, 1.2.56). The ducat was the main trade coin in early modern Germany. In the wager passage, Hardman raises the stakes from twenty to a hundred ducats (5.2.272–5).
WORMFIRE [aside] She’ll be good enough if she’s rich enough. Money, money.

ALFONS Brother, don’t be overhasty in this bargain. You should have let me finish speaking. She is extremely evil.

WORMFIRE [aside] Then she’s right for him. They’re birds of the same feather.

HARDMAN Evil is the least impediment, my lord. If she were as evil and grim as a lion, as roaring and sullen as a bear, as unfriendly as a marmot, as prone to bite and scratch as a dog or a cat, it would be a small impediment; indeed, it is no blemish at all if there is money enough.

ALFONS I don’t know if you are joking or not.

WORMFIRE No, my lord, by our old maidservant’s undershirt, he’s absolutely serious. He’s telling you his true heart. Just marry him with the money, and

71–2 They’re . . . feather. The German uses an evocative, presumably proverbial expression (see Köhler, 220): ‘Gleich und gleich, sagt der Teuffel zum Köhler’ (literally, ‘like to like, says the devil to the charcoal-burner’). The devil and the charcoal-burner are imagined as black (and sinister) in the same way as Catharina and Hardman are both rough and evil, according to Wormfire.

73–8 Hardman’s speech is modelled on Petruccio’s (TS, 1.2.64–75). It preserves the general emphasis on money as the main reason for marrying the shrew but omits Petruccio’s insistence on Padua (1.2.74–5). Like Petruccio, Hardman chooses four elements for hypothetical comparison to Catharina, but KK replaces TS’s literary allusions to undesirable women (‘Florentius’ love . . . Sibyl . . . Socrates’ Xanthippe’, 1.2.68–70) with undesirable animals. For Socrates and Xanthippe in KK, see the Prologue.

75 unfriendly . . . marmot Wander records an expression, ‘Es ist ein altes Murmelthier’ (i.e., ‘she is an old marmot’), that suggests that marmots were associated with unfriendly women.

80–91 Wormfire’s speech is modelled on Grumio’s (TS, 1.2.76–81), but expands on the original with colourful elaborations on the undesirability of Hardman’s imagined wife.

80–1 by . . . undershirt Wormfire’s mock oath makes fun of Hardman’s previous grandiloquence, bathetically swearing by the least expensive or elegant bit of clothing women would wear. Wander cites KK as unique witness to this expression (‘Magd’, 84). There is a similar mock oath in the same author’s Der Pedanthische Irrthum (‘Ich schwüre bei unser Magd Mäusefallen’, literally ‘I swear by our maid’s mousetrap’, p. 273). See Introduction, p. 144.
you can give him either a silly puppet or an old withered hag without a tooth left in her chops, and no hair on her skull, making the shameful head shiver, and the ugly legs shake. If she were fouler than the devil’s dam, and had more diseases than fifty-two old rotten nags, it’s no impediment as long as there’s money, and money enough. Money passes through the world, rules the world, seduces the world, and my lord is a child of the world.

**ALFONS**  What I started as a joke I will end seriously if you are serious, although I do not wish a friend like you anything but what I wish for myself, namely only good. She is young enough, has beauty enough, money enough. The only blemish, and that is blemish enough, is that she is so very shrewish and brawling, which is why I would not have her for all the wealth in the world.

83 **silly puppet** (‘eine läppische Kinderpuppe’, literally a slight children’s doll). KK condenses two elements in TS, ‘a puppet or an aglet-baby’ (1.2.78). The meaning of ‘aglet-baby’ is unclear; perhaps it designates a decorated tag (Ard³, 180). The translator may not have known the word but understood that it functions as a contemptuous term.

84–6 **and . . . shake** This addition to TS shows the adaptor expanding on the effect of ugliness. Inspired by ‘ne’er a tooth in her head’ (TS, 1.2.78–9), he moves from ‘no hair’ and ‘shameful head’ to ugly ‘legs’ in a kind of anti-blazon (see Hillman and Mazzio, 3–22).

87 **devil’s dam** Hardman also hypothetically compares Catharina to the devil’s mother at 2.1.266.

87–8 **and . . . nags** KK surpasses its original by turning ‘as many diseases as’ (TS, 1.2.79) into ‘more diseases than’, and ‘two and fifty horses’ (TS, 1.2.80) into ‘fifty-two old rotten nags’ (‘alte verdorbene Schindmehren’).

89–91 **Money . . . world.** In TS, Grumio caps his flamboyant speech with a memorable parallel construction on money’s power to persuade: ‘nothing comes amiss – so money comes withal’ (1.2.80–1). KK surpasses the original in rhetorical amplification by paraphrasing it with four sayings on the theme.

92–9 Alfons’ speech follows Hortenio’s (TS, 1.2.82–91) while also integrating the end of Hortensio’s previous speech: ‘But thou’rt too much my friend, / And I’ll not wish thee to her’ (1.2.62–3). The only element KK omits is Hortensio’s assurance of Katherina’s social acceptability since she has been ‘[b]rought up as best becomes a gentlewoman’ (1.2.86).
HARDMAN O, my good brother, you don’t know the effects of money. Just tell me who she is, and it’s enough. I will marry her, even if she has the biting tongue of a dog, yes, even if her shrewish voice rattles more than thunder rolling through high mountains.

ALFONS Her father is Sir Theobald, a noble and affable gentleman. Her name is Catharina.

WORMFIRE It would be a good sign if she were called Margaret.

HARDMAN I know this gentleman well. I have heard enough and shall not rest until I have finished this affair. I take my leave, unless my brother chooses to accompany me.

ALFONS Do not start this business too hastily.

WORMFIRE My lord, for your life’s sake, don’t fight this storm but let him be, since he is stung by these wasps. His mind is set now. He will go about the thing properly. If she knew him as well as I do, she would

100–5 A close adaptation of Petruchio’s speech (TS, 1.2.92–5), except that Petruchio asks for ‘her father’s name’ (1.2.93), not ‘who she is’ (101).

106–7 KK omits the surname (‘Minola’, TS, 1.2.96, 98) and place name (‘Padua’, 1.2.99) in Hortensio’s equivalent speech (1.2.96–9).

108–9 The meaning of this expression, which has no equivalent in TS, is unclear. Köhler (224) suspects a connection to Saint Margaret of Antioch who reputedly escaped alive after being swallowed by Satan in the shape of a dragon.

110–13 Petruchio’s equivalent speech (TS, 1.2.100–5) mentions that Katherina’s father ‘knew [his] deceased father well’ (1.2.101).

114 has no equivalent in TS.

116 storm perhaps another allusion to Hardman’s title ‘heir and owner of Whirlwind Heights’ (see 1.3.55, 124, and List of Roles).

116 let . . . wasps Grumio advises Hortensio to ‘let [Petruchio] go while the humour lasts’ (TS, 1.2.106), i.e., while Petruchio acts upon a whim. KK translates this idea into, literally, being ‘driven by these crickets’ (‘wenn jhn diese Grillen treiben’), i.e. ‘foolish and amusing inventions’ (Grimm, ‘Grille’, 2). This idiom recalls the beginning of the scene where Wormfire accuses Hardman of having hornets buzzing in his brain (see 12–13 and note).
soon leave her scolding. If she calls him a rogue once or ten times, he will interpret it as if she hailed him as a lord. He will take other immodest, peevish words as the best compliments, and when he’s well warmed up, he’ll chase away her impetuous blasts with his whirlwind. He’ll cut such a strange figure in her face that she’ll have no more eyes than a blind cat. He’ll treat her so properly that she won’t know up from down, or whether she is in the barn or in the cellar with him.

HARDMAN I’m only wasting my time by staying here longer. May God be with you.

ALFONS Brother, wait, I will go with you. My treasure is also hidden in the house of your future wife. This occasion allows me to see my heart, Sabina, whom I hope to conquer as soon as raging Catharina is gone.

WORMFIRE Raging Catharina, that’s a very encomiastic epithet for a maid. She must be a pretty angel who belongs in the devil’s heaven.

119–22 If … compliments. KK translates Grumio’s supposition that Katherina ‘may perhaps call [Petruccio] half a score knaves or so’ (TS, 1.2.108–9), but adds that Hardman will understand Catharina’s insults as compliments. Wormfire, unlike Grumio, thus provides a first glimpse of his master’s taming method of pretending to understand the reverse of Catharina’s words (see KK, 2.1.260–85, and TS, 2.1.169–79).

124 whirlwind See notes at 1.3.55, 116.

124–5 He’ll … cat. KK does not reproduce the English pun on cat/Kate (TS, 1.2.114), which does not work in German, and simply translates the original (1.2.111–14), including Grumio’s anticipation that Petruccio will ‘disfigure’ (1.2.112) Katherina.

131–4 KK considerably condenses Hortensio’s equivalent speech (TS, 1.2.115–26), notably by omitting Baptista’s stipulation that his older daughter must be married before his younger, which has been explained before (KK, 1.1.1–7; TS, 1.1.48–54). Hortensio describes his ‘treasure’ as in ‘Baptista’s keep’ (TS, 1.2.116). Alfonso, by contrast, says that his treasure (Sabina) is in ‘the house of your [i.e. Hardman’s] future wife’, which takes for granted that Hardman’s suit will be successful and that the inheritance of the eldest child will become his.

135–6 encomiastic epithet (‘encomisches epitheton’) translates Grumio’s ‘of all titles the worst’ (TS, 1.2.128), replacing the untranslatable rhyme (‘Curst’ / ‘worst’, 1.2.127–8) with tongue-in-cheek irony.

137 the devil’s (‘Meister Hämmerleins’) literally ‘Master Small Hammer’, a designation for the devil, derived from the Germanic hammer-wielding god Thor, who came to be associated with the devil (Grimm, ‘Hämmerlein’, 2a). Wormfire equates Catharina with a fallen angel.
ALFONS [to Hardman] But I beg one thing of you, brother, that you introduce me into Sir Theobald’s house as a musician when the time is right. Since she intends to learn to play the lute, this occasion will serve to win her favour.

WORMFIRE I believe that when she lends you the belly-cittern, you’ll forget the lute.

ALFONS Well guessed. [to Hardman] But do you agree, brother?

HARDMAN You know that our friendship puts me at your service, and I swear I shall not say a word, since you are helping me in such a desired affair. So come, we shall do well.

WORMFIRE The young stick together when it comes to duping the old. The world is full of rascals. But, sir, who’s coming there?

Enter SEBASTIAN [and HILARIUS as] Johannes.
[Alfons, Hardman and Wormfire stand aside.]

ALFONS Hush, Wormfire! He is my rival suitor. He also strives to win the love of beautiful Sabina.

140 musician compresses Hortensio’s scheme to be ‘disguised in sober robes / . . . as a schoolmaster / Well seen in music’ (TS, 1.2.130–2).

140–1 she . . . lute Hortensio’s equivalent speech (TS, 1.2.129–35) does not provide this information.

143–4 Wormfire, in a speech with no equivalent in TS, coins a word, ‘belly-cittern’ (‘Bauchzitter’), with a bawdy reference to the female genitals, which he may imagine being fingered like the strings of the instrument. The word is used by the same author and with the same innuendo in Alamodisch Technologisches Interim (1675): ‘Ich spielte gestern Abend der Liese ein wenig auff der Bauchzitter’ (sig. O9v; ‘last night I played a bit for Liz on the belly-cittern’, or ‘. . . on Liz’s belly-cittern’). A cittern is a stringed instrument that is smaller and easier to play than the lute. For other sexual puns on musical instruments, see 2.1.99–104, 3.1.82–4 and notes.

153 SD2 Although KK omits the implied SD in Hortensio’s ‘Petruccio, stand by awhile’ (TS, 1.2.140), it is clear that Sebastian and Hilarius are unaware of Alfons, Hardman and Wormfire until the latter ‘step forward’ (185.1).
WORMFIRE   If it’s about running a race for her, he’s already lost.

SEBASTIAN [to Hilarius]   The next thing I want is that you buy for her the best books about love that you can find. These have great power to enflame the fire of love in the hearts of maidens.

WORMFIRE (aside) But not for you.

SEBASTIAN   And they should be bound in the daintiest and prettiest manner. The paper that you use must be well perfumed, for she whom my soul loves is worth more than all exquisite spices. And may I remind you, Johannes, to be as diligent in her service as you can. Your reward from me will exceed even Sir Theobald’s generosity.

WORMFIRE [aside] He looks to me as if he would receive his salary from her without your knowledge or will.

SEBASTIAN   But what matters will you treat with her?

HILARIUS   My noble lord, do not trouble yourself with that. Everything that I undertake with her is intended to speak for you as my lord patron, and that just as if

---

156–7 If . . . lost. In TS’s equivalent speech, Grumio comments on the entry of Gremio and Lucentio, ‘[a] proper stripling, and an amorous’ (1.2.141), which could refer to either character. KK resolves the ambiguity: Wormfire sarcastically comments on Sebastian’s age, which makes it impossible for him to outrun the young suitors.

158–73 This passage corresponds to a single speech by Gremio in TS (1.2.142–51) into which KK inserts two acerbic asides by Wormfire that have no equivalent in TS.

158–60 The . . . find. KK follows TS (1.2.142–57) in having the old suitor and the disguised lover enter in conversation. Gremio hands a ‘note’ (TS, 1.2.142) to Lucentio, presumably with a list of the books the latter is using in his instruction of Bianca, an implied SD that KK omits.

160–1 These . . . maidens. Sebastian’s hope of enflaming (‘anzublasen’, literally ‘to blow on’) love in the woman he is wooing is implied in the ‘books of love’ (TS, 1.2.144) Gremio wants to be read to Bianca, but only in KK is it spelled out.

163–9 KK adds Sebastian’s encouragement of Hilarius to be ‘diligent in her service’ (167), unaware of the sexual implications of his words which provoke Wormfire’s subsequent innuendo.

174–9 adapts Lucentio’s speech (TS, 1.2.152–6). By calling him ‘a very learned gentleman’ (178), Hilarius flatters Sebastian, unlike Lucentio who suggests that Gremio lacks eloquence (TS, 1.2.155–6).
you were present yourself. Do not doubt my faith, especially since I do this for a very learned gentleman such as you.

SEBASTIAN  O, learning, what an excellent piece of work this is!
WORMFIRE  O this old Master Rabbit, what a fool he is!
HARDMAN   Shut your mouth, or I’ll bridle you.
ALFONS     Keep your maw shut, Wormfire, don’t spoil our bargain.

_They step forward._

Good day to you, Sir Sebastian.

SEBASTIAN  My lord, let me thank you heartily. Is this how we meet?
ALFONS     This time it is. Where are you going?
SEBASTIAN  Where you, my lord, are perhaps not allowed to come for now.
ALFONS     That’s too much. I’m sure my feet can do more than yours. My way leads straight to Sir Theobald’s house.
SEBASTIAN  Hum! I thought such a way was open only to me, as I have found a diligent person experienced in poetry, music and other sciences to instruct his beautiful daughter.

---

182  **Master Rabbit** (‘Herr Gehasi’) ‘Gehasi’ is the name of Elisha’s dishonest servant who became leprous as punishment for his duplicity (see 2 Kings 5:20–7). Owing to its similarity to ‘Hase’ (‘rabbit’), it is used as a term of abuse for ‘fool’. For another ‘rabbit’ insult, see 1.1.28. See also Köhler, 222–3.

185  SD The SD is implicit in _TS_, or inserted by modern editors, e.g., ‘Coming forward’ (_NOS_, 4.153 SD).

189  **Where . . . going?** _KK_ assigns Gremio’s rhetorical question, ‘Trow you [i.e., do you know] wither I am going?’ (_TS_, 1.2.163), to Alfons.

190–216  The rivalry between the two suitors is given greater scope than in the corresponding passage in _TS_ (1.2.163–77). Sebastian, in particular, is more argumentative and distrustful towards the proposed plan than Gremio.

196–7  **experienced . . . sciences** adapts Gremio’s sexual innuendo of the young tutor possessing ‘learning and behaviour / Fit for her turn’ (_TS_, 1.2.167–8).
WORMFIRE [aside] Men use strange ways of introducing themselves nowadays.

ALFONS If that is all it takes to open the door, I also have the key in my hands. This nobleman here has promised to present me with a very skilful person who is an excellent musician. He will instruct the lovely Sabina whom I love so ardently.

SEBASTIAN Whom I love so ardently, as you and everyone will find out from my deeds.

WORMFIRE (aside) And I believe your purse will find it out too.

ALFONS Sir Sebastian, your heart must be overcome with passion since you are in such a hurry to put on your armour, although there is no war as yet. But this is no time to let jealousy overrule us, since we need to proceed together in this affair, whether Fortune smiles on you or on me. Let us thus set aside our ancient hate.

WORMFIRE (aside) He means the old hare. How sweetly he whistles when he seeks to catch the bird.

SEBASTIAN I cannot see what should make us stick together, but I will willingly hear what you say.

ALFONS By chance this nobleman, my good friend, has come to visit me today. He happens to be willing and eager to marry Catharina who is rich and noble, though too rough and evil for us. Provided, however, that he receives her dowry and a few other essentials.

201–2 If . . . hands. has no equivalent in TS, adding another sexual innuendo.

210–11 Sir . . . passion KK adds to TS Alfons’ denigration of Sebastian, alleging he has ‘Wust’ (dirt, slimy secretion from internal organs; Grimm 1 and B1a) around the heart.

215–16 our . . . hate In TS there is no evidence of an ancient grudge between Hortensio and Gremio.

217 old hare i.e. Alfons referred to Sebastian.


219–32 mostly follows the dialogue in TS (1.2.180–7) but adds Hardman’s need for ‘a few other essentials’ (225), according to Alfons.
233–48 Not . . . up Only Sebastian’s question about Hardman’s origins is based on TS (“GREMIO . . . What countryman?”, 1.2.188). The passage adds to the confrontation between Hardman and Sebastian a sense of barely contained violence that has no equivalent in TS.

236–7 Hard . . . again. Wormfire suggests that Catharina and Hardman will match each other, using a proverb, ‘Hart wieder hart, sagt der Teuffel und schmeiß wieder einen Ambos’, literally ‘Hard against hard, says the devil, and throws another anvil’. The anvil and, implicitly, the hammer that strikes on it are equally hard objects, and will not hurt each other (see Wander, ‘Amboss’, 21).

245–9 No reason is provided for Hardman’s (and later Wormfire’s, 301–4) evasiveness about their origins. Unlike Petruccio (‘old Antonio’s son. / My father dead’ (TS, 1.2.189–90)), Hardman does not provide the name of his father.

246–7 dance . . . together Hardman presumably means that they would fight. The Germanic sword dance referred to in Tacitus’ Germania (chapter 24) involves leaping over bare swords.
my name or not, but I can make you shut up: I am from Worms. My father is dead.

Wormfire (aside) It’s a marvel he doesn’t say ‘Thank God’.

Hardman I am heir to all his estate, and hope to spend a long and happy life.

Sebastian I hope, my lord, you have not misunderstood my words, there was no bad intention in them. If you wish to have such a life, you must not take this lady as your wife. But if you seek to hang a wild cat about your neck, I shall be glad to help you.

Wormfire He will not be afraid of her scratching like this old woodcock. Once he’s got her in his clutches, he’ll romp with her, and make her tame.

Hardman I’ll soon teach you to speak on my behalf, and in a way that won’t please you. [to Sebastian] Sir, whoever you are, I have come here to marry a rich woman. If she be rich, I’ll have her in despite of the

248–53 I . . . life. Wormfire’s aside is added to what is otherwise a close adaptation of Petruccio’s speech at TS, 1.2.189–91.

249 Worms A Free Imperial City of the Roman Empire, on the Upper Rhine, about forty miles south of Frankfurt (the play’s likely place of publication, see Introduction, pp. 147–9). It has several connotations: it is the capital of the Nibelungs in the medieval myth of Siegfried the dragon slayer. It gives Hardman an urban air like Verona (TS, 1.2.189). In the tenth century, Worms was a seat of the Emperor Charlemagne. In 1521, it hosted the Diet of Worms during which Luther publicly defended his reformist thought in the presence of Emperor Charles V. The city remained linked to Protestantism in the sixteenth century, attracting reformers like William Tyndale. During the Thirty Years’ War, it came under attack several times, most heavily in 1634.

254–7 I . . . wife. KK adds Sebastian’s attempt to defuse the situation (‘I hope . . . intention’) to a speech which otherwise adapts Gremio’s at TS, 1.2.192–4.

262–79 KK’s version of Petruccio’s speech (TS, 2.1.197–209) imitates the structure of the original but amplifies many of its elements. For example, TS has ‘lions roar’ (1.2.199) but KK has the ‘bellowing, howling and growling of lions’ (269–70). KK also adds the colourful comparison between the pitch of a woman’s voice and a fart (275–7).

262–3 I’ll . . . you. The strained master–servant relationship is absent from TS at the equivalent point.

263–4 Sir . . . are KK adds Hardman’s implication that, while Sebastian asked for his identity, he never introduced himself.
devil. She shall be friendly enough, even though her brawling chops don’t speak one good letter, let alone a word. What do I care for a maid and her scolding voice? Has the bellowing, howling and growling of lions, bears and wolves ever startled me? Have I not seen the roaring sea throw its cruel waves over my head, and open its throat to swallow my entire body? The cracking and crashing of the fire-spitting cannon and thunder, that artillery of heaven, have never frightened me. And should I now fear a woman’s voice that makes no greater bang than wind pressed out from behind, or a nut thrown into the fire? Go away, and scare boys with bubbles, not men.

SEBASTIAN My lord, you have great courage, and, I admit, more than I have.

WORMFIRE My lord fears no woman, whether she is born of the devil or hatched by all Margarets of whom seven banned the devil from hell.

SEBASTIAN I confess, this brave nobleman has arrived at the right time. I promise him all advancement if he marries the older and sets the other free.

ALFONS He’ll do it, for although he doesn’t need it, his mind runs on money. That is why I have promised

---

282–4 Wormfire’s speech begins with a version of Grumio’s short line (“For he fears none,” TS, 1.2.209) and adds speculations about Catharina’s sinister origins (cf. 137 and note). The origins of the reference to seven Margarets who banned the devil from hell (“von allen Margarethen, deren sieben den Teuffel außen gebannet, aufgebrutet seyn”) are unknown. They are mentioned in a book of comic tales, Facetiae facetiarum hoc est joco seriorum fasciculus novus (1647, VD17 23:288361L): ‘Margaretha . . . derer sieben den Teuffel die Höllen zu eng machen’ (sig. X9v; in English, literally ‘Margretha . . . seven of whom make hell too narrow for the devil’). The book seems to have been first published in 1615 (VD17 39:139709Q).

285–7 Sebastian’s speech mirrors Gremio’s (TS, 1.2.210–12) but adds the insistence on Hardman’s task of setting Sabina free.

288–9 He’ll . . . money. has no equivalent in TS.
him that you and I will pay all the expenses he might incur in this affair.

SEBASTIAN I’m ready to do my part.

WORMFIRE (aside) It will make a hole in your purse, that’s for sure.

SEBASTIAN I fear he may not take her when he meets her.

WORMFIRE If I received such a dainty dish with such a pleasant drink as he will take, I’d know how to satisfy my thirsty throat.

SEBASTIAN You seem to be an exceedingly good brother. What country are you from?

WORMFIRE To satisfy my lord’s curiosity, I am a European, and my mother’s body is my birthplace. If my lord means to enter in at the gate, he’ll need to go nose first.

ALFONS Not too fast, Wormfire.

WORMFIRE Treat every man as he deserves. Truly, this old sir deserves to be told.

SEBASTIAN I think this fellow is a bit mad.

WORMFIRE We served in a regiment under the Dragon at Bautzen. My lord was hit on the head with a scrap of

296–316 This passage is added by KK and is humorously concerned with issues of identity similar to those dramatized in relation to Hardman earlier in the scene (241–9).

299–304 Sebastian is as curious about Wormfire’s origins as he was about those of Hardman (241–3), and, like Hardman (245–9), Wormfire gives no straightforward answer.

302–5 my . . . Wormfire The conflation of body and town provokes a sexual innuendo for which Alfons rebukes Wormfire.

306–7 Wormfire defends himself by implying that he speaks in the same vein as he was spoken to (by Sebastian), literally saying that one fries the herring according to the man who eats it; ‘Nach dem der Mann ist brätet man jhm einen Härting’ (Wander, ‘Hering’, 55).

309–12 Wormfire wilfully misunderstands Sebastian, who voices doubts about Wormfire’s mental sanity, not Hardman’s.

309–10 We . . . Bautzen. Wormfire refers to his and Hardman’s alleged military service at Bautzen, a town in east Saxony, which may be intended to recall events from the Thirty Years’ War, notably the siege in 1620 and its destruction by fire during occupation by the Catholic imperial army in 1633. Wormfire may also be recalling the now obscure proverb, ‘er war vor Bautzen geschossen’ (literally ‘he was shot before Bautzen’; see Köhler, 225). The present meaning of ‘Dragon’ (‘Lindwurm’) is unclear.
rabbit fur in such a dangerous encounter that he almost lost all of his brain.

SEBASTIAN   A man who speaks with fools mustn’t expect wise answers.

WORMFIRE   Then, my over-wise lord, you shouldn’t 315 speak with yourself.

Enter FELIX and FABIAN.

Goodness me, what have we here, strutting like a turkey cock?

FELIX   Here are good people who will show me the way.
       – Gentlemen, forgive your humble servant if he 320 enquires where Sir Theobald lives.

WORMFIRE [aside]   Here’s another fellow following the piper into town. – Do you mean the gentleman with those two elegant daughters?

SEBASTIAN [to Felix]   One word before the answer, my 325 lord. You don’t mean her, do you?

FELIX   Perhaps she and him. What business is it of yours?

HARDMAN   The scolding daughter is not your business, that I advise you.

WORMFIRE   And I too, if you want to save your skin. 330

FELIX   I don’t hold with squabbling. – Come, Fabian, I’m wasting my time here.

316 SD–18 KK does not preserve TS’s SD of Tranio entering ‘brave’, i.e. finely dressed in his disguise as Lucentio (1.2.216 SD). Yet the German play picks up on it by having Wormfire describe Felix as a ‘turkey cock’ (‘Schnauzhahn’), a conceited, swaggering person (Grimm, ‘Pfeife’, 3b). Wormfire may suspect Felix and the other suitors of being driven by lust in their courtship. 323–4 Do . . . daughters? In TS it is Biondello who asks whether Baptista is he ‘that has the two fair daughters’ (1.2.220). KK’s assignment of the speech to Wormfire contributes to his increased disruptive presence towards the end of the act. 323–55 Do . . . Alfons. KK remains close to TS (1.2.220–36), but punctuates the dialogue with Wormfire’s sarcastic remarks.
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FABIAN I’d rather spend time in the tavern.
WORMFIRE Well said! We two will be great friends!
HILARIUS The man plays his part well if it ends as it started.
ALFONS [to Felix] My lord, a word before you go. Are you in love with the maid? Yes or no?
FELIX That’s a brief question. Would it worry you if I said yes?
SEBASTIAN No, as long as you go away without another word.
FELIX At your command? It makes me laugh that you want to threaten me. Think on your grave rather, and leave the world and what’s pleasant in it to young folks. Tell me, is the road not as free for me as it is for you?
SEBASTIAN Yes, but not the maid.
WORMFIRE (aside) Upon my life, she’s not free for you either.
FELIX And for what reason, fine old sir?
SEBASTIAN For this reason: Sir Sebastian has already chosen her as his beloved.
WORMFIRE It takes two to make such a choice.
ALFONS No. Instead she has been chosen and elected by Sir Alfons.
FELIX To this I could and should say: Sir Hilarius of Liebenthal wants her to be his. But what’s the cause of this childish quarrel?
WORMFIRE It is vero verius, truer than truth: where carrion

337–8 *Are . . . maid?* KK replaces Hortensio’s question about whether Gremio is ‘a suitor’ (*TS*, 1.2.228) with an enquiry as to whether he is ‘in love’.
346–53 *Tell . . . choice.* A passage that is otherwise close to *TS* (1.2.231–5) inserts two biting comments by Wormfire on Sebastian’s presumptuous wooing of a much younger woman.
359 *vero verius* Latin (Wormfire goes on to translate); a short form of the common Latin tag *vero nihil verius*, nothing truer than truth.
359–60 *where . . . gather.* This proverbial-sounding phrase imagines Sabina as carrion over which the suitors (‘ravens’) fight.
is stinking, there the ravens will gather. I imagine it will be in this affair as it was with the honourable dogs’ wedding: one got the taste of it, and the rest only the smell. My master comes off the best. Nobody wants to lodge in his lady’s nest or invade his park.

[FELIX] Gentlemen, hear me if you are truly noble and of sound mind. The maid for whom we doff our hats is not yet promised to anyone. You are already more than one sighing for her. Why should you not permit there to be another, since you cannot refuse it? It is well known that the mouth waters when one sees a pleasant morsel. Leda’s beautiful daughter had a hundred suitors, so beautiful Sabina may indeed have one more. I wish to be among them as though Paris himself came to marry her.

SEBASTIAN This man means to make us all mute with his prattling.

WORMFIRE He has a quick tongue; he would make an excellent mountebank or a wordy lawyer.

360–3 I . . . smell. Wormfire continues the conceit that compares his betters to animals, suggesting the courting will lead to a ‘Hunde Hochzeit’ (‘dogs’ wedding’), which seems to refer to sexual consummation (‘the taste’) prompted by lust rather than marriage (Grimm, ‘Hundehochzeit’).

364 invade . . . park Wormfire likens Catharina to a wild animal kept by Hardman in his park (‘Gehäge’). For this proverbial expression, see Grimm, ‘Gehege’ 2d.

365 D1 and D2 mistakenly assign the speech to Fabian.

370 morsel For an earlier reference to Sabina as a tasty morsel, see 1.1.131. Neither reference has a direct equivalent in TS.

371–4 Leda’s . . . her. A close adaptation of TS, 1.2.243–6. In Greek mythology, Leda’s daughter is Helen of Troy whose elopement with (or abduction by) Prince Paris precipitated the Trojan War. That Felix casts himself in the role of Paris may indicate that he is an illicit suitor.

378 wordy lawyer Wormfire uses the evocative ‘Zungendrescher’, literally ‘tongue thresher’, someone who uses his tongue, i.e. language, not his hands, to thresh corn. The word probably refers to unscrupulous lawyers using their eloquence to justify wrong for personal gain (see Grimm, ‘Zungendrescher’). Perhaps Wormfire sees through Felix’s disguise.
HILARIUS [to Sebastian]  My honoured lord, let him try his luck a little. His preposterous actions will have a ridiculous end.

HARDMAN  Brother Alfons, why all these vain words?

ALFONS [to Felix]  With your permission, my lord, I will be so bold as to ask you one more question. Have you ever seen Sir Theobald’s daughters?

WORMFIRE (aside)  Only a fool loves those he doesn’t know.

FELIX  No, but I have learnt from others that he has two: one as famous for her rough tongue and manner as the other for her virtue and meek modesty. This has led me to see and woo her if she truly has such noble gifts.

HARDMAN  Friend, turn your thoughts away from the first sister. I seek to win her liking.

SEBASTIAN  Yes, yes, my lord, do not fear. We leave this task to great Hercules.

WORMFIRE  My lord has the club ready with which he will attack her flesh. It is long and thick enough, and covered with good leather.

HARDMAN [to Felix]  My lord, you should know that the father will not let go of the younger daughter whom you all three think about, before he rids himself of the elder who is to be mine.

385 Sir . . . daughters Unlike TS’s Hortensio (1.2.251), Alfons refers to Theobald’s daughters in the plural, which explains Hardman’s touchiness at 393–4.

395–6 KK adapts Gremio’s speech (TS, 1.2.256–7) but omits his mocking exaggeration that Katharine’s taming would top all of Hercules’ labours.

397–9 has no equivalent in TS. Wormfire builds on Sebastian’s comparison of Hardman and Hercules to use Hercules’ club as a phallic image.

400–3 Unlike Petruchio in the equivalent passage in TS (1.2.259–63), Hardman insists that the elder daughter ‘is to be [his]’.
[FELIX] Very well, my lord. Because you are the man who dares to marry the elder sister, I will show you all possible friendship. You are setting the younger free.

WORMFIRE But not free from penetration, which is the lot of womanfolk.

ALFONS Well now, gentlemen, let us make peace. We can as little ban him from wooing as he can ban us. It is folly to quarrel and brawl over what’s not yet one’s own.

FELIX I am content with this way of handling it. Come, gentlemen, let us go in and drink to our fellowship.

ALFONS We are happy to follow.

[Exeunt Felix, Hardman, Sebastian, Hilarius and Alfons.]

WORMFIRE You and I will thus also get good fellowship.

FABIAN I’ll refuse nothing, except a box on the ears.

WORMFIRE I heard a delicious word today that tickles

404–7 streamlines the equivalent speech by Tranio (TS, 1.2.264–9).

404 SP D1 and D2 mistakenly assign the speech to Fabian. This and a number of other speeches are misassigned to characters whose names start with the same letter, which may suggest that the manuscript that served as the printer’s copy used abbreviated SPs (see SPs at 4.4.54, 5.2.15, 27, 43, 136, 263 and notes).

408 But . . . penetration. Wormfire suggests that, even though Sabina might be set free to be wooed, she is not free from the penetration of the hymen. The German word is ‘stich frey’ (literally ‘sting free’) with the common meaning of ‘invulnerable in battle’, but, more specifically, pertaining to women whose hymen does not break when having sex (Grimm, ‘stichfrei’, esp. 3).

410–13 Whereas Alfons emphasizes the suitors’ peacemaking, Hortensio’s corresponding speech in TS (1.2.270–3) focuses on Tranio’s funding of Petruccio’s endeavours.

414–15 condenses the equivalent speech by Tranio (TS, 1.2.274–8).

416 Before Hortensio’s equivalent speech (TS, 1.2.280–1) which ends the scene, Grumio and Biondello speak in unison: ‘O excellent motion! Fellows, let’s be gone’ (TS, 1.2.279). KK omits the servants’ line, but amplifies its import, the rough camaraderie and anticipated joys of drinking, in a subsequent dialogue after the suitors have left the stage (417–28).

419 word presumably Felix’s reference to ‘drink’ before his exit.
my thirsty throat. Be merry, my throat! I know that all the cups that come to my hand will have holes in them, drink will never stop pouring through. How beautifully it will flow! But the longer here, the later there. We are missing out. Let’s go, my friend.

FABIAN Rogues speak like this when they seek to leave. I follow more than willingly if we go to work this way. No honest man refuses another’s invitation.

Exeunt.

2.[1] Enter CATHARINA and SABINA.

CATHARINA Now I have you alone in my power, you shall dance to my tune, you spoilt child.

421 holes Compare the German expression ‘saufen wie ein Loch’ (literally ‘to drink like a hole’), i.e. to drink like a fish (Wander, ‘saufen’, 65).

2.1 No location is specified, but the scene is presumably set in front of Theobald’s house. The scene falls into five parts: 1–81 (to the entry of the suitors, the suitors in disguise, and Wormfire), 82–285 (to Catharina’s re-entry), 286–486 (Hardman and Catharina alone), 487–574 (to the exit of Hardman and Catharina), and 575–670 (the bartering of Sebastian and Felix). The first part, the confrontation between the sisters, follows TS (2.1.1–38), but adds Veit’s innuendos. The second part, the introductions of the new suitors Hardman and Felix, is closely adapted from TS (2.1.39–179) but inserts Wormfire’s comments and a brief dialogue between servant and master on Hardman’s taming technique (235–59). The third part, with Catharina and Hardman’s first encounter, remains close to TS (2.1.180–282) but includes more banter. The fourth part, dramatizing the conclusion of the match between Hardman and Theobald, is equivalent to TS (2.1.283–328). The fifth part, which shows Sebastian and Felix vying for Sabina’s hand, remains close to TS (2.1.329–414) but adds two vignettes on the conflict between youth and age (594–602, 609–20).

1–2 Whereas TS’s scene (2.1) begins with Bianca’s plea to her sister (2.1.1–7), KK starts with Catharina’s gleeful taunting of Sabina.


2 spoilt child Catharina uses the colourful expression ‘Zartlappe’, literally ‘tender morsel’, meaning a spoilt child (see Wander).
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SABINA Dearest sister, do not wrong me. I have never done you any harm, but you mean to trample me under your feet.

CATHARINA Confess here and now, and promptly too, which of your suitors is your favourite, for if you keep the truth to yourself, I’ll not spare you.

SABINA Believe me as you believe truth itself that among all the men I have ever set eyes upon, none has yet entered my heart.

CATHARINA A box on the ear is the answer to a lie.

Beats her:

You wild cat, have you not fallen in love with Alfons?

SABINA Sister, I think it is you who are in love with him. If it is so, be content, I’ll gladly leave him to you.

CATHARINA O, now I see, that’s the way the wind blows! Your ambition angles for wealth! You want to elevate yourself through marrying the old shitpants, and be splendidly kept by him in order to please others! And when that one is ridden to death, you will get a new pot for the old.

3–5 KK condenses Bianca’s speech (TS, 2.1.1–7). For Sabina’s weakened presence early in the play, see Introduction, p. 96.

6–8 Instead of Katherina’s vague threat, ‘[s]ee thou dissemble not’ (TS, 2.1.9), Catharina more menacingly says ‘I’ll not spare you’ (‘ich will deines Fells nicht schonen,’ literally ‘I will not spare your fur’).

9 Believe me KK remains close to the original, but, instead of keeping the affective ‘sister’ (TS, 2.1.10), it has Sabina equate herself proverbially with sober ‘truth itself’ (‘als wie der Wahrheit selbst’; see Köhler, 227).

12 SD TS delays explicit physical violence until line 22 (‘Strikes her.’).

13 have . . . love Catharina uses a colloquial German expression for ‘falling in love’, ‘hastu dich . . . vergaffet’ (Grimm, ‘vergaffen’, 2).

16 that’s . . . blows Catharina uses the proverb ‘wo der Hase im Pfeffer lieget’ (literally ‘where the hare lies in the pepper’). It is based on the idea that ‘nobody knows where the hare lies in the pepper [here meaning ‘broth’; Grimm, ‘Brühe’, 2] but he who dressed it’ (‘keiner aber weiß, wo der haas im pfeffer ligt, als der ihn angericht’; see Grimm, ‘Hase’, 1).
SABINA  You do me great wrong, as in many things. If it is for his sake that you are so set against me, put your mind at rest.

_Catharina binds her hands._

But what games are you playing with me? Dear sister, unbind my hands.

CATHARINA  I see, the maid wants to be played with. Just you wait (beats her), if this is play, all else was play too. I’ll whistle for you while you dance.

_Enter THEOBALD and VEIT._

THEOBALD  What, you raging beast! What’s to be done? What wicked mischief is this? Who gave you power to lord it over this poor child? I reckon you want to be her very own hangman, you malicious tyrant! [to Sabina] Go in, my child, run away from this dragon.

_Sabina weeps._

CATHARINA  O, this darling daughter needs to be flattered, to be greatly spoiled. [to Sabina] But I must give you another punch for the journey.

_Moves to beat her again._

THEOBALD  What, in your father’s presence? Is there no respect left in you, you savage beast?

_Exit Sabina._

24  SD spells out TS’s implied stage direction: ‘I prithee, sister Kate, untie my hands’ (2.1.21).
27  played with Catharina picks up on Sabina’s word ‘kurtzweil’ (‘game’) and turns it into a passive, ‘gekurtzweilet’, ‘played with’.
30  raging beast! Baptista, by contrast, addresses Katherina as ‘dame’ (TS, 2.1.23). Compare her change of epithet from ‘curst Katherine’ (TS, 1.2.182) to ‘raging Catharina’ (KK, 1.3.134).
34  Go ... dragon. In TS, it is not clear whether Baptista’s equivalent line, ‘Go ply thy Needle, meddle not with her’ (2.1.25), addresses Katherina or Bianca, an ambiguity KK resolves.
34  SD In TS, the SD is again implied: ‘BAPTISTA ... Poor girl, she weeps’ (2.1.24). Cf. 24 SD.
38–9  Is ... beast? replaces Baptista’s order to Bianca (‘get thee in’, TS, 2.1.30) with Theobald’s abuse towards Catharina. Cf. note at 30.
CATHARINA  Will you prevent my revenge on her? Now I see that you care nothing for me, but this undeserving thing is the apple of your eye, and not to be touched. Hang her around your neck or she’ll be lost. But no, she must have a suitor who woos her. She’s late already, and I am even further behind, and may dance barefoot in her honour at the wedding. I will be scoffed at, and may go lead apes in hell. But before this happens, I will revenge myself on her thoroughly, and smash her pretty mouth, that dainty dish of her suitors.

THEOBALD  I am the unhappy father of a disobedient daughter who tortures virtue itself only to grieve me.

VEIT  My lord, if I may speak, perhaps I know where the trouble lies. Lady Catharina rants because Lady Sabina has suitors and she has none, though she is the older and riper.

CATHARINA  Who told you that, you snivelling boy?

VEIT  Dear madam, I know well how it is with virgins: when they are old enough, they yearn to be burdened by a man.

apple . . . eye transforms Katherina’s ‘She is your treasure’ (TS, 2.1.32) into a different metaphor.

She’s . . . behind Unlike in TS, this suggests that both sisters are late in getting married.

may . . . hell faithfully translates the proverbs in TS (2.1.33–4). Probably because the second proverb was not known in Germany (Köhler, 227), Catharina clarifies the meaning by adding a further idiom, ‘wann mir der Bock, zum Schimpff, geschencket wird’, literally ‘when I am given the goat for contumely’, translated as ‘I will be scoffed at’.

But . . . suitors. replaces Katherina’s admission of passive suffering (‘Talk not to me, I will go sit and weep’, TS, 2.1.35) with a violent threat.

Baptista’s equivalent speech (TS, 2.1.37–8) caps the scene’s first movement and introduces the next by greeting the approaching suitors.

has no equivalent in TS.

where . . . lies (‘wo der Has im Kraut sitzet’, literally ‘where the hare sits in the grass’) a version of the earlier hare proverb (see 16 and note).

Veit literally says ‘I know well how it is when virgins can put the thumb into the nose. Then May is burdensome to them’ (‘ich weiß wohl, wie es ist, wann die Mädchens den Daumen können in die Nase bringen, dann ist ihnen der May beschwerlich’). Veit picks up on Catharina’s nose-related expression, adding a now obscure idiom. But the suggestion of sexual desire and awakening in spring time is clear.
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63–72 Veit elaborately describes a ‘brave young fellow’ (his penis) who would gladly please Catharina.

71–2 chase . . . ideas. Veit literally says his fellow will ‘chase away the crickets’ (‘wird euch auch die Grillen wohl ver¬treiben’), an idiom for cheering up a melancholic person imagined as having crickets in their head, making them restless (Grimm, ‘Grille’, 5c).

74 wedding gift! (‘Brautstück’) a gift offered to the servants by the bride (Köhler, 228).

74–6 I . . . lowest. Catharina understands that the wooer (Veit) implicitly refers to his penis, and threatens to knock him down (whether Veit or the penis is left unclear).

77 belly For the sexual innuendo, see ‘belly-cittern’, 1.3.143–4 and note.

80–1 Here . . . unknown. After the added interlude between Catharina and Veit, KK reverts to the source text: ‘But who comes here?’ (TS, 2.1.38).

81 SD TS’s SD mentions that Lucentio (as Cambio) enters ‘in the habit of a mean man’, and that Biondello (as Lucentio’s boy) bears ‘a lute and books’ (2.1.38.1–2, 4). Unlike Wormfire, Grumio does not appear on stage in this scene.
Enter SEBASTIAN, HARDMAN, FELIX [as Hilarius], [HILARIUS as] Johannes, [ALFONS as] Musician, WORMFIRE and FABIAN.

SEBASTIAN A happy day to you, my lord neighbour.
THEOBALD Many thanks, my lord Sebastian, welcome to you and your whole company.
HARDMAN My lord, let me know without delay if you have a virtuous and dainty daughter called Catharina.
THEOBALD Yes, I have a daughter of that name.
SEBASTIAN [to Hardman] You speak a bit too bluntly. I wish you would use more modesty.
HARDMAN Ha, what do I care, Sir Sebastian? I am no longer beardless.
WORMFIRE [aside] I suspected these thanks would be remembered.
HARDMAN I am, to put things briefly, a nobleman from Worms, and since, my lord, I heard of the beauty, virtue, honour and maidenly modesty of your virgin daughter Catharina, I could not rest until I came here to become her suitor. To be more welcome as the stranger that I am, I offer to you this person

90 what . . . care Hardman uses an obscure expression to convey his indifference to Sebastian (‘Ey was küsset mich im Leibe, Herr Sebastian’, literally ‘what kisses me in the body, Sir Sebastian’).

90–1 I am . . . beardless. Hardman refuses to be patronized by Sebastian by literally saying ‘leave me unshaved’ (‘lasset mich unbalbieret’), a beard betokening age and manhood.

92–223 Wormfire’s many asides, all exclusive to KK, constitute the major difference from the equivalent passage in TS (2.1.46–138).

92–3 (‘Ich gedachte wohl daß dieser danck-habit auff die Erinnerung kommen würde’) The meaning is obscure. In the preceding scene, it was Hardman who accused Sebastian of ‘talk[ing] a little too sharply’ (1.3.245), and Wormfire may have anticipated that Sebastian would remember that slight; alternatively, Wormfire may simply have anticipated Hardman’s objection to Sebastian’s criticism.

94–101 Hardman’s introduction is closely modelled on Petruccio’s (TS, 2.1.47–53), moving from his origins (Worms, as opposed to Petruccio’s Verona) to praise for Catharina (95–8) and to an admission that he is a stranger.

99–104 I offer . . . arts. Petruccio specifies Licio’s abilities in ‘music and the mathematics’ and other ‘sciences’ (TS, 2.1.56–7). Hardman omits mathematics, and instead adds that the musician will teach ‘the lute’, which prompts an obscure sexual innuendo by Wormfire. For music and sexual innuendos, see also 3.1.82–4, 112–16.
who will instruct her in music, and especially the lute—

**WORMFIRE** (aside) On which many hundreds of chords resound.

**HARDMAN** — and who is experienced in other fine arts. I beg you to accept myself and him most favourably.

**THEOBALD** Be my guest, dear lord, and this person for your sake too. But I am sorry you came from so far away for my daughter.

**WORMFIRE** [aside] Now we’re getting there!

**HARDMAN** I see that my person is not acceptable, or she is already taken. God be with you then.

**WORMFIRE** [aside] Show us the wares, there’s a market in Hanover too.

**THEOBALD** No, my lord, do not be so hasty. Understand me well. I am only very sorry that you will not find such virtues in my daughter as you imagine. Be that as it may, what is your name, my lord, please?

**HARDMAN** My name is Hardman Madfeather. My father, known throughout the country, has died, and left me heir of Whirlwind Heights.

**WORMFIRE** [aside] I hear that often enough.

**THEOBALD** He was my good friend. I am truly sorry about his death.

---

104–5 I . . . favourably. KK omits Petruccio’s naming of ‘Licio, born in Mantua’ (*TS*, 2.1.60), in keeping with the play’s omission of names and place names elsewhere (see 3.2.317–19 and note).

106–8 Theobald’s speech is close to Baptista’s (*TS*, 2.1.61–3), but adds the information that Worms is ‘far away’ from the unknown setting of the play.

109 The German is obscure, literally saying ‘Now the dog is riding on the plug’ (‘Nun reitet der Hund auf dem Spunde’). See 1.2.62n.

112–13 Wormfire’s perhaps idiomtic comment is obscure. Its beginning literally translates as ‘Get the goat around’ (‘Herum mit der Ziegen’). From 1636 to 1692, Hanover, in northern Germany, was the capital of the Principality of Calenberg.

118–20 Unlike Petruccio, Hardman mentions his family name (see List of Roles), not his father’s first name, Antonio (*TS*, 2.1.68).

120 **Whirlwind Heights** See List of Roles, **HARDMAN**.

122–3 Unlike Baptista in the equivalent speech (*TS*, 2.1.70), Theobald expresses his condolences, prompting Wormfire’s dry observation (124).
WORMFIRE (aside) But my lord not sorry at all.
THEOBALD For his sake, my lord, I hope you will be all the more favourable towards me. I am at your service.
WORMFIRE [aside] Now it’ll work better than before! Things will go well from now on. Leipzig surrenders.
SEBASTIAN Your speeches notwithstanding, Sir Hardman, I also have some words to address to Sir Theobald. – As I promised you, my lord, I myself have taken pains to find this young student [pointing to Hilarius] who will be apt –
WORMFIRE (aside) At all times apter than you.
SEBASTIAN – to instruct your maidenly daughter. I promise his service will satisfy you.
WORMFIRE (aside) But it will satisfy the daughter better than him if she holds still.
THEOBALD I will requite it in every possible way. Meanwhile, I thank you for such great pains. [to Hilarius] You shall be kept and paid by me, for your virtuous character shows that you are of good breeding.
WORMFIRE [aside] Students generally have good breeding sano sensu.
THEOBALD [to Felix] Good sir, pardon my boldness, what is your name?
FELIX My lord, you are permitted to enquire without pardon after your servant’s name which will surely

128 Leipzig surrenders. Wormfire probably alludes to the Battle of Breitenfeld (1642) in the Thirty Years’ War in which Leipzig surrendered to the Swedish forces (see Forssberg, 109).
131–8 As . . . still. KK omits a short hostile exchange between Gremio and Petruccio (TS, 2.1.71–5). Sebastian introduces the supposed instructor Johannes (as Gremio does Cambio, 2.1.76–82), but omits his name and the qualifications Gremio lists (2.1.79–82).
145 sano sensu Latin, of sound mind.
148–69 KK retains Tranio’s introduction to Baptista but departs from it in structure and wording: Tranio presents himself as a suitor to Bianca (TS, 2.1.89) with gifts of ‘Greek and Latin books’ (2.1.99) before disclosing his origins (2.1.102). KK turns the passage into a polite dialogue that foregrounds the friendship between the two families.
be known to you: I am Sir Hilarius of Liebenthal the Younger.

THEOBALD My heart told me you must be the son of a good friend. I am most happy to find you in good health, and I will be pleased to show you my affectionate friendship.

FABIAN (aside) That goes down well.

THEOBALD But what brings you here?

FELIX My father, who sends his humble greetings, –

THEOBALD Accept my thanks.

FELIX – has sent me away to gain experience and learning. This has brought me to you, my lord, from whose wit and famous ability my youth seeks to profit. I have also come because I have heard of your maiden daughter’s excellent gifts which I would like to see, and I would be happy if the friendship of the parents could be continued by the children.

THEOBALD This must have been counselled by the gods. It will be my greatest concern to keep and continue such friendship.

SEBASTIAN [aside] This fellow has got himself straightaway into more favour than all of us.

THEOBALD Gentlemen, you are all welcome to walk in. I hope you will do me the honour of accepting what my humble house can offer. – You, Veit, lead them to the hall, and tell my people to do them every honourable service.

[Exeunt Veit, Fabian, Felix, Alfons, Hilarius and Sebastian.]


176 SD D1 and D2 have no exit SD, but it seems likely that only Theobald, Hardman and Wormfire remain onstage.
Sir Hardman, please stay with me a while.

WORMFIRE [aside] The old nag is the first, but wants to be the last, or stay at home even, and make good use of his tool.

HARDMAN My affairs require my prompt attention. My lord, you know I live far from here, and cannot journey up and down all the time. I love the maid, your daughter. My family and my wealth are known to you. If I become your daughter’s husband, how much do you intend to offer as a dowry?

THEOBALD It is known that I am willing to give 5,000 in ready money. After my death, half of my possessions are guaranteed.

HARDMAN I am glad to hear this, and will in return promise my house, my farm and all my lands if she survives me. There is nothing left to do but for you to make the customary contract, my lord, so that it may be signed by both parties, confirmed and acted upon.

WORMFIRE [aside] He’s forgetting something important.

---

177–95 The dialogue between Hardman and Theobald remains close to the original (TS, 2.1.113–26), but omits Petruccio’s specification that he is ‘solely heir’ and has ‘bettered’ his father’s bequest (2.1.116–17).

178 old nag (‘Krippenbeißer’, literally ‘trough biter’) An imaginative term for a horse whose teeth scrape the edges of the trough when drinking, thus scratching the wood (Grimm, ‘Krippenbeißer’, 1); a shrewish person (Grimm, 2). Presumably an acerbic reference to Theobald.

180 his tool (‘seinen Lümmel’) ‘Lümmel’ designates a rude person (Grimm, 1), so the word presumably refers to Hardman here.

For the sexual meaning, see Grimm, 3.

183–4 I . . . daughter. a comic addition to Petruccio’s equivalent speech (TS, 2.1.113–19) given that Hardman has never met her.

187–8 5,000 . . . money Given the uneven monetary situation of the politically divided German territories, it is hard to gauge the value of Theobald’s offer, but it is clear that the sum is immense, like Baptista’s ‘twenty thousand crowns’ (TS, 2.1.121).

196 Wormfire uses a proverb, literally saying ‘my Master calculates the bill without the host’ (‘Mein Herr macht die Rechnung ohne den Wirt’; Wander, ‘Rechnung’, 14).
THEOBALD   Good sir, do not be too hasty. One does not sell the skin unless one has caught the bear.

WORMFIRE (aside)   Do not shout ‘herring’ unless you have got it by its tail.

THEOBALD   This is what worries me: will you be able to win my daughter’s love?

HARDMAN   O, my lord father, you are wide of the mark. Do not worry. I will speak to her in such a way that it will be delightful.

THEOBALD   You seem to mean it as young folks do, but her humour is very strange.

HARDMAN   Father, do not make everything so hard. My humour is well suited to hers. I am as ready to reject anger and words of scorn as she is ready to promote them. It will be with us as when two strong fires come together: each feeds on the other’s force and thereby swallows it up. If a small, soft breeze blows, it makes a fire big and impossible to tame. A storm, however, disperses it. You can do what you please, thus it will be with us. I am rather rough and wild, and so must have someone like myself. I never loved tenderlings.

THEOBALD   You are courageous and may make a bold attempt. It is my heart’s desire that you start and end this joyfully. But first I must warn you: be well armed for peevish words.

WORMFIRE [aside]   Such words are his best music when he is in the vein.

197–8 **One . . . bear.** Our literal translation of the German expression ‘Man verkaufet die Haut nicht, man habe dann den Bären gefangen’ (Wander, ‘Haut’, 77), which is used to warn against overhastiness.

199–200 Wormfire builds on Theobald’s previous proverb with an obscure but proverbial-sounding expression: ‘rufet nicht Hering, man ihn dann beim Schwanz’, which we translate literally.

203–17 Petruccio’s equivalent speech (TS, 2.1.129–36) is slightly expanded and briefly interrupted by Theobald.

218–27 closely adapts the equivalent speeches by Baptista and Petruccio (TS, 2.1.137–40), while adding Wormfire’s aside.
HARDMAN   I worry as little about those as high stone cliffs worry about furious, blustering winds, even if they are exposed to horrible storms. I am immovable, be it sweet or sour with her.

THEOBALD   Do it your own way. Will you come in with me, or shall I send my daughter to you?

HARDMAN   I think it is advisable that I await her arrival here, so that we have our first little dance alone. Womenfolk are shy, and a little silly, when other people are around.

THEOBALD   As you wish.   [Exit Theobald.]

WORMFIRE   I do not think your mistress will be too shy and silly to set the capitolium right.

HARDMAN   I was not serious. Just let her come, she will find her man. One honour for another.

WORMFIRE   But I hope I may use my testiculos as witnesses for this first meeting, so that I can produce them in case of need.

HARDMAN   Produce a damned gallows for your roguish neck. I need no witnesses nearby.

WORMFIRE   My lord, I expect you are worried that I may witness how worthy you are of your title and the name which you keep reminding me about. But it would not be unlawful to assist you in case of need.

HARDMAN   Fool, shut up now, and go away. I need to think.

228 Do . . . way. KK here omits a transitional comic passage in TS: Hortensio re-enters ‘with his head broke’ (2.1.140.1), i.e. injured, and reports how Katherina has hit him with the lute, much to Petruchio’s amusement (2.1.141–61).

228–33 Will . . . around. The passage follows TS, 2.1.165–8, but only Hardman explains why he wants to wait alone. He describes his first meeting with Catharina as a ‘little dance’ (‘Gängelchen’, literally ‘little walk’). See Grimm, ‘Gängchen’.

235–59 has no equivalent in TS.

236 capitolium figurative for ‘head’ (see Grimm). Wormfire seems to warn Hardman of Catharina’s probable resistance.

239 testiculos Wormfire plays with the similar sounds of the Latin word for ‘testicles’ and ‘to bear witness’ (‘testieren’, Grimm, 1).

244–6 My . . . about. The German is unclear, but Wormfire probably suggests that Hardman is afraid that his servant will see him having his ‘title and name’ of shrew-tamer tested.
Wormfire uses Latin (e.g., ‘lectiones’), Italian (‘Signor’) and a religious register (e.g. the ‘Lord’s Prayer’) to lend a mock formality to his bawdy speech.

Wormfire imagines the first meeting between Hardman and Catharina parallels an educational formula consisting of lessons (lectiones), and ‘pro et contra’ debating, with Catharina resisting Hardman’s proposal.

Wormfire’s first reference to Catharina’s maid Sybilla, whom he hopes to seduce.

250–9 Wormfire uses Latin (e.g., ‘lectiones’), Italian (‘Signor’) and a religious register (e.g. the ‘Lord’s Prayer’) to lend a mock formality to his bawdy speech.

250–1 there . . . contra. Wormfire imagines the first meeting between Hardman and Catharina parallels an educational formula consisting of lessons (lectiones), and ‘pro et contra’ debating, with Catharina resisting Hardman’s proposal.

251–6 I . . . master. Wormfire’s first reference to Catharina’s maid Sybilla, whom he hopes to seduce.
goodbye with abuse, teasing and curses, I will give obedient thanks, as if she had invited me to the best banquet. If she refuses to honour me with the slightest favour, I will wish for the day and hour of our wedding and bedding as if she had set them herself. In short, I will make such a mixture of sugar and wormwood that she won’t know how to annoy me. This confusion will be to my advantage. A proper art not known to everyone is how to enter into the humour of others, and to master it. But here she comes. The coin is good, and may be accepted for sterling.

[Enter CATHARINA.]

Sprightly now: good day, Madame Trina, for they say this is your name.

CATHARINA Your fool’s head has heard right, although you are hard of hearing. Sensible people call me Catharina.

HARDMAN You cut yourself, Lady Trina, with a big knife. Like Matz, they give you a bad name, like silly
Trina, and often evil Trina, shrewish Trina. O, you tenderest example of all Trinas in the world, you loveliest of all virtuous Trinas, most excellent coy Trina, blessed be all praiseworthy Trinas for your sake, you never-sufficiently-praised Trina. Your beauty, meekness, your great maiden bashfulness, modesty and worthiness, besides other laudable and fair virtues, are known far and wide. Because I have heard of these (which are merely a shadow compared with the creature herself), I have been moved to come here by divine providence to woo you to be my dearest wife, my flesh and blood.

**CATHARINA** You have been moved by your worm-eaten brain to come here. Let the rogue who led you here lead you away again. I think you are a movable.

**HARDMAN** What kind of animal is that, a movable?

**CATHARINA** A chair one can move about.

**HARDMAN** Well said, come and sit on my lap then.

**CATHARINA** That bench is not clean enough for maidens. Asses like you carry something else.

**HARDMAN** Women are made to carry us, and so are you.

**CATHARINA** But no such clay-brained rogues as you.

**HARDMAN** Well, let us cut this short. Dearest Catharina, I do not want to burden your beautiful body since I know you are young and tender.

**CATHARINA** All too tender to carry so big a swine.

---

305–79 This passage follows TS (2.1.194–243) mostly speech by speech but occasionally adds a short sentence (see 312, 316, 327, 340, 364 and 377 and notes), condenses a few lines (see 320–1 and note) and adds two short passages (332–8, 369–75).

312 That . . . maidens. has no equivalent in TS.


316 Well . . . short. has no equivalent in TS.
2.1.320  Kunst über alle Künste

HARDMAN  Buzz not so much, you wasp, you are too 320 angry.

CATHARINA  If I’m a wasp, why aren’t you wary of my sting?

HARDMAN  I know a good remedy: it needs pulling.

CATHARINA  True, if the fool knew where it sits. 325

HARDMAN  Who doesn’t know that? In her tail.

CATHARINA  O, silly boy, that was a little too green. In her tongue.

HARDMAN  Ha, ha, you speak truth with your tongue.

CATHARINA  I do, because I am already tired of your 330 boring jokes.

HARDMAN  Fairest Catharina, stop joking with your servant. I know you are not serious. Your natural friendliness shines through your performed spite.

CATHARINA  I am weary of this foolery. Take such useless wind to another place. It bears no fruit here.

**She starts to leave.**

HARDMAN  My dearest lady and heart’s darling, you must not speak thus about your love. I am worthy of more honour as a nobleman.

CATHARINA  I will test your nobility with a slap in the face. 340

[She strikes him.]
HARDMAN You are quick and valiant, but I swear I’ll slap you back if you dare to do this again.

CATHARINA You would lose your coat of arms if you beat a woman. And with your coat of arms lost, you’d be a poor nobleman.

HARDMAN You conclude well, but are an all too pretty gaoler. Tenderest Catharina, draw my coat of arms in the book of your favours.

CATHARINA And what is your coat of arms? A coxcomb?

HARDMAN My dear child, a cock without a fight if the virtuous Catharina agrees to be my hen.

CATHARINA O, my good lord, you are no cock for me. You crow like an owl.

HARDMAN No, come, fairest Catharina. Don’t sour the friendliness of your dear face with frowning.

CATHARINA It’s my fashion when I meet an ape.

HARDMAN What! Well, then you have no occasion, since there is no ape here.

CATHARINA Truly, there is, there is.

HARDMAN (Looks around him.) I am not blind, show him to me.

CATHARINA It would be easy if I had a mirror.

HARDMAN Perhaps it would reflect my face?

CATHARINA Well guessed. Or did someone tell you?

HARDMAN By Saint Velten, I am almost too green for you.
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CATHARINA And yet you pretend to be fantastical.
HARDMAN Everything I do is meant to amuse you.
CATHARINA But I don’t care for it.
HARDMAN O, my dearest child, I love you more than anything in the world, so let my heart have a place in yours. Let my body be yours, and yours mine. You will not believe how well I know how to please womenfolk.
CATHARINA Every fool praises himself. Such praise stinks, and I am against all stench, so farewell.

[She starts to leave. He holds her back.]

HARDMAN No, little Catharina, don’t go away like this. Acquit yourself better.
CATHARINA I’ll scratch you if you hold me back one more time. Let me go, in the devil’s name.
HARDMAN If you will act like a cat, then know you have met a true bear. But blessed image, do not go from me yet. I cannot let the soul part from the body thus.
CATHARINA My soul is much too pure to live on such carrion.
HARDMAN Such carrion shall feed you with what is daintiest about it, my love.
CATHARINA Stick such dainties in the mud. You talk like a fool, and you are a fool, and I take you for a fool.
HARDMAN It is your pleasure to joke with your servant.

369–75 has no equivalent in TS.
370 place We translate Köhler’s emendation, ‘Platz’; D1 and D2 read ‘Plag’ (i.e. ‘nuisance’).
377 Acquit . . . better. has no equivalent in TS.
370 place] Köhler (Platz); D1, D2 Plag

380–95 If . . . perfection. KK adds this short passage on Catharina’s refusal to accept his advances, and Hardman’s insistence on offering them.
in all friendliness. I know well that my poor self does not deserve such great praise.

**CATHARINA** Indeed, I shall have to bring the *ABC of Fools* and talk you through the *praedicamenta hasionis*.

**[HARDMAN]** A learned maid is truly a delightful piece of work. What a pity the skilful Catharina does not travel, but she shall do so now, with me. It gladdens my flesh, bones and marrow that I shall live in such a gifted body. I discern its highest perfection. You, my heart’s love, were depicted as blacker to me than our Lord God’s ape, yet I see you are whiter than his best likeness. I was told you were shrewish, choleric, blustering and sullen. Yet I see you are bathed in grace, pickled with courtesy and spiced with modest chastity. I will put you on the spit of my constancy, and roast you so well in my hot love as will do you good in body and soul. You are as sweet and agreeable as the most delicious claret, and an exquisite woodcock bathed in her own gravy. It

---

393–4 *ABC of Fools* (Gecken A.B.C.) The reference to the Fools’ Alphabet is obscure. Köhler suggests that there may have been an alphabetical list of characteristics of a fool (232).

394–5 *praedicamenta hasionis* combines the scholastic *praedicamenta*, or categories, which apply to objects of human apprehension, with mock Latin for ‘Hase’ (‘hare’). Catharina insulst Hardman by suggesting that he is a fool. For hare jokes and insults, see 2.1.288, 455, 3.1.186–7.

396 SP D1 and D2 mistakenly assign the speech to Catharina.

396–400 **A . . . perfection.** has no equivalent in *TS*. The beginning of Hardman’s speech about Catharina’s learning seems to be prompted by her use of Latin.

399–400 **live . . . body** presumably by having sex with her.

402 **Lord God’s ape** (‘Herr Gotts Affé’) proverbial for the devil (Köhler, 234).

403–4 **shrewish . . . sullen.** *TS* has three adjectives at the equivalent moment (‘rough and coy and sullen’, 2.1.245). *KK* adds a fourth, explicitly referring to Catharina’s fame as ‘shrewish’ (‘eyerbüüssig’, literally ‘pus-biting’); see Prologue, 3.

406–10 **I . . . gravy.** The vivid image for Hardman’s comically ambiguous praise of Catharina has no direct equivalent in *TS*.

410 **gravy** The German literally reads ‘spiced in thy own dirt’ (‘in deinem eigenen Dreck gewürtzet’), referring to the remains of butter in a pan after melting (Grimm, ‘Dreck’, 9).
is impossible for you to look sour unless you have drunk vinegar. You cannot show a resentful face to anyone, nor bite your coral lips, nor twist the rose red of your ruby mouth, nor make wrinkles on the lily of your fair forehead as evil wives do. You receive those who love you with virtuous politeness, and you entertain them with graceful conversation. A modest blush adorns your face whenever you hear a wicked or unnecessary word. Your bright sparkling eyes hide themselves when something immodest strikes them. Why then does the unjust world say virtuous Catharina is filled with vices? O, vicious topsy-turvy world! Catharina is as upright and strong as a well-grown hazel bush, and as brown and smooth as the shell of a ripe hazelnut, though so much sweeter than the dainty kernel inside.

**CATHARINA** Dirty flatterer, be careful not to bite open such a nut, as it shits into the mouth.

**HARDMAN** There is no danger. That only happens with those nuts that are worm-eaten, but Catharina is far from being so. With your inestimable permission, I would like to ask you to walk to and fro before me. I know you do not limp.

**CATHARINA** Go away, fantastico! Go, it is time you went to the gallows or wherever you have come from.

**HARDMAN** Dearest Catharina, you mean the knee-gallows. You are right, my child, yours shall be for me, it is perfectly shaped for me.

---

427–33 *KK* inserts a scatological exchange before its adaptation of the last line of Petruccio’s equivalent speech (*TS*, 2.1.258) about Catharina’s regular gait.

434 *fantastico* (Fantast) See 1.1.97n.

436–49 *Dearest* . . . *over-adorable*. *KK* inserts a brief passage with no equivalent in *TS* containing sexual innuendoes and more false praise by Hardman.

436–7 *knee-gallows* a euphemism for ‘vagina’ (Grimm, ‘Kniegalgen’), probably owing to its shaft-like shape to which Hardman alludes. ‘Knee’ was used to refer to the genitals (Grimm, ‘Knie’, II.1.i).
CATHARINA Nothing else is. You may present yourself, but at the right time.

HARDMAN I will not miss this time. The sooner, the better.

CATHARINA Do not sell yourself before the time.

HARDMAN There is no hurry. The solemnities have already been agreed upon, and are witnessed between us. But what sense Catharina speaks as if she borrowed from the sayings of the wisest. She is a true oracle whose voice is pure reason. Praised be the excellent host who lives in such a beautiful house. Her reason is more than admirable, her body over-adorable. Has beautiful Diana ever illuminated the woods with her loveliness more than Catharina brings light to this place with her singular form? O sweet Catharina, you be Diana, and let Diana be Catharina. May that Catharina be coy and chaste, and that Diana cheerful.

CATHARINA Astonishing inventions! From where did you borrow all these wise speeches?

HARDMAN They flow to me extempore, without study, from my natural mother, reason.

CATHARINA A foolish son for such a sage mother.

HARDMAN Am I not exceedingly wise, my reason-rich Catharina?

---

446 sayings . . . wisest (‘Sprüchwrörtern der weisesten’) probably a reference to the Old Testament Book of Proverbs (Buch der Sprichwörter), whose central theme is wisdom.

447–9 Praised . . . over-adorable. The body/house metaphor has a long history in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Compare Sebastian’s reference to Catharina as ‘a fine house’ with ‘an evil owner’ (1.1.142–3).

449–86 Has . . . wife. This passage adapts TS (2.1.260–82) speech by speech, with the exception of a short passage added by KK (466–70).

449–52 Has . . . form? In the equivalent passage in TS, Katherina is compared to Diana, the Roman goddess of hunting and chastity, because of her ‘princely gait’ (2.1.261).

455 Astonishing inventions! Catharina literally says ‘hare inventions worthy-of-astonishment’ (‘Verwunderns würdige Hasen Einfälle’). For other comic references to hares, see 2.1.288, 394–5, 3.1.186–7.
CATHARINA  Yes, and so beware of excess.

HARDMAN  You speak well according to your good fashion. I will do what you say, when I lie in your soft bed and warm lap.

CATHARINA  Be as keen as you like. One does not burden the cradle with an ass.

HARDMAN  That would not be worthwhile. For now I only wish to take care of your bed, lovely Catharina. The cradle will follow when the time is right. I will also hold back all other words for now, and tell you my suit in plain German: your father has wholly agreed that you shall be my wife. We are of one mind concerning the dowry. I will have your hand this very moment, whether you like it or not; whether you look sweet or sour, I must and will have you, I and no other. By this clear light by which I see your shining beauty, I swear that you please me mightily, and that I do not and cannot love any other in the world, and that you must not trust any other but myself. Dearest Catharina, I have been born to do you honour and to tame you with friendliness, in order to turn a wild cat into a Catharina as virtuous as all other virtuous Catharinas. Here comes your father. Do not refuse, it cannot be otherwise. I can, will and must have you as my dear wife.

462 **beware . . . excess** In the German text, Hardman’s reference to himself as ‘weiß’ (wise) is deliberately misunderstood by Catharina as meaning white (also ‘weiß’ in German), an indication, Catharina implies, that he may have caught cold, whence her mock advice to him to keep warm (‘haltet euch nur warm’). Given the impossibility of preserving the German wordplay in translation, we substitute for it the pun on ‘exceedingly’ and ‘excess’.

466–70 **Be . . . right.** has no equivalent in *TS*. Catharina’s second sentence (‘Man leget keinen Esel in die Wiege.’) is probably proverbial (Köhler, 235), prompting Hardman’s reference to their future offspring.

468–86 mostly a close rendering of Petruchio’s equivalent speech (*TS*, 2.1.269–82), with two additions in which Hardman affirms their mutual exclusivity: ‘I and no other’ (476–7) and ‘I do not and cannot love any other in the world’ (479).

486 SD Baptista enters with Gremio and Tranio (as Lucentio) (*TS*, 2.1.277 SD), Veit having no equivalent in *TS*. 
This passage is mostly a close adaptation of TS (2.1.278–328), with some short additions (see 497–8, 516–17, 519–24, 528–9, 530–1, 560, 569–70) and one that is slightly longer (544–52). The most significant omissions are two short speeches by Tranio (TS, 2.1.305, 324); Felix remains silent in this passage.

493 proved unfatherly Katherina, by contrast, uses sarcasm: ‘showed a tender fatherly regard’ (TS, 2.1.289).
496 outwit (‘überteufeln’, literally ‘out-devil’)

497–8 Is . . . father? KK adds the last sentence to TS’s equivalent speech (2.1.288–92).

499–515 Hardman’s speech is close to Petruccio’s but adds the first sentence, addressed to Catharina, with the feigned acknowledgement that she is ‘rightly angry’, and inserts the pledge to defend Catharina’s name against slander (‘From . . . life’, 503–5).

meek as a turtle-dove, with no gall or choler. She is as moderate as the dawn in summer time. Her great patience makes me believe she is another Griselda who endures every injury. Her chastity makes her into another Lucrece. In short, because she pleases me, and I please her too, we have concluded between us that we want next Sunday to be our wedding day.

CATHARINA Deny it, deny it, you rogue! I’d rather see you hanged on Sunday!

SEBASTIAN Do you hear what she says, Sir Hardman?

HARDMAN Shut your mouth. You try to poke your nose in everything, don’t you? I took her as mine, and she took me as hers. If we are content, what has it to do with you and others? Who would speak against our marriage? What are these rogues who desire to sow discord between the betrothed? We are of one heart. Our cause is right, and we have decided between us to speak indirectly. There are certain necessary reasons why I allow her to be shrewish when we are in the

511 **Griselda** (Chrysilla) The context and the equivalent name in TS (‘Grissell’, 2.1.298) make clear that ‘Chrysilla’ is a variant of ‘Griselda’, the model of wifely patience known from Boccaccio, Chaucer and elsewhere. The German text praises the patience of Griselda by using a probably proverbial but now obscure expression, literally saying that ‘mice have nested in her body’ (‘welcher auch gar die Mäuse in den Leib gen-istet’). See Köhler, 237.

513 **Lucrece** Roman model of wifely chastity who killed herself after being raped by Tarquin. Cf. ‘Roman Lucrece’ (TS, 2.1.299).

516–17 **KK** adds the forceful first sentence to TS’s equivalent speech (2.1.302).

519–58 adapts Petruccio’s speech at TS, 2.1.306–21, by adding several short passages and inserting a short dialogue with Catharina (‘Your . . . her’, 542–55).

519–24 **Shut . . . betrothed?** The degree of Hardman’s (pretended) irritability has no equivalent in TS, where Petruccio simply says, ‘Be patient, gentlemen’, and asks, ‘If she and I be pleased, what’s that to you?’ (2.1.306–7).

522–3 **Who . . . marriage?** (‘Es heisset mit euch nun verbott die Kaute.’) The German is obscure, but Hardman’s objection to any opposition to the marriage is clear.

525–6 **to . . . indirectly** (‘so verblümet zu reden’, literally ‘to speak with such flowers’) See Grimm, ‘verblümen’, 2.
company of fools. When we are alone, the business is quite different. She loves me as fervently and whole-heartedly as I love her. I dare anyone who lays a finger on her! She is the friendliest Catharina that ever was born. The dear child fell upon my neck, and wound herself around me as ivy circles around a tree. She gave me one kiss after the other. O, you gentlemen are mere novices in the world: you do not know how the world runs. You will not believe how graciously she behaves when we are solus cum sola. But since my cause is well advanced, I must travel to Frankfurt now, and buy the most gorgeous robes and jewels. My dearest must make her beauty yet more beautiful with beautiful gems. She shall not lack ornaments whatever the price. – Your little hand on this, my heart’s darling.

He extends his hand to her.

CATHARINA A hand is not to be thrown away like that.

528–9 When . . . different. has no equivalent in TS.
530–1 I dare . . . her! (‘Trotz dem der jhr ein Haar krümmt’, literally ‘Beware he who bends one hair of her hairs’). For this proverb, see Grimm, ‘Haar’, 17g, and Wander, ‘Haar’, 128. The sentence has no equivalent in TS.
533–4 wound . . . tree KK substitutes this vivid image for TS’s ‘hung about my neck’ (2.1.312).
535–6 you . . . runs (‘Ihr wisset noch nicht, wo Barthel den Most holet’, literally ‘you do not know yet where Barthel gets the must’, i.e. the freshly-pressed grape juice) a proverb, referring to someone who is worldly wise and concludes well (Grimm, ‘Barthel’).
537 solus cum sola Latin, a man alone with a woman.
539 Frankfurt a Free Imperial City of the Holy Roman Empire in which trade flourished; presumably the play’s place of publication (see Introduction, pp. 147–9). See also ‘Worms’ at 1.3.249 and note.
542–7 SD Your . . . his. KK repositions Petruccio’s order, ‘Give me thy hand, Kate’ (TS, 2.1.318), adds a SD in which he extends his hand to her (543 SD) and only later grabs her hand for a forced consent (547 SD). For the clarification of action through KK’s SDs that is not spelled out in TS, see Introduction, pp. 121–4.
544–52 A . . . ourselves. KK inserts this brief exchange into the adaptation of Petruccio’s speech (TS, 2.1.306–21), making Catharina articulate her resistance.
Kunst über alle Künste

HARDMAN Be not ashamed, my heart. All these people present are our friends. Come, give me your hand.

He takes her hand and presses it into his.

CATHARINA I believe this rogue is not only a magician but also stark mad.

HARDMAN You speak well, fairest Catharina. I, Hardman, have bewitched you, and you me through the poison of love. We will help ourselves. – Indeed, father, you have raised the good child too simply: she is ashamed and blushes when someone so much as looks at her. There is nothing more to do now but arrange the wedding festivities and invite merry guests. This coming Sunday we will stand in church; today I must leave.

THEOBALD I am so confused by this thing, I hardly know what to say. I am signing a pact with the devil.

HARDMAN Pardon me, father, do you wish to go back on your word? How is it with you?

THEOBALD If the match is ordained by the Highest, so may it be. May your hearts be like your hands, indissolubly locked together. May God give you joy.

SEBASTIAN We all join in that wish from the bottom of our hearts.

547 SD The violent action contrasts with TS, where Baptista politely asks for both their hands in order to join them (2.1.322).

560 I . . . devil. Theobald literally says ‘now I am holding the wolf by the ears’ (‘Ich halte jetzt recht den Wolff bey den Ohren’), expressing his concern that his daughter has vocally resisted the match. The proverb refers to someone in a complicated situation in which they can neither advance nor return. For its Latin origins, see Köhler, 238. See also Wander, ‘Wolf’, 580. The passage has no equivalent in TS.

567–8 Gremio and Tranio jointly say they ‘will be witnesses’ (TS, 2.1.324) to the match. KK assigns the speech to Sebastian alone.
VEIT [aside]  Hit the virgin mark, that will not be hard. Remember my wedding gift. 570

HARDMAN  We two lovers wish you the same, and now adieu, gentlemen, until we meet again. – Come, my dearest darling, we shall take loving leave of each other inside.

[Exeunt Catharina and Hardman.]

SEBASTIAN  This iron is oiled quickly. I have never seen a marriage concluded so swiftly. 575

THEOBALD  May God on High bless this marriage. I have played the adventurous merchant and pawned my goods at great risk.

SEBASTIAN  Venture often wins. I have no doubt about its success and wish it wholeheartedly. But my lord, what about your resolution concerning your younger daughter? I am your neighbour and was the first to court her. I have the oldest letters.

VEIT (aside)  But they were ill-received. 585

FELIX  And I am the one who loves and deserves this beautiful lady most.

SEBASTIAN  My young lord, you could not love as faithfully and steadily as I do.

FELIX  Old frost-beard, your love is as frozen as your powers.

569–70 Veit’s bawdy aside is added by KK. For the ‘wedding gift’ (‘Brautstück’), see 74 and note.

573–4 we . . . inside in marked contrast to Petruccio’s ‘And kiss me, Kate’ (TS, 2.1.328).

575 This . . . quickly. (‘Dieses Eysen ist bald, und hurtig geschmieret.’) added by KK, perhaps proverbial.

577–84 May . . . her. KK remains close to TS (2.1.330–7), but omits Tranio’s continuation of Baptista’s conceit, imagining Katherina as a commodity (2.1.332–3), and its conclusion in a couplet shared by Baptista and Gremio (2.1.334–5).

584–5 I . . . ill-received. KK adds the vivid detail of Sebastian’s ‘oldest letters’ and its subversion in Veit’s aside.

586–602 This passage at first follows TS closely (586–91; 2.1.339–42) but then replaces a brief tit for tat on Tranio’s youth and Gremio’s age (2.1.343–4) by a longer version, including the extended horse-riding conceit, with a suggestive comment by Tranio that Sabina is a ‘young jade’ who needs to be ridden by a vigorous ‘horseman’ like Felix.
SEBASTIAN    I trust I am more able-bodied than you, milksop.

FELIX    What do you want, old man? Your spirit is willing, but your flesh is weak. You are much too stiff to mount a fresh young jade, and to manage it like a good horseman.

SEBASTIAN    Young fellow, you are too light, and would soon be unsaddled.

FELIX    And you, old schoolboy, have lost your spurs. Your whip is much too limp. When others dance, you must hold the lights.

THEOBALD    It is not seemly that you gentlemen should quarrel like boys. Sir Hilarius, I wish to talk with you in private for a while before I inform you of my decision.

They go to the side.

SEBASTIAN    This doesn’t please me at all. Such great confidence between them, O me.

VEIT [aside]    I fear you will come second. Our maid likes the young man more than the old.

SEBASTIAN    It’s a shame that people who lack understanding have small respect for honourable old age. Magna fuit capitis quondam reverentia cani.

VEIT [aside]    Even if you gather all the maxims from

592  you From this point in their confrontation (592–602), Sebastian and Felix use the familiar (and here impolite) second-person singular pronoun, ‘du’, to address each other.

593  milksop (Milch-Maul) See 1.1.102 and note.


594  old man The German literally says ‘turnip robber’ (‘Rübendieb’). Not in Grimm.

601–2  When . . . lights. proverbial (Wander, ‘tanzen’. 110). Felix charges Sebastian with the inability to engage in (sexual) action.

604–20  Sir . . . alive. Whereas in TS, Baptista directly goes on to ask the two suitors about the dowry, KK inserts a private talk between Theobald and Felix during which Sebastian complains to Veit about disrespect for old age.

610  Magna . . . cani. Latin, reverence towards the white head used to be great in the past. From Ovid’s Fasti (V, 57).

614  maxims (‘Sprüche’, literally ‘sayings’) Veit mocks Sebastian’s pompous Latin quotation by referring to the humanist pedagogical practice of commonplacing, i.e. collecting quotations from classical authors in order to use them at opportune moments.
Cicero and Seneca, you will not convince a pretty maid that you are more suitable for her than a fresh young gentleman. I would not recommend our maid to you; she has too much fire and would melt your remaining strength. You would sink into your grave alive.

Exit.

THEOBALD Gentlemen, because it is my fatherly task to do the best for my daughter, I have taken the decision that he who can and will keep his promises towards her, and who receives her consent, he shall have her.

SEBASTIAN My wealth is well known to you, my lord. My house is filled with many beautiful wares for use and ornament. My coffers hold many coins and other valuables. My estates outside town have oxen, horses, cattle, sheep and enough of everything else. My acres are well tilled. I myself am somewhat old, but if I pay my debt to nature tomorrow, my love will inherit everything.

FELIX The last sounds best, the first least. I can set three houses against his, the least of them better than his by far. Everyone knows that they are abundantly and most nobly furnished. The rent of my estates adds up to at least 2,000 thaler a year, not counting the sale of the harvest. Have I tickled you with that, sir?

621–5 KK stays close to TS (2.1.345–8) but has Theobald add that the suitors need to ‘receive [Sabina’s] consent’ (624).

626–33 KK follows TS (2.1.350–66) but condenses Gremio’s lavish description of his wealth, notably by collapsing exotic luxuries like ‘Tyrian tapestry’ and ‘Turkey cushions’ (2.1.353–7) into general ‘ornament’.

634–9 KK follows Tranio’s bragging response (TS, 2.1.367–75), but omits the place names (‘Pisa’, ‘Padua’, TS, 2.1.371–2), as elsewhere (see 3.2.317–19 and note).

634 The . . . least. ‘The last’ probably refers to Sebastian’s death; ‘the first’ presumably to his wealth.

638 thaler (‘Reichsthaler’) a silver coin that was widely in use in the Holy Roman Empire from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. Cf. Tranio’s ‘two thousand ducats’ (TS, 2.1.373).
SEBASTIAN  If this is true, you outstrip me. Yet I still 640
have 20,000 ducats *in banco*. This concludes my case,
will you accept it?

FELIX  Say no more. My father has a ton of gold in
exchange, discounting what is here and there in other
goods. I will assure this beautiful lady of what I have 645
said here, and ten times more than you. Besides I am
a fresh young man who will please her in everything
else.

SEBASTIAN  I must not promise more than I have.

FELIX  Then the bride is mine according to my lord. 650

THEOBALD  Yes, as long as your father gives his consent
and assurance. Should you die before Lord Sebastian,
my daughter would be in a delicate position given
your promise.

FELIX  O, have no fear on that account. He is old, I am 655
young.

SEBASTIAN  Can young people not die? Fine reasoning!

FELIX  According to the ordinary course of nature, I
mean, if Sir Know-It-All can understand that.

---

640–2  *Yet... it?*  *KK* replaces Gremio’s offer
of riches bound up in merchandise (*TS*,
2.1.378–80) by money ‘*in banco*’, and
eliminates all references to argosies,
galleys and other sea vessels (*TS*,
2.1.380–3), perhaps because the loca-
tions mentioned in the play are all distant
from the sea.

641  *This... case*  The German uses a meta-
phor that literally says, ‘this will close
the door’ (‘*dis wird die Thür zuthun*’).

645–8  *I will... else.*  Tranio offers ‘twice as
much what’er’ Gremio proposes (*TS*,
2.1.384). The last sentence of this pas-
sage has no equivalent in Tranio’s corre-
sponding speech (*TS*, 2.1.381–4).

649–59  *KK* follows *TS* speech by speech
(2.1.385–95), except that it adds the last
one, allowing Felix to have the last word
in his confrontation with Sebastian.

659  *Sir Know-It-All* (‘*eure nasenweisheit*’,
literally ‘your nose-whiteness’) with a
pun on ‘Weisheit’ and ‘Weissheit’
(wisdom and whiteness). See Grimm,
‘nasenweis’, 3.
THEOBALD  It remains as I’ve said: if your father does not consent to the conditions, Sir Sebastian still has hope. Meanwhile, please step inside with me.

   Exeunt [Theobald and Sebastian].

FELIX  An ill hope it is for him. I served my master well in this first bout. Now, I must think about further schemes: I think we need another player for the game. The unlawful son needs an unlawful father. I must look for one. All is topsy-turvy: usually parents produce children; now I must produce a father. But there’s no harm in that; I hope my work will be handsomely rewarded.

   Exit. 670

[2.2]

   Enter WORMFIRE.

WORMFIRE  What the devil, not a soul here? Has the devil already taken my lord? Or is he hiding inside his lady? There’s a mad wasp in the hornets’ nest! May fortune smile on him. But he will not lose himself. What belongs to the gallows doesn’t drown in the bath. I

660–2 It ... hope. KK omits Baptista’s reminder that ‘Katherine is to be married’ (TS, 2.1.397) on Sunday, followed by Bianca a week later, which increases the urgency of the disguise schemes in TS. If Lucentio fails to meet Baptista’s ultimatum, Gremio is to marry Bianca (TS, 2.1.400), a certainty which KK dilutes by merely allowing Sebastian to ‘still have hope’.

662 SD Theobald and Sebastian exit together, while Gremio lingers after Baptista’s exit in order to taunt Tranio with his increased chances of success (TS, 2.1.402–6).

663–70 KK stays close to TS (2.1.407–14), but transforms Tranio’s reference to gambling (‘I have faced it with a card of ten’, 2.1.408) into the newly arisen necessity to seek ‘another player for the game’ (665) of winning Sabina.

2.2 Wormfire’s soliloquy has no equivalent in TS. For the soliloquies added to KK, see Introduction, pp. 104–9.

1 What ... devil (‘Wie nun zum Henker’, literally ‘What the hangman’). A common expression for surprise or discontent in which ‘Henker’ is a euphemism for ‘devil’ (Grimm, ‘Henker’, 3).

3 There’s ... nest! For the use of hornets and wasps to figure madness, see 1.3.12–13, 116 and notes.

have set up my cause well. She is ready on certain conditions. If my lord says yes, and her lady yes, the whore will be mine. I thought my tool would have it my way, but not this time. Such an honourable tree will not fall with one stroke. I think she must be *harum bonarum* and one of our kind, since her sign shows that the host is a mad wag. Well, the more the merrier. I will become an honourable cuckold from now on, and cry cuckoo to my brothers. No matter, it’s the fashion now. I have many high and noble brothers in the order, and doubtless some among you here, good gentlemen, since I see your wives are laughing. The whore pretends to be honourable towards my chaste person. One is allowed to finger her a little, but to pluck the cittern properly, that is not allowed. Patience,
patience, a bit of farting, one stays in atrio the first time. But if the opportunity comes around again, the wind shall swell my sails better. I will drift into the Netherlands, though I aimed for England. It is good to walk on a paved road, and the rider on a trained horse doesn’t stumble so easily. I must find my lord now to see how it fares with his love, and to find something wet. The heat of wooing has dried up my throat.

Exit.

3.[1] Enter SABINA, [HILARIUS as] Johannes, and [ALFONS as] Musician [with a lute].

HILARIUS I tell you, dallier, put your pipe away, or blow a milder note. Or else I’ll set your mouthpiece straight and show you a fingering that shall make your face fall.
Kunst über alle Künste

ALFONS  You quarrelsome peevish pedantic school fox, don’t you know that noble music takes precedence, and so do we her kindred. So be kind and give me precedence, so that I may instruct this beauty for the space of an hour. You then have the remaining time to purvey your tittle-tattling drudgery.

HILARIUS  You brainless flog-worthy stockfish, you don’t have enough reason to understand that music is just a parergon to refresh the mind when the higher studia tire it. So stand back, and let me instruct her first, or I will teach you to sing the la mi.

ALFONS  You are truly a brute. Beware or I’ll explain the syntax to you so well that the grammar hits your head.

HILARIUS  Melius praevenire, quam praeveniri is what I learnt at school.

He starts to beat him.

SABINA  Hold, my lord. It’s strange that you should quarrel about what lies in my choice alone. I am not a

4 SP Here and throughout this scene, the SP for Alfons in D1 and D2 is ‘Musicus’, i.e. musician. For the same convention regarding Hilarius, see 1.2.0 SD and note. Our edition standardizes the SPs.

4 school fox (‘Schulfuchs’) KK’s adaptation of TS’s ‘pedant’ (3.1.4), referring to petty pretentious teachers who were said to wear cheap fox-furred coats (Grimm, 3).

8–9 to . . . drudgery KK replaces TS’s neutral ‘lecture’ (3.1.8) with an insult.

10–16 KK stays close to TS (3.1.9–15) but has the suitors compete by adding learned words (see notes at 14 and 16).

10 flog-worthy stockfish (‘blauenswürdiger Stockfisch’) ‘Stockfisch’ was used as an insult, particularly in relation to beating someone up (Köhler, 240). ‘[B]lauenswürdig’ literally means ‘worthy to be made blue’ with bruises (Grimm 1, ‘bleuen’).

12 parergon Latin, accessory.

14 the la mi The names of notes from tonic solfa (see note at 1.3.18). ‘Auf ein lami ausgehen’ (literally, ‘ending on a lami’) also designated a pitiful ending, stemming from the melodic movement from la to mi which gives a plaintive close to certain tunes (Grimm, ‘Lami’).

16 the grammar Alfons literally says he will hit Hilarius with ‘the Donat’, a common school grammar of Latin whose title was inspired by the popularity of the works of Aelius Donatus, a fourth-century Roman teacher of grammar and rhetoric (Grimm, ‘Donat’).

17 Melius . . . praeveniri Latin, better to forestall than to be forstalled. Unattributed Latin proverb (see Philippi, 1.245).
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学校男孩，你可以给他下命令，我不想被你课程的限制，而是随我所好。

ALFONS 【对Alfons】，你准备好去调音了吗？

HILARIUS 时间会告诉你。如果是这样，仪器就不好，请你去调音。

ALFONS 【bar】，有件事让人觉得奇怪。我得留心。

HILARIUS 我最漂亮的女士，请坐。

SABINA 我们到哪儿了？

HILARIUS 亲爱的，还不到我想让你知道的程度。我已经向你解释了诗歌的必要规则，并向你展示了短长的模式，即两个长音节悬挂在单个短音节上。但我注意到你不喜欢它。

SABINA 我承认它看起来有一点无聊。再给我另一种方式。

HILARIUS 最好的方式是相反的，即两个短音节悬挂在单个长音节上。这个方式非常优雅，并叫做 dactylic 模式，因为 dactylis 显示其愉快跃起的本性：一个较长的音节，其中两个较短的音节。

29–30 KK 插入了 Alfons 的怀疑，比 TS 做的（3.1.87–9），可能暗示了 Sabina 更大的果敢，与 Bianca 相比。

33–60 KK 保留了 TS 的想法，展示了老师对学生的兴趣，但离开了原来的短长模式，由 Hilarius 治疗母音分节，而不是拉丁翻译（参见导言，pp. 118–19）。

35–60 的模式 Hilarius 描述了极少使用的 bacchius，一种由一个非重音和两个重音音节组成的音步：da-DUM-DUM。

40–50 不同于 Lucentio（TS, 3.1.31–6），Hilarius 并没有在教学过程中透露他的真实身份（但可以假设他在之前已经透露过）。反而，他巧妙地将 dactyl 作为阴茎的象征（‘一个较长的音节’, 44）来向 Sabina 展现，然后用 dactylic 四行诗来讲述他们的爱情故事，包括他们的身体联盟。对于 dactyl 作为阴茎的象征，见 Wollin。
shorter syllables hang in the most elegant fashion. Listen to this example:

Love me, my darling, my love will be only
For you, the dear lovely one, cherished forever,
So that not only our souls, but our bodies
May lovingly move and with love come together.

SABINA I admit this manner is very delightful and pleasant. But I find it is a little difficult and therefore hard to learn.

HILARIUS My dearest, one simply needs to understand well the qualities of the dactyli, and what kind of nature and force lie in the three parts. Do not imagine the thing to be more difficult than it is. Although it may appear to you a little sour the first time, afterwards it will seem so sweet that your appetite will not be stifled.

ALFONS Honoured lady, my instrument is tuned.

SABINA Let’s hear. Bah, how it jars!

HILARIUS Fellow, spit into the hole. The peg is not right.
Pull it higher. [to Sabina] Now try how the verse works for you.

SABINA Well, I will try:

Loving is not what has been my past practice,
So should I choose now as the moment to start?

47–50 Our translation seeks to replicate the German’s dactylic quatrains with cross-rhymes and four stresses to each line, here displayed in bold.

51–60 Sabina and Hilarius jointly extend his conceit, equating the loss of virginity and sexual intercourse with the composition of dactylic poetry.

61–81 After replacing TS’s Latin with a class on native poetry, KK returns to TS (KK 61–6; TS 3.1.37–40) only then to diverge again, substituting Sabina’s dactylic attempt for Bianca’s supposed Latin translation (KK 67–81; TS 3.1.40–3), in which the women neither dismiss nor encourage their suitor.

63–4 Fellow ... higher. Pegs of a lute tended to slip out of place, but could be made to stick by spitting into the peg hole.

67–81 Sabina’s dactylic composition answers Hilarius’ in kind, delaying her answer to his suit (67–70). KK then transforms Bianca’s distrust (coupled with the quiet encouragement expressed by her translation (TS, 3.1.40–3)) into a brief added dialogue between Sabina and Hilarius (71–81).
Taking their time is how maids please to ponder
Unless there’s some foolish mistake on my part.

HILARIUS  You will improve in this form of poetry, but
you need to choose better words. These are a little too
rough and hard.

SABINA  Be content. The beginning is hard. It will
improve.

HILARIUS  Indeed, I desire it, my love.

SABINA  Your wish will become true the sooner if I can
trust your art. Mistrust sometimes weighs heavily on
us women.

[HILARIUS]  I hope my heart’s love shall yet find faith in
me, because I will surely prove what I have spoken.

ALFONS  My instrument has a good tone now, Madam.

HILARIUS  [aside]  But an ill one for me if your tuning has
determined it.

[Hilarius and Sabina speak aside]

I have little trust in this cord-twanger, he looks quite
fiery.

SABINA  Perhaps the tuning warmed him up.

HILARIUS  I judge this fire differently and half believe

80 SP We follow Köhler in assigning the
speech to Hilarius. D1 and D2 mistak-
enly ascribe it to Sabina.

82–106 KK loosely corresponds to and
expands upon the equivalent moment in
TS (3.1.44–54), flagging up the distrust
between the two teachers, as well as
between teachers and pupil.

82–4 KK converts TS’s musical joke into a
more explicitly sexual one: Hortensio
interrupts the lovers, saying that his instru-
ment is ‘now in tune’ (3.1.44), to which
Lucentio’s reply (‘All but the bass,’ 3.1.44)
plays on ‘bass’ (the lowest voice in a song)
and ‘base’ (of low character). Alfon liter-
ally says ‘my instrument now stands in a
good tone’ (‘Mein Instrument stehet nun-
mehr im rechten Thon’), potentially with
phallic insinuations. Hilarius picks these
up, playing on the German ‘Stimmung’
(‘tuning’), which could also mean ‘mood’.

84 SD D1 and D2 have no SD here, nor at
98 SD and 178 SD. It seems clear, how-
ever, that the dialogue between Hilarius
and Sabina at 85–96, 99–106 and 179–91
is spoken aside, unheard by Alfon.
that you have lit it in his liver, my dearest. A lover always wears the spectacles of jealousy on his ears. I think I must put these on my nose now.

SABINA You have nothing to fear.

HILARIUS My dearest, do not hold it against me that I keep some watch over him. Distrust is an effect of love.

SABINA Do not doubt me.

ALFONS Lady, would you like to hear me too now?

SABINA Sir, you hurry as if you were dying.

[Hilarius and Sabina speak aside]

HILARIUS My highly honoured Sir Fiddle Artist has an appetite that is much too keen. I bet my life the rogue loves what I love. I have great reason to keep watch.

SABINA Don’t wrong me with this distrust.

HILARIUS Trusting him and trusting you are two different things, my lovely heart.

SABINA The end will tell. [to Alfons] So come here, sir, and let me hear your instrument.

ALFONS Most honoured lady, I will not treat the matter superficially with you, as we musici usually do, but will deal with it quite deeply so as to impress the science upon you.

HILARIUS (aside) The devil take that pressing.

ALFONS Here is the scala which I have devised in a perfect new manner. Women usually conceive better

89 you . . . liver Love was believed to start in the liver (see Grimm, ‘Leber’, 3).

99–100 has . . . keen Hilarius literally says that Alfons ‘is keen on the dear bread’ (‘ist gar eyfrig auff das liebe Brod’), equating Sabina with the most basic sustenance.

107–16 KK follows TS (3.1.62–8) in having Alfons introduce his lesson by presenting his particular method of gamut teaching (107–10), but adds Hilarius’ jealous aside and elaborates the sexual musical joke (KK, 111–16; TS, 3.1.62–3). Alfons’ new ‘scala’ (i.e. scale, 112), a euphemism for his penis, depends on his innuendo on the German for b flat major (‘dur’, Latin for ‘hard’), a rising series of notes (ascendendo) followed by a falling series (descendendo).
of $b$ flat major than $b$ flat minor, so I will first instruct you in the ascendendo, and then in the descendendo which teaches itself.

SABINA I already know much of this and wish to know nothing further from you. There is no need to teach it again.

ALFONS But, Madam, here is a new manner. I do not show it to everyone, but I will not be guilty of keeping it from you.

SABINA Sir, I am not so curious, so stick with the old manner.

ALFONS Will you take a lesson on the lute then?

SABINA I am not in the mood now, nor ready to be attentive enough.

ALFONS Hear only one song which I composed yesterday in honour of your favourite whom you know very well.

SABINA You must be mistaken, as I have not yet chosen anyone as my favourite.

ALFONS Your amusing politeness is well known. Do you not know Sir Alfons of Nistlingen?

SABINA Not more than I know you, nor do I love him more.

ALFONS As he is my great friend, I entreat you to listen kindly to my composition, and to bless him with your well-disposed favour.

SABINA This last requires some time and ample

117–19 $KK$ translates Bianca’s rebarbative rejection of the gamut ($TS$, 3.1.69), adding that she is not desirous to learn more about it through Alfons (‘from you’, 118).

120–4 $KK$ faithfully renders Hortensio’s offer and Bianca’s rejection of the lesson ($TS$, 3.1.70 and 3.1.77–8), but omits the ‘gamut of Hortensio’ (3.1.70–6). Instead, $KK$ adds a brief dialogue between the two (125–42) in which Alfons’ identity is decoded.
consideration. If your song is fit for a maiden’s ear, I shan’t forbid you to play, since I love a good invention.

**ALFONS** _sits down a little apart, and sings the following song to the lute. To the melody of ‘Is there anyone still living like me’, &c._

How oft has mighty Jove,  
Lord of the heavens above,  
Disguised himself to win  
Some nymph that he has seen,  
Her body made for play  
To pass the time away.

Once he became a bull  
Upon the beautiful  
Europa strand, so named  
For that sweet maid who came  
Into his arms. O see  
How lovely that can be!

142 SD To . . . &c. (‘Lebt jemand noch wie ich &c.’) The text of the song to whose tune Alfons performs his composition was printed in a contemporary song book, _Tugendhaffter Jungfrauen und Jungengesellen Zeit-Vertreiber_ (place of publication unknown, c. 1670; VD17 1:739188Q), by Hilarius Lustig von Freuden-Thal (Song 109, sigs G6v–G7r); see Scheitler, 1.1053–4. Hilarius Lustig von Freuden-Thal appears to be a pseudonym that may have inspired the name of ‘Hilarius von Liebenthal’ in KK.

143–78 Alfons reveals his identity to Sabina through a song telling how Jove seduced mortal women by transforming himself into various animals. Alfons’ analogy between Jove and himself is unintentionally comic. The German song consists of rhymed iambic trimeter couplets, six stanzas of six lines each, as in our translation. Additionally, in the German version the second couplet in each stanza has feminine endings, the other couplets masculine ones.

143–66 The myth of Jove’s transformations is told, most famously, in Ovid’s _Metamorphoses_, a hugely popular work in early modern Europe (see Keith and Rupp).

149–54 For Jove’s transformation into a white bull and his ravishing of the princess Europa, see _Metamorphoses_, 2.833–75, 6.103–7.
When he became a swan
The same old game went on.
With warm white legs wrapped round,
He was not fully bound,
For wandering at ease,
His beak went where it pleased.

A cuckoo in the nest
Was what he tried out next,
Leaving behind a pair
Of eggs to show how there
He was love’s lucky one,
Like all who have such fun.

What Jove found easy then
Is much too hard for men;
We mortals must devise
Some less extreme disguise.
A man remains a man
Whatever he puts on.

He who now pines for you
With all his heart, he too
Has put on this disguise
To come before your eyes.
Ah! take him, grant relief
Lest he should die of grief.

155–66 Ovid merely alludes to Leda and the swan as one in a list of Jupiter’s affairs (Metamorphoses, 6.109), suggesting that the myth was well known by his time. Leda gave birth to two eggs, one of them containing Helen. See also 2.2.13–14 and note.

157 The German literally says that her ‘warm white legs enclosed his’ (‘Die warmen weisen Beine / Umschlossen ja die seine’), perhaps suggesting Leda’s (and by extension Sabina’s) willing surrender.
Like Alfons’ song, the short dialogue between Hilarius and Sabina, in which they reflect on the song’s meaning and Alfons’ disguise, has no equivalent in TS.

although . . . feathers (‘ob er sich schon mit andern Federn behencket’) proverbial (see Wander, ‘Feder’, 133). Sabina refers back to Alfons’ song about Jove’s disguise, and alludes to Alfons’ own disguise as a musician.

But . . . trick. Sabina literally says, ‘may he not believe that he will be able to fix his hare-eggs here’ (‘aber er glaube nur nicht / daß er seine Hasen-Eyer anbringen werde’), mocking Alfons’ song by referring to the ‘foul play’ suggested by the cuckoo eggs, which she intends to prevent. For other hare jokes and insults, see 2.1.288, 394–5, 455.

For Hilarius’ anger and aggressiveness, see 1–3 and note.

KK inserts this brief exchange between Sabina and Veit, with a characteristic sexual innuendo by the latter, ‘fur’ (196), presumably alluding to Sabina’s pubic hair.

While the servant reminds Bianca to ‘dress [her] sister’s chamber up’, since ‘tomorrow is the wedding day’, KK avoids all temporal markers.

3.1.179 [Kunst über alle Künste]

[Hilarius and Sabina speak aside]

HILARIUS What comfort or wisdom do you draw from this song, my heart?
SABINA It is too high for my low wit.
HILARIUS It seems to me he has either presented my person in it, or is not who he pretends to be. I hardly know what to say or think.
SABINA I know this bird from his song, although he covers himself in other’s feathers. But he should not believe he can get away with his trick.
HILARIUS I’d rather cut his throat.
SABINA Don’t be angry. If your words are true and I may trust them, then trust me likewise.
HILARIUS These are golden words from a ruby-red mouth.

Enter VEIT.

VEIT Madam, for some reason your father asks you to leave the books and tidy your chamber as best you can.
SABINA What is going on?
VEIT I don’t know, but I think pelt-mongers have arrived. They’ll want to work on fur if the maid gives them something to do.
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SABINA O, you and your foolery. But I think I must go.

HILARIUS I have nothing left to do here. Shadow follows light. Exit.

VEIT Go forth with the blessing of the Lord.

ALFONS This ink-eater follows her as if he were something other than a servant. Honest Veit, what do you think of your maid’s fine Sir Praeceptor, will he instruct her well?

VEIT Between you and me, I almost think that he instructs her as do other Praeceptores to whom noble virgins are entrusted. They take them for their underlings. He is a fresh young man named Johannes. Perhaps he seeks to prepare the way to qualify our maid according to the current mode, because he heard it is no longer the fashion to enter the wedding bed as a virgin. I cannot hold it against him. If I had the means or the permission to do it, for all my sins, I would. A saddled horse rides well.

ALFONS Did you not observe their behaviour? Are they very friendly together when they are alone?

VEIT If I had seen that they bit into each other’s mouths in an over-trusting fashion, and rubbed against each other, I would have thought differently. And A... well. Veit suggests that sleeping with a sexually experienced woman is more pleasurable than with a virgin. Compare Wormfire’s comment at 2.2.23–4.

202–23 KK adds an exchange between Veit and Alfons which anticipates the latter’s doubts about Sabina’s chastity repeated at 224–49, in accordance with TS (3.1.87–9).

203 ink-eater (‘Dintenfresser’) Scribbler (see Grimm).

205 Praeceptor Latin, teacher.

205–6 will... well? As earlier in the scene, instruction implies ambiguously humanist teaching and sexual initiation.

207 Between... me The German reads ‘sub rosa’, Latin for ‘under the rose’, meaning ‘in secret’. According to legend, roses decked the ceilings of political meetings in ancient Rome, so that everything that was said ‘sub rosa’ (‘under the rose’) remained in the room, i.e., was confidential.

211–12 qualify... mode Veit implies that the current mode is not to be a virgin, and so the qualification he has in mind is sex.

216 A... well. Veit suggests that sleeping with a sexually experienced woman is more pleasurable than with a virgin. Compare Wormfire’s comment at 2.2.23–4.

217 their behaviour The German allows for the possibility that Alfons refers to ‘her behaviour’ (‘jhr thu[n]’), rather than theirs, which would suggest Sabina’s forwardness.

219 they... mouths i.e. they kiss.
other, I would not have permission to say so plainly. I must go now. There is work inside, and I come away empty-handed.  

[Exit.]

ALFONS It tortures me. I noticed it at once. I don’t know what to make or say of my fine colleague. I see familiarity between them. Her friendliness to him is too great. What loving looks she gave him when they parted, while she hardly granted me one at all! It is impossible she should not know me in this disguise since I make myself known quite clearly. Does she prefer a miserable tutoring fool, a lousy knave, a scurvy school fox like him to a nobleman like me? Who knows if this Veit is complicit with this tutor? Let the hangman swear to it! But who is he? Nobody knows who he is, although his character and brave appearance show something noble. Yet it is the custom of noblemen to sow seed in common earth. Many a brave lad has no

222–3 I . . . empty-handed. The German literally says ‘it’s up to me to wipe my maw’ (‘Mein Maul wischen gilt mit’), as if Veit had nothing to eat and could only wipe away his saliva.

224–49 KK broadly follows TS (3.1.85–90) in conveying Alfons’ suspicions and thoughts of revenge, but greatly amplifies his brooding by adding insult upon insult (e.g. 230–2) and sketching out his suspicions about Hilarius’ identity (234–6). Unlike TS, KK has Alfons dwell on Sabina’s guilt in ‘prefer[ring] a miserable tutoring fool’ (231) to a nobleman like himself, and accuses her of giving him ‘loving looks’ (227). While Hortensio ends his brief soliloquy on a rhymed promise to ‘quit’ Bianca by ‘changing’ his favour (TS, 3.1.90), i.e. courting another woman, should she prefer the supposed lowly poetry teacher, Alfons plans to expose Sabina by revealing her liaison to Felix, the supposed ‘Monsieur of Liebenthal’ (244–7).

230 miserable . . . fool The German literally says ‘a miserable labour shitter’ (‘einen elenden Plackscheisser’), meaning a poor teacher (see Grimm, ‘Blackscheißer’).

232 school fox See note at 4.

233 complicit . . . tutor (‘unter dieser Pedantendecke ist’) Alfons draws on the expression ‘mit jemandem unter einer Decke stecken’ (Wander, ‘Decke’, 22), literally to stick with someone under one cover, i.e. to be complicit with him or her. For ‘Pedant’, see 1.2.20n.

233, 238 hangman For other invocations of the hangman, see 1.1.122, 1.3.31, 38, 2.1.33, 3.2.19 and 3.3.139.

236–7 Yet . . . earth. This proverbial sounding expression means that noblemen often have illegitimate children with common women, and the subsequent sentence indicates that Alfons suspects Hilarius of being of such illegitimate origins.
bad parents. But whoever he is, I wish the hangman would break his neck. He is just too forward. He may be a rogue who tempts her and shames her reputation through his fraud and mischief. Who knows what he has done to her or given her to drink. It is impossible that so noble a lady should be attracted to such a poor lowly servant. I will observe a little longer. If I learn something for certain, I will revenge myself on them most grievously, and I will inform Monsieur of Liebenthal how things are with her. As a virtuous gentleman, he will leave her to public shame, and this double-dealer will get his just punishment. 

240

Exit.

239 **He... forward.** Alfons literally says ‘he plays bad tricks for my taste’ (‘Er macht mir schlechte Possen’). ‘Possen’ could refer to tricks, pranks or jokes (Grimm, 2), but also specifically to farcical plays with Pickelherring, the itinerant players’ fool figure (Grimm, 2b).
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Enter CATHARINA.

[CATHARINA] Now it is as I feared. I am put to shame. O, had I never been born! If only my father had died before he created me! I am a fine bride who is supposed to hold her wedding dance today. My heart warned me that this mad devil would torture me – me, who have tortured many, tit for tat. Now evil Catharina will become scorned Catharina. Dogs will pass by me and lift their leg. O, shame beyond shame! If this monster returns, I will give him the kindest words,

3.2 There is no specified location, but the scene is presumably set in front of Theobald’s house. It falls into five parts: 1–85 (to Wormfire and Hardman’s entrance), 86–147 (to Theobald and Wormfire’s exit to the wedding), 148–232 (to the re-entry of the wedding group), 233–348 (to the exit of Theobald, Sabina and Felix) and 349–98 (the dialogues between Sebastian and Hilarius, and Veit and Fabian). The first part, in which Catharina and her father anxiously wait for the groom, follows TS (3.2.1–83), but adds Catharina’s soliloquy at 1–12, and shortens Biondello’s report on the strange clothing of bridegroom and servant (TS, 3.2.43–61 and KK, 72–80). The second part, the arrival of Hardman and Wormfire, fantastically dressed, remains close to TS (3.2.84–126) but inserts Wormfire’s humorous comments. The third part has Hilarius and Felix update each other on their disguise scheme, and Sebastian report on the wedding ceremony. It follows TS (3.2.127–82) but elaborates on the shocking and amusing descriptions of the wedding and adds Fabian’s caustic observations on service and money (164–76). The fourth part, which includes the re-entry of the company after the ceremony and Hardman’s insistence on leaving abruptly, is closely adapted from TS (3.2.183–253), but adds Wormfire’s comments and augments the fast-paced exchange between Catharina and Hardman (258–312), while omitting most of Petruccio’s speech claiming Katherina as his property (3.2.228–40). The last part has no equivalent in TS. It includes Sebastian and Hilarius talking about the suit to Sabina (349–67), and Veit and Fabian trying to make sense of recent events (368–98).

1–12 Before adapting TS’s beginning of the scene (11), KK adds a brief soliloquy by Catharina in which she expresses her fear of acquiring the reputation of scorned bride, and promises to improve her behaviour towards Hardman upon his return (see Introduction, pp. 105–6).

1 SP In D1 and D2, the SP is implied in the entrance SD.

1 I am . . . shame Catharina literally says ‘I sit in the jeer’ (‘Ich sitze im Schimpf’); see Grimm, ‘Schimpf’, 2.

4 wedding dance Catharina refers to the communal festivities that she thinks will be denied her, but she may also allude to the wedding night (Wander, ‘Tanz’, 77).

6 tit for tat Catharina literally says ‘sausage for sausage’ (‘Wurst wieder Wurst’), a proverb that reflects the custom of offering one’s neighbours fresh sausage when a pig is slaughtered (Wander, ‘Wurst’, 67).
and force myself to be friendly even though it is against my nature. Here comes the man who has caused all this evil.

*Enter Theobald and Felix [as Hilarius].*

**Theobald**  Now I greatly desire news from the lad. Today is the appointed wedding-day. Everything is ready, but nobody has had any news from the groom.

*Enter Veit.*

**Veit**  My lord, I asked at Sir Hardman’s usual lodgings and all other sorts of places in search of news, but could not discover the least trace of him or when he will arrive. I reckon the hangman has broken his mad neck.

**Catharina**  I would to God you were a prophet.

**Theobald**  I do not know what to do. This insult is too great for my noble degree; with others it would seem a farce. What will they say, those scornful people to whom the high status of nobility is always a thorn in the side? O, that I must endure such mockery!

11–12 *the ... evil* Compare Catharina’s accusations against Sir Theobald in her speech at 27–41.

12  SD In *TS*, Baptista and Tranio enter with Katherina, Bianca, Gremio ‘*and others, Attendants*’ (3.2.0.3), including presumably Lucentio. In *KK*, Catharina is already onstage, while Sabina, Sebastian and Hilarius do not enter until later, at lines 232, 176 and 152 respectively.

13–26 *KK* adapts Baptista’s speech (*TS*, 3.2.1–7) but interrupts it with speeches by Veit and Catharina, added by *KK*, that heighten the suspense about Hardman’s arrival.

22–6 *KK* preserves Baptista’s fear of mockery (*TS*, 3.2.4) but adds the humorously self-reflective statement that the situation would seem like a scene from a farce (‘Posse’) if only others experienced it too.

24–6 *What ... side?* Theobald literally asks, ‘what verdicts will the splinter-judges render who are constantly stung in the eye by nobility’s preference’ (‘*Was für urtheilen werden die Splitter-Richter führen / welche doch des Adels Führzüg stäts in die Augen sticht*’). Those harshly judging the petty foibles of others were called ‘splinter judges’ (Grimm, ‘*Splitterrichter*’), a term derived from Christ’s Sermon on the Mount: ‘why beholdest thou the mote [i.e. splinter] that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?’ (Matthew 7.3).
CATHARINA  You should keep quiet, for who bears the shame, father, except for me who am innocent? Against my will I must submit to the desire of this raging madcap. I must be promised to a rough rogue who has no intention of keeping his word. I must be forced to offer my faith to one who is faithless. That kind of faithless man who would swear a hundred oaths and then play his tricks. Here is your bride, now marry her. O, that this should happen even to wisdom like yours, yet even old hens lay in nettles sometimes. But I am the one who has to suffer most, I mean the jeering voice of the people. They will laugh enough at mad Hardman and his bride, and make a song about them. They will point their fingers at me, O, what a shame!

FELIX  Peace, madam. Sir Hardman is not so thoughtless as to expose Sir Theobald to shame and leave you to the mockery of the people. Who knows what has prevented his journey? Such things are common with travellers. He will not fail us.

CATHARINA  If only I had never seen him! I wish him the gallows or the wheel for his faithfulness! But none of this does me any good.  

Exit.

27–41 Catharina’s speech remains reasonably close to TS (3.2.8–20) but shows a more independent Catharina, pitching her ‘will’ (29) against Theobald’s, while Katherina is ‘forced / To give [her] hand opposed against [her] heart’ (3.2.8–9).


37–8 the jeering . . . people Catharina literally says ‘the people’s fairy-tale voice’ (‘der Leute Mährlein Stimm’), linking the oral and fictive quality of these popular stories to the way news of her slight will spread.

38–40 They . . . them. KK adds the idea of the slanderous song, concluding it with a rhyme (‘Die des tollen Hartmans und seiner Braut genug lachen, ein Liedlein von ihnen machen’).

42–6 KK stays close to TS, but omits Tranio’s supposed acquaintance with Petruchio (‘I know him passing wise’, 3.2.24) and offers instead a commonsensical explanation for Hardman’s absence, adding that ‘[h]e will not fail us’, a reference to his status as Sabina’s supposed husband-to-be.

49 SD In TS, Katherina exits at the equivalent moment, and she does so ‘weeping’ (3.2.26.1).
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50–4 KK preserves Baptista’s speech, substituting ‘lamb’ for ‘saint’, and ‘angry cat’ for ‘shrew’ (TS, 3.2.28–9), but inserts Veit’s sexually suggestive remark before it.

55–8 KK adapts Biondello’s excitement (TS, 3.2.30–1), adding the Latin mirabilia nova, mirabiliorum novissima mirabilissima (‘new wonders, newest most wonderful of all wonders’), perhaps alluding to the satiric anti-Catholic pamphlet Nova Mirabilia oder Neue Zeitung aus dem Fegefeuer (Nova Mirabilia or News from Purgatory) by the pseudonymous Theophilum Antipapium, which went through a number of editions in 1668 and 1669 (see VD17 3:318763B, 12:154610G, 3:653749G, 14:678664E and 12:107853P).

59–70 KK assigns two speeches by Baptista to Felix (TS, 3.2.32 and 3.2.78; KK, 59–60 and 68–9), transposes TS’s later conceit of the horse and its rider (3.2.76–83) and omits the somewhat obscure reference to ‘Saint Jamy’ (3.2.79). KK also omits the brief dialogue between Baptista and Biondello about whether Petruccio has ‘come’ or ‘is coming’ (3.2.35 and 38), a grammatical play that cannot be reproduced in German.

Far . . . mark Proverbial, referring to hitting the mark in archery (Wander, ‘fehlen’, 41).
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FELIX Well, what is your old and your new news?

FABIAN He comes very honourably dressed with a new hat and old garments. He goes about in such Shrovetide honours, and is surrounded by much comitat.

THEOBALD Who is coming with him?

FABIAN My lord brother, the lord’s servant, decked out the same way. They both present themselves in such a peculiar way that you could take their garments for monsters and them for fools without hurting your conscience.

THEOBALD I am glad he is here, let him be dressed as he pleases. It would be a good thing if the man could be as easily changed as the garment.

FABIAN [aside] My vice-lord was fortunate in that, but hush, *pudeat te talia protulere*.

Enter HARDMAN and WORMFIRE, strangely dressed.

WORMFIRE Ha, courage, in the name of all the saints, we have returned to German ground. Lord of a thousand

---

72–4 *KK* adapts Biondello’s first words (‘Why, Petruccio is coming in a new hat and an old jerkin’, *TS*, 3.2.43–4), but radically condenses his lengthy description of Petruccio’s outlandish dress (3.2.43–61).

73–4 Shrovetide See 1.2.43n.

74 *comitat* Latin, retinue, companions.

75–80 *KK* faithfully translates Baptista’s question (*TS*, 3.2.62) but compresses Biondello’s description of Grumio’s clothes (3.2.63–8).

81–3 *KK* translates Baptista’s concession that he is ‘glad’ Petruccio has come ‘howsoever he comes’ (*TS*, 3.2.71), but adds Theobald’s proverbial second sentence (see Wander, ‘Kleid’, 28).

84 *My . . . that* presumably a reference to Felix and his disguise as Hilarius.

85 *pudeat . . . protulere* Latin, you should be ashamed to say such things. The speech has no equivalent in *TS*.

85 SD strangely dressed Not mentioned in *TS*’s equivalent SD (3.2.83 SD).

86–147 While Grumio is present in the equivalent passage in *TS* (3.2.84–122), he does not speak. Wormfire’s four speeches (86–90, 117, 124–5, 138–9) strengthen his comical presence. See also 246–331 and note.

87 returned . . . ground Presumably a foolish comment by Wormfire rather than an indication that he and Hardman have gone on foreign travels. In 2.1, Hardman affirmed that he ‘must travel to Frankfurt’ (538–9) to make purchases for the wedding.

87–8 Lord . . . years (‘Tausend guter Jahr Herr’) probably a reference to Christ’s thousand-year reign announced in the Book of Revelation (20.1–4).
good years, how nicely we shall be welcomed by our flesh and blood, what affectionate rubbing there will be, how it tickles me!

HARDMAN    Shut up, you babbling rogue, or I’ll give you a clout. But ye gods and little fishes! Greetings, father, and greetings to you, gentlemen! Why do you stand here with gaping mouths?

THEOBALD    Welcome, my lord.

HARDMAN    Yet I see I have not come well.

FELIX    We are pleased to see you but would rather see you in more pleasing clothes.

HARDMAN    You don’t understand, so please spare me your further wisdom. If I were dressed even more strangely, it would please me well. Why am I wasting my time with fools here? Where is my dearest Catharina? My sense and inclination are for her. Where is my heart’s beloved? How are you, father? You gentlemen all gape at me as if you had never seen

88–9  **our . . . blood** The German literally says ‘the opposites of our belly’ (‘unsers Bauchs Gegentheilen’), i.e. the female genitals (see Grimm, ‘Bauch’, 3).

92  **ye . . . fishes** Our translation of Hardman’s blasphemous interjection, ‘potz hundert tausend Sack voll enten’ (literally, ‘a hundred thousand bags full of ducks’), which collapses ‘sacerment’ (sacrament) into ‘Sack’ (bag) and ‘Ente’ (duck). The word ‘potz’ is derived from ‘Gottes’ (‘God’s’).

94  **gaping mouths** Hardman literally says ‘you stand here and sell maw apes’ (‘Stehet jhr hier und haltet Maulaffen veil’). ‘Maw apes’ is a corruption of ‘Maul offen’ (‘maw open’), which probably originates in the custom of selling earthen pots in the shape of heads with open mouths into which people would stick kindling.

95–8  **KK** adapts **TS**’s pun on ‘welcome’ and ‘come not well’ (3.2.86–7), i.e. well dressed, by means of ‘willkommen’ (welcome) and ‘nicht wohl nach jhrem Willen kommen’ (not come according to your will). **KK** omits Baptista’s continuation of the word play (**TS**, 3.2.88) and instead inserts a punning speech by Felix.

99–107  **KK** closely adapts Petruccio’s speech (**TS**, 3.2.90–5), but adds Hardman’s sarcastic comments about his interlocutors’ ‘wisdom’ (100) and their inability to ‘understand’ (107).

105–6  **You . . . man.** Hardman literally says, ‘you lords gape at me like the goose at a new gate’ (‘Ihr Herren gaffet mich alle an wie die Gans ein neues Thor’), referring to a proverbial conception of geese as being easily puzzled by commonplace objects (Grimm, ‘Gans’, 2a γ).
a man. Am I a demi-beast? It’s a wretched situation when inexperienced people fail to understand things.

THEOBALD  This appearance will seem strange to every reasonable person. You know that today is your day of honour, and yet you come thus unready. A little while ago we were disappointed about your absence, now we are dismayed by your appearance in such an unfitting fashion. Come, take off these foolish clothes! It is shameful for you and for us.

FELIX  [to Hardman]  Speak, sir, what held you up so long?

WORMFIRE  [aside]  That which does not press us down.

HARDMAN  It would be annoying for me to tell you at this busy time, and still more boring for you to hear. Why do you care? It is enough that I am here to deliver myself up to my dearest lady and to fill her arms. That’s why I must go. Time flies, and I haven’t finished anything yet.

WORMFIRE  [aside]  Damn it, time is getting long for me and my appendage too.

FELIX  Wait, don’t go in like that. Please, go to my chamber and put on more suitable clothes first.

HARDMAN  Let me be hit by lightning if my love does not

106  Am ... demi-beast?  KK transforms TS’s cosmic marvels (‘Some comet or unusual prodigy’, 3.2.95) into, literally, a ‘wonder-animal’ (‘Wunder-Thier’), that is, a monster or a creature half-human, half-animal (Grimm, ‘Wundertier’, 1a).

108–14  Theobald’s speech remains close to Baptista’s in TS (3.2.96–100) except that KK adds Theobald’s first sentence.

110–110  while ago we were disappointed about your absence, now we are dismayed by your appearance in such an unfitting fashion. Come, take off these foolish clothes! It is shameful for you and for us.

115–16  Felix’s question is a condensed version of Tranio’s (TS, 3.2.101–3), but Wormfire’s aside, with its play on prepositions – ‘held you up’ (‘aufhalten’) and ‘press us down’ (‘niederdrücken’) – has no equivalent in TS.

118–23  KK stays close to TS (3.2.104–10) but omits Petruchio’s hint at excusable reasons for his late arrival (3.2.106–8).

124–5  KK adds Wormfire’s aside about his appendage (i.e. penis), as eager for Sybilla as Hardman is for Catharina.

126–32  KK remains close to TS (3.2.111–14) except that it turns Petruchio’s straightforward ‘Not I, believe me; thus I’ll visit her’ (3.2.113) into a more emphatic rejection of Felix’s suggestion.
receive me in this outfit! A whole consistory of the
holiest people will not prevent me. My will is my 130
compass.

THEOBALD  But I hope you will not marry her like this.

HARDMAN  Exactly like this, or else may I drop dead! It
is me she marries, and not my garments. Why do I
need to argue? I have no need for a steward. I’m
wasting my time with these foolish antics. I will go in
and greet my bride with a lovely kiss.  Exit.

WORMFIRE  I will not be absent from there either. A Dieu,
mon frère, we’ll drink to health and happiness today!

FABIAN  I am pro and contra to dispute this matter.  140

FELIX [aside to Fabian and Wormfire]  You are two fine
gentlemen.

FABIAN  Indeed, in fine drinking health!

THEOBALD  I must follow to be present at the reception.

If he doesn’t take off these fool’s robes, I think it 145
would be wise to invite you all to my home. I would rather not be scorned by the people.

Exit [with Wormfire].

FELIX I think that would be for the best. He will no doubt play some other tricks. I believe his own reasons have brought him to this. His good sense shines through his mad and foolish behaviour. The fool’s cap covers many a shrewd mind.

Enter [HILARIUS as] Johannes.

Here comes my master just at the right moment! – How is it going with your own affairs? What you have entrusted to me will soon be brought to a happy end.

HILARIUS Indeed I like the sound of this, since my business looks pretty fair, too. Only one thing plagues me, and it is no small problem: I have a fellow suitor who doesn’t seem to be the man he pretends to be. I believe he is known to my lady, but so far I have learned nothing from her, although I see her heart belongs to nobody but me. But – (They go to the side.)
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164–76 TS has no equivalent to Fabian’s soliloquy about the dishonour of serving a fellow-servant (see Introduction, pp. 104–5).

164 sting take her virginity.

173–4 I . . . it. Fabian literally says ‘I have to bite it away’, that is, ‘swallow it’ (‘ich muß es so verbeissen’) (see Grimm, ‘verbeißen’. 2d).

174 Spes lucri Latin, in the hope of reward.

175–6 we . . . places Fabian literally says ‘we would start a movement of caps’ (‘wir wolten ein Kappenrückens anfangen’), that is, a fight symbolized by the dislocation of caps when pushing each other (see Grimm, ‘Kappenücken’, 2).

176 SD laughing not mentioned in TS’s equivalent SD (3.2.147 SD).

FABIAN   He’ll sting her soon. I take it she’s still to be stung. I thought there was something else behind it. What rogues there are in the world! One can rise through such tricks. I could have helped my lord to trick the people as much as this upstart does, strutting around in such gorgeous clothes, and spending the time feasting and guzzling. It plagues my blood when I have to serve him. But when we’re among people who have nothing to do with my lord’s business, I’ll happily let others do it. But what help is there? I must bear it. Spes lucri is a pretty thing. If it were not for that and my master, we would start a fight to change places in this masquerade.

Enter SEBASTIAN laughing.

[aside] What’s the matter with this old flatterer? Laughter looks as pretty on him as on an ape that wrinkles its nose when emptying its behind. O, blind world, that this old, incapable man desires to venture into someone young.

SEBASTIAN I cannot breathe for laughter! But what’s the meaning of this, my go-between with my fellow suitor?

177–81 As in the preceding SD, the insistence on Sebastian’s laughter has no equivalent in TS.

177 this . . . flatterer Fabian mocks Sebastian by literally calling him a ‘soft treader’ (‘Leisetreter’), an insult that presumably stems from the care with which flatterers need to move in the presence of a patron (see Grimm).

182 I . . . laughter! Sebastian literally says ‘I have nearly laughed myself into having a bloated belly’ (‘Ich habe mich fast bauchblässig gelachet’), i.e. he has been struggling to breathe.

182–6 But . . . news. Sebastian’s suspicion and Felix’s reassurance have no equivalent in TS.
FELIX Your servant, Sir Sebastian. I recognized my countryman, and asked for the news. Where have you just come from?

SEBASTIAN You ask where; well, from Sir Theobald’s lodgings, where I attended an amusing *copulation*.

FELIX Of what sort, my lord?

SEBASTIAN And you ask? I see it is I rather than you who have been given the honour of being witness to this business. Sir Hardman is bound to Lady Catharina. There’s a couple that is mad beyond all measure. But he is past compare. He’s a true devil.

FELIX And she is a fury among the devil’s lovers.

SEBASTIAN She’s not to be compared to him. She’s a patient lamb with a raging wolf, a meek dove with an angry hawk. Not even the devil can resemble his extraordinary nature. He cares for neither heaven nor hell.

FELIX But what did he do inside?

SEBASTIAN The priest had to hurry there, and then Hardman ordered him abruptly to couple them in God’s name. The priest begged to be excused, pleading a lack of preparation. When he said he did not even have the book with him, Hardman threw a calendar into his hands and threatened him, ordering him not to

---

188–95 **You . . . compare.** KK loosely adapts the beginning of Gremio’s account of the wedding and Tranio’s questions (*TS*, 3.2.149–53).

188–9 **Sir . . . lodgings** In *TS*, Gremio has come ‘from the church’ (3.2.148).

189 **copulation** (*copulation*) a joining; more specifically, a wedding. In German it was not until later that the generative act became the dominant meaning.

195–9 **He’s . . . hawk.** This closely adapts the exchange between Gremio and Tranio (*TS*, 3.2.154–6) but adds the ‘raging wolf’ and ‘angry hawk’ to Sebastian’s characterization of Hardman.

197–202 **KK** adds to the equivalent passage in *TS* both the hyperbolic conclusion to Sebastian’s description of Hardman and Felix’s subsequent question.

203–17 Sebastian’s account begins with a passage that has no equivalent in *TS*: Hardman’s roughness with the priest (203–10), who is forced to perform the ceremony with a calendar. The second half of the speech, by contrast, closely follows Gremio’s (*TS*, 3.2.157–63).

208–9 **not . . . fuss** Sebastian literally says Hardman ordered the priest not ‘to make too much equipment’ (‘viel Geschirr zu machen’); see Grimm, ‘Geschirr’, 20 g β.
make so much fuss. In sheer terror, the priest performed his office as swiftly as possible. When he came to ask the bride whether she wished to be Hardman’s wife, Hardman shouted a loud yes, and swore so abominably that the good father dropped his fine book of ceremonies for fear, and, as he stooped to pick it up again, a cold sweat broke from the fat man who was so amazed that the raging bridegroom gave him a blow that knocked the book to the ground again.

FELIX What did she say to this? Did she take no part in all this raging?

SEBASTIAN She trembled and shook like a leaf. When Hardman saw that, he growled and thundered with a violence that made all his previous oaths seem tame, and he behaved without sense as if we wished to take away his bride. When all was done, he seized his bride by the neck and pressed her so hard against him that she almost shit herself and turned blue in the face. Then he kissed her loudly, which sent an echo through the hall, and I ran out –

FABIAN [aside] – as fast as I could.

SEBASTIAN – because I could no longer stay or watch for laughing. Nothing like this has ever happened before or will ever happen again. But here comes the madcap.

215 the fat man the priest.
218–32 KK places Felix’s question at the same moment as Tranio’s in TS (3.2.165) and preserves some specific features of Gremio’s speech (TS, 3.2.166–82) in Sebastian’s, notably Katherina’s reaction (‘Trembled and shook’, 3.2.166) and Petruccio’s ‘clamorous smack’ (3.2.177). The rest of the speech is more loosely adapted, and KK adds Fabian’s aside at 229.
226 shit herself Sebastian literally says Hardman pressed Catharina so hard she had almost ‘let marrow’ (‘Marck lassen’), a euphemism for defecating (see Wander, ‘Mark’, 13).
232 SD In TS, unlike in KK, ‘Music plays’ (3.2.181 SD) as the newly-weds and the wedding guests enter. Alfons is not among the characters who enter, whereas Hortensio (as Licio) is (TS, 3.2.182 SD), although he remains silent for the rest of the scene.
Enter HARDMAN, CATHARINA, THEOBALD, SABINA, WORMFIRE and VEIT.

HARDMAN  It’s no use pleading with me. I have no choice but to go away even if the table were more richly set or there were even greater friends present. I am not a man who acts against his nature on account of entertainment and company. My affairs are absolutely essential. Thus, be it sour or sweet, the moment of parting has come.

THEOBALD  Do you really want to leave tonight?

HARDMAN  Tonight? Today, this hour and moment! If you knew my business, father, you would hurry me on my way. So, gentlemen, may God be with you. Be merry, feast and drink as if you were mad. Drink to both our healths, drink whole cups and half ones!

WORMFIRE  Master, shall I stay and see that they drink everything up?

HARDMAN  A rope round your neck!

WORMFIRE  That would hardly suit me. A cup of Bacherach wine would be better.

FELIX [to Hardman]  Brother, relent and stay here.

WORMFIRE  Yes, my lord, I would dearly like to stay here.

HARDMAN  It cannot be.

SEBASTIAN  Sir, shall I beg you?

WORMFIRE  O, yes please, beg for me too.

HARDMAN [to Sebastian]  You are the right person to move me.

233–45  KK paraphrases TS, but omits Petruccio’s assertion that he gave himself away to Katherina (TS, 3.2.193–4), which alludes to his usurpation of the priest’s authority during the ceremony.

246–331  As in the scenic movement before the wedding (see note at 86–147), Wormfire’s comical presence is much greater than in TS (3.2.183–240), where Grumio has only one short speech (3.2.206–7).

250  Bacherach wine  Wormfire literally says a cup of ‘Bacheracher’, a wine from the famous wine-growing region of Bacherach in the Rhine-Palatinate (see Köhler, 246).

251–69  KK follows TS speech by speech except for Wormfire’s added interjections.

256–7  Compare Hardman’s scoffing rejection of Sebastian with Petruccio’s simple dismissal of Gremio (‘It cannot be’, TS, 3.2.200).
CATHARINA   And if I asked, my darling?
HARDMAN   With that I would be content.
CATHARINA   I love to hear that you are content to stay. 260
WORMFIRE   And I even more so.
HARDMAN   I am content that you ask me, but not that you
ask me to stay.
WORMFIRE  [aside]   Alas, that sounds bad.
CATHARINA   Well, if you love me, stay. This is my first 265
request to you.
HARDMAN   Wormfire, are my horses ready?
WORMFIRE   Yes, my lord. The horses have eaten the oats
by now, but I still haven’t said goodbye to my lady.
HARDMAN   I’ll write such shit on your back with my club 270
that it will make you break into a cold sweat! Away, away!
CATHARINA   Well then, do what you have to do.
HARDMAN   You do well to bend to my will, my dearest
darling. I love you all the more for it. 275
CATHARINA   Go then, I shan’t go away today, nor
tomorrow either.
WORMFIRE  [aside]   That’s music to my ears. I shan’t go
at all.
CATHARINA   I’ll go when it pleases me. 280
WORMFIRE  [aside]   I wish I could say the same.
HARDMAN   That’s right, Catharina, you will leave when
it pleases me. That is how it must be.

260   KK replaces Katherina’s careful question
(‘Are you content to stay?’, TS, 3.2.202)  
with an affirmation.
265–6   KK translates Katherina’s ‘if you love
me, stay’ (TS, 3.2.205), but adds the
remark that this is her ‘first request’ to
her new husband.
268–9   KK translates Grumio’s nonsense
about the oats eating the horses (TS, 
3.2.206–7) and adds the phrase about
taking leave of his lady, i.e. Sybilla, who
has no equivalent in TS.
270–2   has no equivalent in TS. For the fact
that Hardman’s violence and abuse
exceed Petruccio’s, see 3.3.104 SD and
note.
273–89   KK closely adapts Katherina’s
speech (TS, 3.2.208–15), but splits it into
several parts by having it interrupted by
Hardman and Wormfire.
CATHARINA  The door is open to you, and you know the way. Dance while your feet are itching. As for me, I won’t.

HARDMAN  What’s this tune now? I do not like it.

CATHARINA  Nor I yours. You’ll be an evil cock if you crow so strangely so early.

HARDMAN  Sweetest Catharina, I crow and scratch the ground for your own good, so be a good and patient hen, not an ill-tempered and angry one.

CATHARINA  I will be angry. – Gentlemen, pay no attention to his behaviour.

SEBASTIAN  Now the dragon starts to stir.

HARDMAN  Gentlemen, mind your own business, and don’t mind my darling.

CATHARINA  A pretty darling you are.

HARDMAN  And your favourite darling, I know that for sure.

CATHARINA  This would make a fool out of a woman if she didn’t have the spirit to resist. – Gentlemen, let’s go in to the bridal feast.

HARDMAN  That’s right, fairest, they ought to go as you command. – Away, gentlemen, obey the bride, feast and lord it like God’s children. Be merry and mad, or go and hang yourselves from despair. But my dearest

285 Dance . . . itching. KK translates TS’s proverb (‘be jogging whiles your boots are green’, 3.2.212) with an equivalent, proverbial-sounding sentence. 288–92 KK transforms Katherina’s expression of discontent towards her ‘surly groom’ (TS, 3.2.214) into a conceit that makes Hardman ‘an evil cock’, which he develops by asking her to be ‘a good and patient hen’, whereas Petruccio simply asks, ‘O Kate, content thee; prithee be not angry’ (TS, 3.2.216).

293–303 KK adapts Katherina’s two speeches and Gremio’s glee at witnessing the impending power struggle between her and Petruccio (TS, 3.2.217–22), but adds Hardman’s intervention and his ‘darling’ exchange with Catharina. 304–28 The passage corresponds to a single speech by Petruccio at the end of which he, Katherina and Grumio exit (TS, 3.2.223–40). KK interrupts the speech with Catharina’s and Theobald’s petitions to leave her there, and two comic interjections by Wormfire. 304–8 That’s . . . me. A close adaptation of the first part of Petruccio’s equivalent speech (TS, 3.2.223–8).
Catharina shall come with me. I cannot leave my dearest earthly possession behind.

*He takes her by the hand.*

**CATHARINA** Leave me, and go away if you wish.

**HARDMAN** Don’t be angry, my heart’s child, nobody will do you any harm when you’re with me.

**THEOBALD** Then leave her here, sir.

**HARDMAN** Why do you seek to steal away my heart? – You, pretty soul. (*He kisses her.*) You are my all, my nothing, my life and death depend on you. – Here my treasure stands. Woe to him who is bold enough to touch her. I will protect her against you all, and all the world, yes, the devil himself will not take her from me.

What, you rogues! Wormfire, out with your pistol!

**WORMFIRE** My lord, my warm beer has frozen in this heat.

**HARDMAN** I see, we are beset by rogues and thieves who want to block our way. Help, save your lady, my faithful servant, if you have a heart in your stomach!

309 SD There is no SD at the equivalent moment in *TS* (3.2.228).

310–13 Theobald’s petition echoes Catharina’s and shows him taking her part. Baptista, in contrast, remains silent, and the next that is heard from him, after his daughter and son-in-law have left, is ‘Nay, let them go – a couple of quiet ones’ (*TS*, 3.2.241).

315–16 **You . . . you.** *KK* adds Hardman’s address to Catharina and his kiss. The equivalent passage in Petruccio’s speech is addressed not to Katharina but to the wedding guests he is about to leave (*TS*, 3.2.231–3). Whereas Petruccio reduces Katharina to one of his possessions amongst other ‘goods’ (*TS*, 3.2.231), Hardman calls Catharina his ‘all’ and ‘nothing’ on whom his ‘life and death depend’.

317–19 **Woe . . . me.** *KK* has no equivalent for Petruccio’s mention of ‘Padua’ in the equivalent passage (*TS*, 3.2.236), in keeping with the play’s omission of place names elsewhere (see 1.3.106–7, 2.1.104–5, 634–9 and notes).

320 **you rogues** Hardman literally says ‘you mice heads’ (‘ihr Mausköpfe’), referring to thievish dishonourable people (see Grimm, ‘Mäusekopf’, 2).

320–8 **Wormfire . . . protection.** *KK* closely adapts the equivalent portion of Petruccio’s speech in *TS* (3.2.236–40) and adds Wormfire’s interjections.

321 **warm beer** (‘Warmbier’) Wormfire plays on the word ‘warm beer’, referring to both a firearm and a rich drink with beer, eggs and spices (see Grimm).
WORMFIRE That’s not much.

HARDMAN Have no fear, my dearest child. Not a soul shall harm you, you are under my protection.

He carries her out in his arms.

WORMFIRE May the devil thank my lord that he is holding such a drunken wedding. Let the gallows host him, as long as he leaves me behind. Exit.

SABINA What a merry company! But it is wrong not to keep the bride at least until the wedding feast. It would be good to keep her here awhile.

FELIX I don’t think it’s good that his stubborn head could not be tamed to stay.

THEOBALD We must let them leave together. God grant that they tame each other.

HILARIUS What does my most beautiful lady think of her sister?

SABINA I think she is mad herself, and now has a mad husband who suits her perfectly.

THEOBALD Gentlemen, please step inside. Sir Hilarius of Liebenthal will replace the groom, and my daughter will keep him company.

FELIX Thus the groom’s place is filled. A good prelude.
HILARIUS    I wish she would do this with her dearest love.
SABINA     I hope both our wishes will be granted.

_Hilarius_    I wish she would do this with her dearest love.
_Sabina_     I hope both our wishes will be granted.

_Exeunt Theobald, Sabina and Felix._

SEBASTIAN   I will follow the gentlemen soon. Sir
            Johannes, stay awhile.
HILARIUS    I am bound and desirous to obey my lord.
SEBASTIAN   I must tell you about my sorrows for a little
            while. This Liebenthal has received her father’s
            consent under certain circumstances. I am out of the
            race, unless you have something to comfort me with.
HILARIUS    I am sorry to hear this, since I already have
            the maid quite on my side.
SEBASTIAN   That fills me with joy. But is there hope?
HILARIUS    Yes, if I still have time, for as you can imagine,
            my lord, I cannot bring her to requite my love fully in
            such a short time.
SEBASTIAN   I will be ready _communicato consilio_ to help
            in every way with what is to be done next. Let us go
            in now. In there, I shall easily get to her myself and
            continue what you have begun.  
            _Exit._
HILARIUS    [aside] Just go inside, your continuation will
            be of no avail.  
            _Exit._
FABIAN      Who’s this black-coat? He’s all too friendly
            with your lady.

Whereas _TS_ has Baptista conclude the
scene (‘Come gentlemen, let’s go’,
3.2.253), _KK_ ends the scenic movement
with a brief exchange between Sabina
and Hilarius; here she reciprocates his
love.

_KK_ adds two dialogues after the end
of the equivalent scene in _TS_, one
between Sebastian and Hilarius on the
success of the latter’s love suit, suppos-
edly in the name of the former (349–67),
and one between the two servants Fabian
and Veit, who forthrightly comment on
the sexual mores of their social superiors
(368–98).

_Communicato consilio_ Latin, when the
plan has been imparted.

_Black-coat_ (‘Schwartzmantel’) a cloak
worn by students, particularly those
studying theology (see Grimm).
VEIT He is her praeceptor, though I think he teaches her too much. I bet if your master knew it, he’d give him bad wages for that information.

FABIAN It is the fashion now, noblemen make children for the peasants, and the peasants are thankful for it. One honour for another.

VEIT That’s a fine thing. But I wonder how the blood will be changed, though it is none of our concern. If we’re needed, we’ll offer help without thinking twice about it. I wonder why our lady is so friendly with this rogue; she cared little for men before. She has surely seen something good in him.

FABIAN Don’t you know what rascals these students are?

VEIT I once waited on one, and he was bad enough.

FABIAN Those who desire grafting, let them go to the students, I say. I know many noble maids who desire to be near a university. Our master’s wife has often mentioned how full of pleasure those academies are. You may guess why. But do you think this student cloak covers a bad core?

VEIT I don’t know.

FABIAN If you can keep your mouth shut, I might tell you something in confidence.

370 praeceptor Latin, teacher.

373–5 For the same idea, see Alfons at 3.1.236–8.

376–7 how ... changed Veit refers to the idea of the pure blood of the nobility which the non-noble mistress threatens to dilute (see Kautsky, 205–10).

378–9 without ... it Veit literally says ‘without worrying a hair about it’ (‘bekümmern uns nicht ein Haar darum’), referring to the insignificance of a hair (see Grimm, ‘Haar’, 17).

380 rogue The German is ‘Mauser’, describing someone who stealthily preys on others, like a cat hunting mice (see Grimm).

384 grafting (‘propfreiser’) The German word designates grafts or scions and, as in English, was also used figuratively.

387 academies Academies along the classical models of intellectual societies concerned with language or science flourished in Renaissance Europe (see Moran).

388–9 this ... cloak (‘dieses Penal Mäntelchen’) ‘Penal’ refers to a box with writing feathers and was used as a condescending designation for students (see Grimm, Pennal, m.); also, a penis (see Grimm, Pennal, n. 2).
VEIT   You know well that what is unknown to me is safe with me.
FABIAN   I’ll tell you in your ear.

[3.3] Enter WORMFIRE.

WORMFIRE Ugh, disgusting! The devil take all tired horses, all mad masters and all shitty paths! I’m so knackered! Cold, rain and mud have thoroughly drenched and covered me inside and out, and yet I must act the quartermaster and am sent to order a fire, so that those behind me may shake off the cold. If I were not a small fast-boiling pot, my lips would have frozen to my teeth, my tongue to the roof of my mouth and my heart to my breast before I came by a fire. I marvel how our women have fared, since they are open and cannot easily defend themselves against the cold. In short, the weather is cold, and a man as big as

---

395 SD Fabian presumably tells Veit about the disguise of Hilarius and Felix.
398 *i prae sequar* Latin, go before, I follow.
3.3 The scene is set in Hardman’s house. It falls into two parts: the dialogue between Matz and Wormfire (1–95), and Hardman’s anger towards his servants (96–186). The first part showing Wormfire’s arrival and his exchange with Matz stays close to TS (4.1.1–105), but has an additional short passage about Sybilla (27–32) and omits a hearty welcome of Grumio by the household (4.1.95–101). The second part includes Hardman’s irate refusal to wash or eat. *KK* loosely follows TS (4.1.106–67) but rearranges and transforms the source passage, in particular adding short passages that demonstrate Hardman’s roughness and Catharina’s attempts at peacemaking. 1–14 *KK* follows TS (4.1.1–10).
1 *Ugh, disgusting!* The German literally says ‘Fie, illness’ (‘Pfuy kränkheit’). For the word as expletive, see Grimm, *‘krankt’,* 2b.
5 *quartermaster* (‘Fourier’) a military officer responsible for food provision and other supplies.
9–12 *I... cold.* There is no direct equivalent in TS for this reference to the female genitals.
I am easily robbed of warmth by the violence of the frost. Holla holla, Matz Trumper!

*Enter Matz.*

**Matz**  Who calls with such a cold voice?

**Wormfire**  A mere block of ice. If you doubt it, run a sleigh down my shoulders to the heels, you’ll find ice all the way. O, Matz, a good fire now.

**Matz**  Does my master come with his wife?

**Wormfire**  Yes, yes, he comes, and so throw wood on the fire, and cast no water, Matz. Fire and wood!

**Matz**  Is she as angry and shrewish as she is said to be?

**Wormfire**  She was half-half, good Matz, before this frost. But your reason well knows that winter tames men and women, yes, all evil animals, and it has done so with my old evil master, my angry mistress and my new fellow servant and faithful owner of my enamoured heart.

**Matz**  Are you in love?

**Wormfire**  What’s that to you in any case? Yes, she has tamed me, my honest Matz, so that everything about us is limp except for what’s stiff from the cold. Just kindle the fire, Matz, or shall I hand my mad master a libel to complain of your disobedience? I know you shall feel his hands soon enough, and rightly so for your cold comfort, since you are slow in your warm office.

---

15–28 Almost a verbatim translation of *TS* (4.1.11–28), except that *KK* replaces a short passage about Grumio and his size (‘myself . . . least’; *TS*, 4.1.21–5) with a passage about Sybilla and Wormfire’s love for her (‘my new . . . cold’, 27–32).

23 *half-half* Whereas Grumio merely confirms that Katherina was as bad as her reputation (‘She was’, *TS*, 4.1.19), Wormfire’s answer is more nuanced.

31–2 *everything . . . cold* with a salacious joke on the state of his penis.

33–4 *shall . . . disobedience* Whereas Grumio’s threat is to tell ‘our mistress’ (*TS*, 4.1.26), Wormfire’s is to complain to Hardman, perhaps in keeping with *KK*’s increasing of the male protagonist’s roughness.
MATZ  Tell me, my honest man –
WORMFIRE  – ho, careful, that’s yet to be proved.
MATZ  – how does the world go?
WORMFIRE  O, the world is very cold, Matz, in all offices except yours. So, kindle the fire, do your Vulcanic office and feed your warm element. My master and mistress will soon be frozen to dirt.
MATZ  The fire is ready, so tell me something new from the old world, Wormfire.
WORMFIRE  That term suits you well. But where’s the cook? Is supper ready? The house swept and polished? Are the servants dressed in their best robes? Are the maids wearing their feast-day ornaments? Is everything in order?
MATZ  It is all ready. So, say, my good man, what news?
WORMFIRE  Pro primus, an old woman laid a new egg.
MATZ  That’s old news.
WORMFIRE  Indeed, then take it to you while it is still warm. Moreover, my horse is very tired, I am

39 that’s . . . proved Wormfire jokingly calls into doubt his own honesty.
40–6 KK closely follows TS (4.1.29–35), but adds Wormfire’s evocative command to Matz to do his ‘Vulcanic office’ (42–3), from Vulcan, the Roman god of fire.
43 feed . . . element presumably by adding wood to the fire.
44 dirt KK replaces Grumio’s ‘frozen to death’ (TS, 4.1.33) with ‘frozen to dirt’, which becomes understandable a little later when Wormfire mentions Hardman and Catharina’s fall ‘into the mud’ (57–8).
45–7 tell . . . well In asking Wormfire to tell him some news, Matz uses the Latinate word ‘naarrire’, which here alludes to the German for ‘fool’ (‘Narr’), an insult that Wormfire returns to Matz himself.
47–51 Before adapting Grumio’s series of inquiries about the household preparations (TS, 4.1.40–5), KK omits a brief exchange between the two servants on the news (TS, 4.1.36–40), possibly owing to its intricate puns and allusions.
53 Pro primus Latin, first of all.
53–6 Pro . . . warm, KK inserts a joke on fanciful fake news before returning to TS.
55–6 while . . . warm presumably referring to the newly laid egg.
56–8 Moreover, . . it. Wormfire’s speech is close to Grumio’s (TS, 4.1.47–8) but adds the description of his exhaustion as ‘checkmated’, in German ‘schachmatt’ (D1), the word ‘matt’ referring to feeling weak. D2 drives home the point by reading ‘schwach mat’, literally ‘weak weary’, punning on the phonic similarity to ‘schachmatt’.
checkmated, and my mistress and master fell into the mud. There you have it.

MATZ You speak too briefly, tell me more.

WORMFIRE Now I’ll start. First, we slowly rode down a foul mountain, my master behind my mistress.

MATZ Both on one horse?

WORMFIRE What’s it got to do with you?

MATZ I ask whether they both rode on one horse.

WORMFIRE Make a song of your story if you want to become an absolute fool. If you hadn’t interrupted me and disturbed my invention, you would have known how our mistress fell from the jade into the mud, how soiled she was, how her skirt fell over her head, and what I saw there. How my master hit me because she fell and because of what I saw there. How my master hit me because she fell and I looked there. How he cursed, how she prayed who had never prayed before, how the maid scraped the mud off her, and I the shit, how I shouted and my own lady wailed. How my horse ran away, and my lord’s bridle broke, with many other things worth eternal remembrance for posterity’s sake which will now die and rot in oblivion, and you, like all others, shall crawl uninstructed to your grave.

MATZ It appears from what you say that our lord is more evil than she after all.

59–80 KK stays close to TS (4.1.59–75) but inserts the detail of Catharina’s skirt falling over her head and Wormfire looking at what is revealed there (69–72).

61 foul mountain ‘foul hill’ in TS (4.1.59). In the German text, ‘faulen Berg’ (literally ‘lazy mountain’) seems to result from a misunderstanding of the meaning of ‘foul’.

65–6 Make . . . fool. Wormfire literally says ‘tell the news until you become a total fool’ (‘Narrire du die Zeitung, biß du zum gantzen Narren wirst’). He teases Matz through the same pun on fool (‘Narr’) as at 45–7 (see note).
Kunst über alle Künste

83–91 KK stays close to TS (4.1.77–84), but reduces the number of named servants from six to three and omits Grumio’s insistence on their tidy appearance (4.1.80–2). It also replaces his suggestion that they ‘curtsy with their left legs’ (4.1.82) with a polite greeting expressed in French.

84–5 But . . . here Wormfire literally says ‘but I uselessly blow the wind into the world here’ (‘Aber blase ich hier vergebens den Wind in die Welt’), suggesting a vain effort. For the proverb, see Wander, ‘Wind’, 413.

85 Lazypaunch . . . Noosehalter See the List of Roles.

87 révérence . . . mains French, curtsy with a kiss of the hands.

88 compliment a tribute of courtesy.

89 meo nomine Latin, on my behalf.

92–3 KK translates Curtis’ call to the servants (TS, 4.1.87–8), but omits the subsequent joke (4.1.89–102) prompted by his use of the word ‘to countenance’ for ‘to greet’, perhaps owing to the lack of German equivalent.

95 SD In TS, Petruccio and Katherina appear onstage (TS, 4.1.105 SD) after the entrance of ‘four or five Servants’ (TS, 4.1.93 SD). KK delays their entrance and omits their welcome to Grumio (4.1.94–103). Sybilla has no equivalent in TS (see pp. 107–9). She remains silent until her exit with Wormfire (113 SD).

96–113 a fairly close adaptation of TS, 4.1.106–24, that occasionally condenses passages.

96–100 Hardman’s speech corresponds to Petruccio’s (TS, 4.1.106–8), but Hardman replaces the servants’ names with a generic insult (‘these lazy rogues’).

98 fellows Hardman describes the servants as, literally, ‘birds’ (‘Vögel’), an image of carelessness also used as an insult (Grimm, Vogel, 14).

WORMFIRE Indeed, and experience will perhaps teach you that when he comes home. But why do I linger here, where are Lazypaunch, Alwayswet, Noosehalter and the others? Did they prepare themselves to make a good révérence avec baise les mains and a fine compliment to our ruling lady? Order them for the sake of our lord, meo nomine, not to touch my master’s horse’s tail before they have kissed our noble lady’s hand. Are they ready?

MATZ They are. Out, boys! You must greet your master and mistress. Are they far off?

WORMFIRE They are nearby. Peace now! He’s coming with a great hubbub. I can hear him.

Enter HARDMAN, CATHARINA and SYBILLA.

HARDMAN Where are these lazy rogues? May a hundred thousand pounds of lead strike them dead! What? Why do I keep these fellows? Nobody by the door to

85...
hold my stirrup, or to take my lady’s horse and mine? Where are you, you gallows-birds?

Enter three servents.

[servents]  Here!

Hardman  Here, here, here. You block-headed slaves and lazy dogs! May your legs become lame! Is there no respect and dutiful attendance anymore?

He strikes them.

Where is the foolish thief I sent ahead? May lice choke him!

Wormfire  Here, my lord. As foolish as I was before.

Hardman  You galley-slave! You beast, didn’t I order you to come and meet me for the honour of my love and to bring these cursed thieves with you?

Wormfire  My lord, Alwayswet’s frock was not ready, and Noosehalter lost his thievish hat, and Lazypauch couldn’t find his rapier.

Exit with Sybilla [and Matz].

100  SD In TS, the servants enter before the couple’s arrival and heartily greet Grumio (4.1.95–100).

101  In D1 and D2, the servants’ call is implied in the preceding SD which reads, ‘Drey Diener gehen ein, ruffen alle hier’ (‘Three servants enter, all call here’).

104  SD The first of several SDs indicating Hardman’s physical violence towards his servants (see also 127 SD and 133 SD); there is no unambiguous equivalent in TS (see Ard³, 248). For Hardman’s extra violence when compared to Petruccio, see also 1.3.233–48, 3.2.270–2, 3.5.15–25 and notes.

108–13  KK remains close to TS (4.1.115–24); but condenses Grumio’s speech about the servants’ failure to arrive.

108  galley-slave (‘Galeyw ü rdiger esclave’) a strong term of abuse (see Grimm, ‘galeyw ü rdig’, i.e. deserving the galley). From the late Middle Ages, slaves were increasingly employed as rowers.

110  cursed thieves Hardman literally calls the servants ‘cursed halters’ (‘verfluchte Galgenschwengel’), metonymically referring to the criminals hanging from them. ‘Galgenschwengel’ evokes the gallows (‘Galgen’) and swinging (‘schwengen’) (see Grimm, ‘Galgenschwengel’).

112  thievish hat KK literally says ‘thief’s lid’ (‘Diebs-Deckel’), in reference to the clothes thieves need in order to hide (see Grimm, ‘Diebsdeckel’).

113  SD The German text provides no exit SD for Matz in this scene. He may well leave at this point with Wormfire and Sybilla, although he could also do so with an unnamed servant at 113 SD or with the servants and Wormfire at 164 SD. Most modern editors leave it unclear when Grumio exits in the equivalent scene; in Ard³, he does so considerably later (4.1.156 SD).
HARDMAN  You are useless cowards and lazy dogs. I have been away from home for a short while, and what has happened to my authority? Where is the life that I led before? Is there no awe anymore? I will put some order into you birds. Is there no slave ready to bring my love a chair? – Be welcome, dearest darling.

He kisses her, while she stands still.

Don’t be upset by this disorder, I will put everything in order for you.

CATHARINA  O, the order is good.

HARDMAN  You do well, my love, to praise what I have done. [to the Servants] Why are you standing around, you gallows-birds? Bring in the food.

[Exit First Servant.]

Sit down, my heart’s love. – You, rogue, take off my boots.

He strikes the [Second] Servant.

114–21 Following the servants’ exit, Petruccio immediately shouts for supper, asks Katherina to sit down, demands his boots be removed and sings snatches of ballads (TS, 4.1.125–32); Hardman instead complains about his loss of authority, requests a chair for Catharina, kisses her and comments on the disorder, all actions with no immediate equivalent in TS.

116–17 Where ... before? KK preserves Petruccio’s quotation of the first line of a popular ballad (‘Where is the life that late I led,’ TS, 4.1.126), but there is no indication that the translator or adaptor was aware that this was a musical reference.

118 birds (Vögel) See note at 98.

119 SD Another kiss by Hardman with no equivalent in TS (see above, 3.2.315–16 and note).

122 Catharina objects to the mistreatment of the household earlier than Katherina does (TS, 4.1.142).

123–41 Like Petruccio (TS, 4.1.125–40), Hardman alternates between making irascible commands to his servants and seemingly supplying good-natured invitations to his wife. While some elements are the same or similar in the two versions (‘supper ... be merry ... boots ... water’, TS, 4.1.125–40), others are specific to TS (the domestic ‘Where’s my spaniel Troilus? ... Where are my slippers?’, 4.1.136–9) or to KK (e.g., Hardman’s request for a ‘towel’ and ‘clean water’, 135–7).

125 gallows-birds (‘Galgenschwengel’) literally ‘halter’; see note at 110.

126 rogue (‘Schinder’) literally ‘hangman’ (see Grimm).

127 SD Most modern editors since Rowe have understood Petruccio’s ‘Take that’ (TS, 4.1.134) to be an implied SD and assumed that he strikes the servant. In KK, the stage action is spelled out. See note at 104 SD.
You slave, do you want to tear off my foot? – How are you, my lady? You look sad. – Will you dull dogs not bring water for us to wash our hands? – Be merry, my child, it will soon be better.

[The Second and Third Servants] bring water.

You, stupid brute, did someone shit on your fists? Are you spilling the water?

He strikes [a servant].

Dearest Catharina, wash yourself and be glad. – Rotten wretch, can’t you bring a towel? What kind of water is this? Dish-water?

He strikes [a servant] down with the bowl.

I’ll show you clean water, may the devil take you. – Come to the table, dearest heart.

Enter Wormfire.

Where did the hangman hide you? You’re always warming your whore’s nest. Get out, and fetch Master Rich-With-Joy to keep my love company.

Wormfire That’s the company she needs.

Enter [First] Servant with food.

Hardenman What do you say, whoreson villain?

133 SD Modern editors of TS often insert a SD at the equivalent point (4.1.141) – e.g. Thompson: ‘He strikes the Servant.’ – though Ard does not. See note at 104 SD.

138 SD–44 Unlike Grumio (who may have exited or remains onstage silently; see note at 113 SD), Wormfire re-enters, makes a (probably sarcastic) comment on the character of Master Freudenreich and receives Hardman’s insult.

139–40 You’re . . . nest. Hardman suggests Wormfire is not on duty because he is in Sybilla’s bed.

140–1 Master Rich-With-Joy (‘Herr Freudenreich’); the only mention of this shadowy figure who never appears, like the equivalent ‘cousin Ferdinand’ in TS (4.1.137).
What . . . animal. KK closely adapts Petruccio’s anger and Katherina’s plea for indulgence (TS, 4.1.141–3).

SD literally, ‘It rains cuffs’ (‘Es regnet stosse’).

What . . . willing. KK retains Petruccio’s question (‘What’s this’, TS, 4.1.146), but has Hardman stress his domestic authority, and replaces the unnamed servant in TS by Wormfire. In terms of staging, it is not clear whether Hardman addresses the first servant or Wormfire, who replies perhaps for himself, perhaps for the servant (152).

Where . . . house. KK corresponds to TS (4.1.150–6), but Hardman’s anger focuses on the cook, not the servants.

Where . . . cook? (‘wo ist der Saumage der Koch’) literally, ‘where is the sow’s stomach of a cook’. As a pig’s stomach takes a lot of filling, the term came to be used as an insult to a gluttonous, unclean person (Grimm, ‘Saumagen’, 3).

Have . . . victim. KK closely adapts the equivalent passage in TS (4.1.157–64), but adds Hardman’s observation about Catharina’s ‘politic’ navigation (164) of the power dynamics in her new home.
dried up. The juice and power are gone. Only the burnt bones are left, and these my doctor expressly forbids me to eat, because it increases gall and choler to which we are both victim. – There, you dogs, feed and may it choke you. (He throws it to them.) With what shall I treat my love?

CATHARINA I would be well-contented with these foods.
HARDMAN I praise your good cheer, my darling, but you must be treated to better food, or nothing at all. [to Wormfire] Villain, serve us better tomorrow, and take that to the cook. (He strikes him.)

WORMFIRE Lord, you may save your labour. I have a good memory.
HARDMAN Away, you beasts.

Exeunt [Servants and Wormfire].

Dearest darling, it’s not my fault, and it pains my soul that you have been so poorly welcomed and served. I would offer my blood for your sake. But comfort yourself that the fault was not mine because I was absent. I will make up for everything. Today’s fasting will be broken tomorrow. Come, my darling, I will lead you to bed, you shall be served better there.

Exeunt.

167 bones (‘Schindknochen’) literally, ‘hangman’s bones’.
169–79 There . . . beasts. Between a rendition of Petruccio’s speech on his choleric humour (164–9; TS, 4.1.159–64) and his promise to Katherina to mend her welcome the next day (180–6; TS, 4.1.165–7), KK inserts another version of the scene’s theme, that is, Hardman’s studied anger and Catharina’s attempt to defuse it.
170 SD KK’s SD and the preceding sentence have no equivalent in TS. In A Shrew, a SD reads, ‘Manent servingmen and eat up all the meat’ (Miller, 6.32.2).
176 SD There is no equivalent SD in TS. See note at 104 SD.
180–6 Unlike in TS, Hardman and Catharina are alone onstage for his last speech of this scene, corresponding to TS, 4.1.165–7. Hardman stresses his devotion to his new wife more so than Petruccio, suggestively adding that she will be ‘served better’ in bed (186).
Enter MATZ Trumper and WORMFIRE.

WORMFIRE Monsieur Matz, what do you think of this fine wedding day? Has anything like this ever happened to you? No food and no drink, hey? The devil take such weddings!

MATZ I don’t believe such a wedding has been recorded in the chronicles since the destruction of Troy.

WORMFIRE You talk well given your fire-stoker’s wit.

MATZ I could not have believed that there would ever be such a holiday. It’s as though Poverty were to marry Necessity, and would invite Hunger and Thirst to the wedding. But where is he?

WORMFIRE He is with her in the bridal chamber, and continues making his speech on unhealthy food which he firmly denigrates with curses and complaints in a true litany of sayings.

MATZ But what does she do?

3.4 The scene is set in Hardman’s house and corresponds to a brief passage in TS (4.1.168–76) that consists of a brief exchange between four servants (Nathaniel, Peter, Grumio and Curtis) who comment on Petruchio’s shocking taming techniques. KK substitutes a dialogue between Matz and Wormfire in which they deplore the lack of wedding celebrations and Wormfire reports on the goings-on in the bridal chamber.

2–3 Has . . . drink Wormfire literally says, ‘did the like ever happen to you, that the teeth were saved and the throat had a holiday?’ (‘Ist dir dergleichen wohl fürkomen / daran man die Zähne gesparet / und der Hals einen Feyrtag gehabt’), humorously pointing towards the neglect of providing the customary food and drink at a wedding.

6 destruction . . . Troy by the Greeks in the Trojan war, as recounted in Homer’s Iliad.

7 fire-stoker’s (‘stubenheitzerischen’) Wormfire’s condescending reference to Matz’s occupation. ‘Stubenheizer’ is a term recorded from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century for an indoors fire-keeper (Grimm).


11 where . . . he? In TS, this question is asked by Grumio (4.1.170).

12–24 KK adapts Curtis’ speech (TS, 4.1.171–6) but divides it into three parts, signalled by Matz’s brief interruptions at lines 16 and 20.
WORMFIRE  She sits in her chamber like holy Patience, her face as dark as if she had woken from some sad dream, and did not know where she was.

MATZ  He will kill her with such inhuman treatment.

WORMFIRE  It seems as though she doesn’t know whether she’s standing or walking, or what she ought to do. One devil has met another. I think I hear him. Let’s go, or he’ll dismiss us.

Exeunt.

[3.5]  Enter HARDMAN.

HARDMAN  Thus it must be. I have begun my reign most politically. With my friendliness mingled with angry rage, I have given her such doubts that she cannot altogether trust my professed love, nor complain about my pretended anger, which looks like affection. I am now like the rowers that turn their backs on the way they seek to go. A Scythian shoots while fleeing. I confess I love her dearly. In order to make her all the worthier of my love, I must perform the moral tutor


24  dismiss us  KK adds Wormfire’s suggestion that Hardman may dismiss the men from his service.

3.5  The scene, presumably set in Hardman’s house, corresponds to Petruccio’s soliloquy at TS, 4.1.177–200. It closely adapts the original but inserts a reflection on the paradoxical effect of Hardman’s taming technique (2–7) and the necessity to play-act (8–12). For another version of this speech, see A Shrew (Miller, 6.37–47).

1–2  Thus . . . politically. Petruccio’s soliloquy begins similarly: ‘Thus have I politicly begun my reign’ (TS, 4.1.177).

6–7  rowers . . . go  Hardman means he needs to do the opposite of what might seem necessary in order to succeed. For the proverb, see Wander, ‘Rudersmann’.

7  A . . . fleeing. Reiterating the idea of the previous proverb, Hardman alludes to the classical myth that warriors from Scythia, a people in Central Asia famed for horsemanship, hit their target by riding past it and turning around to shoot their arrows.

9  moral tutor  (Sitten-Lehrer) The same German word is used in Patient Job’s reference to ‘the teacher of morals who will now appear’ (Prologue, 19–20).
under the guise of Jean Potage, and play several persons. Not every fool can do this since it is the office of the master. I have already achieved wonders. My falcon is sharp and hungry now, and will not be fed until it humbles itself. I must therefore adopt the manner in which wild animals are tamed. She hasn’t eaten the whole day, and she had little yesterday, and shall not eat tonight. She had no rest last night, and shall be allowed to rest even less tonight. I will find fault with the bed as I did with the food. The maids’ backs will bear the brunt of my rage. I will throw the pillows around and stamp on the linen and pull up the bed to make the feathers fly. Little of the curtains and bedframe will be kept whole, and the straw shall be made to cover the chamber ground. Additionally I shall curse and rage till the beams tremble. But in the midst of this madness I will cuddle with her and swear it happens out of great affection to her. I will continue this the whole night, turning from one to the other so that she will be unable to close an eye or rest her head. It is the right way: make a bad wife good through friendliness, or kill her. Her heated stubbornness

10 under . . . Potage Hardman literally describes himself as having to ‘act under the hat and coat of Jean Potage’ (‘unter Jean Potage seinem Hut und Mantel agiren’), alluding to the French clown figure (see Asper).

13–15 My . . . tamed. KK continues its close rendition of TS, translating the first four lines of Petruccio’s falconry metaphor (4.1.179–82), but replacing the subsequent more technical elaboration (4.1.183–5) by a generic summary that he must ‘adopt the manner in which wild animals are tamed’.

15–25 She . . . tremble. KK translates the uproar Petruccio creates (TS, 4.1.186–91), but makes Hardman more gratuitously violent by adding that he will beat the maids for the supposed untidiness of the beds. See also 3.3.104 SD and note.

20 bear the brunt Hardman literally says that ‘the maids’ hump backs will have to atone’ (‘der Mägde Buckel werden büßen müssen’).

30–1 It . . . her. In adapting TS’s proverbial ‘[t]his is a way to kill a wife with kindness’ (4.1.197), KK provides the two options of making her ‘good through friendliness’ or killing her in the process. The sentence incorporates part of the play’s title. TS alludes to its title slightly later in the corresponding speech (4.1.199).
will cool when a stronger one overcomes her. If she changes her tune, I will strike a milder chord afterwards. He who knows a better way than mine, let him come forward. We shall see who prevails.  

Exit.

4.[1] Enter FELIX [as Hilarius] and [ALFONS as] Musician.

FELIX I can hardly believe what you tell me, good sir.

ALFONS My lord Hilarius of Liebenthal, rest assured that it is nothing other than the bare truth. Let us hide a little here to discover it better. Her lesson is taking place now. By witnessing the charming instruction she receives, you will see in action what I have disclosed to you in words.

34–5 He . . . prevails. Like Petruccio at the equivalent moment (TS, 4.1.199–200), Hardman addresses the audience.

35 We . . . prevails. Hardman literally says ‘let us pull for being the master’ (‘Wir wollen uns um den Meister ziehen’), proposing a tug of war (see Köhler, 249).

4.1 There is no specification of location, but the scene is presumably set in Sir Theobald’s house and roughly corresponds to TS, 4.2.1–72. It falls into two parts: the first shows Alfons and Felix witnessing the love scene between Sabina and Hilarius (1–85, TS, 4.2.1–59); the second shows the scheme of finding someone to impersonate Hilarius’ father (86–105, TS, 4.2.60–72). KK has an added soliloquy by Sabina, expressing her strong love for Hilarius, and it elaborates upon the subsequent exchange between the lovers (9–40). It omits the entire dialogue between Tranio and the Merchant (TS, 4.2.73–122), compressing the scheme’s description into a brief explanation by Fabian (90–7).

1–7 KK largely follows the original (TS, 4.2.1–5), but while TS reveals Bianca’s and Lucentio’s affair straight away through Tranio’s mock surprise, KK has Alfons merely suggest the dishonour of Sabina’s ‘instruction’ (5), increasing the impact of the subsequent passage which dramatizes the love between the young couple.

4.[1] this edn; Die vierde Handlung, D1, D2, Köhler
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4.[1].22

FELIX  I obey your will.

They go to the side.

Enter SABINA and sits down at a table on the inner stage.

SABINA  Happy hour which will bring my soul to my body. O love, never tried by me before, how great is your sweetness! Everything else in the world is stale and miserable in comparison! True joy and pleasure lie in you alone, pervading all my senses, body and soul. Many things can be found to entertain the body, but the soul cannot find pleasure and contentment except through another soul, united in sweet love. But where is the comfort that I long for so much? Does his mind not feel the same yearning desire as mine?

Enter [HILARIUS as] Johannes.

But why do I complain? The light of my sun rises bright and clear. My dearest, be welcome.

She kisses him.

HILARIUS  My beautiful lady, to receive such lovely words, accompanied by such pretty works, makes me

8  SD1–8 SD2  KK adds careful stage directions, suggestive of the spatial organization of the early modern German stage. An inner stage (‘innere Scene’ as in KK, or ‘innerer Schauplatz’) is mentioned in various other German plays of the mid to late seventeenth century, for instance, Christian Weise’s Baurischer Machiavellus (Dresden, 1679; VD17 23:290747H), sig. A3v; and Johannes Rist, Das Friedewünschende Teutschland (n.p., 1647; VD17 23:249118M), sig. F3r. See also Willi Flemming, Andreas Gryphius und die Bühne (Halle a. S., 1921), 424.

9–20 SD  Before adapting TS’s dialogue between the lovers, KK inserts a soliloquy by Sabina which is notable for its frank expressions of intense love and female desire, in keeping with her initiative in kissing Hilarius later in the scene (20 SD and 84 SD). See Introduction, pp. 106–7.

21–40 SD  In the equivalent passage in TS (4.2.6–10), Lucentio and Bianca flirt by referring to an actual book he claims to be reading, Ovid’s Ars Amatoria (‘The Art to Love’, 4.2.8). KK replaces the learned courting with the explicit affirmations of love by Sabina and Hilarius. It gently mocks the original’s literary games by having the couple describe how they have put away actual books (see 24–6), and adds an elaborate conceit in which ‘book’ stands for each character’s heart.
your happy servant. I hope to find in them the constancy I look for. But, my darling, are you here without any books at all?

SABINA I wish to have no other book than your heart, and in that my name, just as your name is indelibly written in mine; and this I hope is assured through the faith of your mouth and your eyes.

HILARIUS My soul pledges to assure you of this. I am glad to have accomplished my instruction fully by teaching you to feel love for me, my dear heart’s heart. I do not wish to study in any other library but to leaf through your beautiful book for ever. My mind will read in it as long as it has a brain. Are you content with that, my lovely angel?

SABINA I do not know what your quips mean. But my love, you know I am wholly yours.

HILARIUS And I yours, my heart’s child, as long as there is breath in my body.

They embrace and kiss.

ALFONS Are my words now confirmed by the action? Or do they need more proofs?

FELIX I believe this, and much else. But Monsieur lute-player, who would have thought so?

ALFONS I no longer wish to be mocked in this guise. I am not a lute-player, but a nobleman well-known to you: Alfons of Nistlingen. I will no longer be a suitor to this unworthy person, but will give my love where

41–4 KK stays close to TS (4.2.11–15) but, rather than translating Tranio’s pretended railing against ‘unconstant womankind’, it adds Felix’s mocking of Alfons as ‘Monsieur lute-player’. 45–60 KK reconfigures the dialogue between Tranio and Hortensio (TS, 4.2.16–43), omitting Tranio’s indictment of Bianca’s supposed ‘lightness’ (4.2.24) and Hortensio’s promise to abandon the pursuit of ‘beautous looks’ (4.2.41) in women, and adding the two men’s expression of supposed solidarity.

Alfons . . . Nistlingen See the List of Roles.
my offer is returned. I swear never more to honour her in this way. I will reciprocate the friendliness and desire of a young rich widow, and will link my life to hers. You, sir, do as you wish, and suffer what you can.

**FELIX** Alfons, to please you I swear to withdraw my suit to her. May you prosper in all your further endeavours.

**ALFONS** I dutifully thank you, both for your good decision to leave this light lady and for your good wishes which I offer in return. May we be eternally linked in constant friendship.

**FELIX** Rest assured that I will be yours for ever.

*Exit Alfons.*

Felix goes towards Sabina and Hilarius.

Now you may help yourselves to each other. Surely Master Tutor’s lessons are very delightful, as the student proves so good.

**HILARIUS** Such lovely students can give orders to the tutor.

**SABINA** And such worthy tutors have the heart of the student in their hand.

**FELIX** This union is the reason why I and Sir Alfons forswear you. I may not aim so high in any case, nor want to, but he wishes to link himself to a widow, and will take pains to make her tame and pious.

51 *young . . . widow* ‘a wealthy widow’ in *TS* (4.2.37), with no indication of her age. She is called ‘Eulalia’ in *KK* in 5.2, the only scene in which she appears. See also the List of Roles.

60 SD2 *TS* has no equivalent SD.

61–7 *Surely . . . hand.* *TS* has no equivalent to Felix’s tongue-in-cheek comment on the student–tutor fiction of Hilarius and Sabina.

68–70 *This . . . widow* *KK* condenses Tranio’s news of Bianca’s freedom from suitors and Alfons’ intention to marry a widow, and omits the response to it (*TS*, 4.2.46–52), while adding the assurance that he had never had the intention to marry his social superior.

71–9 *take . . . tongue.* follows speech-by-speech Tranio and Bianca’s exchange about ‘the taming school’ to which Hortensio is said to have gone (*TS*, 4.2.53–9, 55).
SABINA   How presumptuously he flatters himself! That’s not how the world runs.
FELIX    He believes he has understood the art of the taming-school.
SABINA   Is there such a place?
FELIX    Yes, and Sir Hardman is its tutor. He teaches how to make eleven and twenty be even: how to tame a bad wife, and heal her shrewish tongue.
SABINA   That’s a hard thing. But my lesson is over. My darling, take care.
HILARIUS A goodbye without a kiss?
SABINA   (laughing) I had almost forgotten the most delightful thing.

She kisses him and exits.

HILARIUS   My heart, farewell.

Enter FABIAN.

But who comes here?

FELIX    Well, Fabian? I hope you have found an honourable father for me. How does our business stand?

77–8 He... even In TS, Petruccio, according to Tranio, ‘teacheth eleven-and-twenty long / To tame a shrew’ (4.2.58–9). The numbers in KK and TS are the same, but Felix’s point differs from Tranio’s: while Felix comments on the impossibility of the taming task, Tranio’s reference to the card game Thirty-one, in which the goal is to get a hand which has thirty-one points, implies that Petruccio’s teaching is just right. The author of KK may well have failed to understand the reference to the card game.
79 heal... tongue Similarly, the effect of Petruccio’s teaching is said to be to ‘charm her chattering tongue’ (TS, 4.2.59).
80–5 The leave-taking between Sabina and Hilarius has no equivalent in TS where Bianca remains onstage and so becomes complicit in the scheme of the fake father.
84 SD She... him See note at 9–20 SD.
FABIAN   Pretty well, thanks to my great effort. I am dog-tired from searching for a grave gentleman. He looks as honourable as Saint Valentine, is filled to the brim with imagined wisdom, and when it comes to natural philosophy, thinks he is the biggest pig in the sty. In sum, he agrees to your business, although he is not the man he thinks he is. That aside, he is willing to do anything for gain.

FELIX   It is good to have him. I will train him to become an apt sub-father.

HILARIUS   It will be good to rely on a trick this time. A little one can do no harm.

FABIAN   My comrade is apt enough for that. But vel quasi, my lord, won’t you come? He waits for you in our lodging.

FELIX   Immediately. Let us neglect nothing.   [Exeunt.]
There is no specified location, but the scene is presumably set in Hardman’s house. It corresponds to Act 4, Scene 3 in TS, and falls into four parts: part one to the arrival of Hardman and Alfons (1–104), part two to the arrival of Fritz the tailor (105–138), part three to Fritz’s dismissal (139–297), and part four, Hardman’s plans to visit his father-in-law (298–326). The first part, in which Wormfire and Sybilla tease the hungry Catharina, stays close to TS (4.3.1–35) but adds two short dialogues between the two servants on their affair (1–25), and between the two women about Hardman’s behaviour (73–104). Part two corresponds to TS 4.3.36–62 in Hardman’s starvation of Catharina, but adds Hardman’s anger with the tailor for coming at meal time (131–8). Part three, the confrontation with the tailor, adapts TS, 4.3.63–167 and comically elaborates the description of the fine clothes (238–68). The sequence of events is slightly changed and there is some addition to the dialogue between Catharina and Hardman (180–205). The last part stays particularly close to TS (4.3.168–95).

1–25 Wormfire and Sybilla’s dialogue, for which there is no equivalent in TS, contributes to a mini-subplot through which the servants’ love throws light on that of their social betters. For KK’s addition of Sybilla, see Introduction pp. 107–9.

1 appendage (‘Anhang’) penis, see note at 3.2.124–5 and note.

2–3 He . . . food (‘wer arbeitet ist der Nahrung wert’) an adaptation of Luke 10.7: ‘the labourer is worthy of his hire’ (‘ein Arbeiter ist seines Lohnes wert’).

3 exemplum gratia Latin, for example; Wormfire’s first of several learned foreign-language terms in this passage (1–72), which contrast with the down-to-earth subject matter.

4 threshing ox The implicit reference is to 1 Corinthians 9.9: ‘For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.’

5 cochleation Latin, from cochlear, spoon. Wormfire may play on the German word the Latin translates, ‘lößeln’, which means both to behave like a fool (Grimm, 1) and to court (Grimm, 2). See Köehler, 250.
WORMFIRE Above or below? Or both? But no, mine counts as well. You think perhaps that man and woman are one body. But it doesn’t work in this case.

SYBILLA A man and his wife? It’s a bit too soon.

WORMFIRE But not too soon for us to crawl into each other.

SYBILLA Yes. In a way that conforms to courtoisie.

WORMFIRE If the thing finds a jolly outbreak before its time, we shall have to make spiritual amends for our courtesy, and sing the poenitere aloud in front of an honourable congregation. Well, the heart has its reasons.

SYBILLA There’s no harm, it’s the fashion. We shall not be the first nor the last. As long as the baptism doesn’t come before the wedding.

WORMFIRE The parson counsels so. But much talk fills few maws. Fill the cup!

SYBILLA May God bless us. What will be, will be.

*They feed eagerly.*

*Enter CATHARINA.*

8–9 **Above . . . well.** Wormfire’s suggestive remarks refer to various bodily orifices.

9–11 **You . . . soon.** Wormfire alludes to the religious teaching that man and woman in marriage become one flesh (see, for example, Mark 10.6–8). The German ‘Mann und Weib’ can be translated as both ‘man and woman’ (9–10) and ‘[a] man and his wife’ (11; i.e. husband and wife). Sybilla reminds Wormfire that man and woman are said to become one flesh (or body) in marriage, and that they are not (yet) married.

12–13 **crawl . . . other** have sex.

14 **conforms . . . courtoisie** Sybilla seems to suggest that by having sex outside marriage, they are conforming to courtly manners.

15–18 **If . . . congregation.** Wormfire suggests that if a pregnancy results from their affair, they will atone by marrying, imagined as singing their repentance (the poenitere). Public penitence for sexual sins was fairly common in Protestant countries.

24 **Fill the cup!** (‘Es gilt / Hänschens im Keller’) Wormfire alludes to a certain kind of cup, literally called ‘little John in the cellar’, that contains a figurine that rises from the base (the ‘cellar’) to the top when it is filled. The process of filling the empty vessel and the resulting emergence of the little man suggest insemination and conception, or birth. Such cups were used for drinking toasts to women who wished to conceive, or were about to give birth (Wander, ‘Hänschen’, 1).
In the equivalent passage in TS, Grumio and Katherina enter the stage in mid-conversation: Katherina has begged Grumio for food in vain and laments Petruchio’s treatment of her (4.3.1–16). KK replaces this passage with a dialogue between the starving Catharina and the two servants finishing their dinner.

The succession of offers and answers roughly corresponds to that in the equivalent dialogue in TS (4.3.17–35). Wormfire’s descriptions of the kind of food he would offer his mistress are more elaborate, however, and add unsavoury culinary details, like capers being ‘farted from a goat’s fundament’ (53–4), a humorous element absent from TS.


SP D1 and D2 assign the speech (and that from line 57) to Sybilla, probably the result of a printer’s error or other textual corruption.

The inventive compound of Greek words is obscure but could pertain to prawns (Cario from ‘karis’) stuffed in wine leaves (phyllikāς from ‘phyllikos’ meaning ‘leaf-like’), and seasoned with lemon (Citro) and cinnamon (cynamo from ‘kinnamonon’). This exotic dish stands in stark contrast to Wormfire’s previous references which are to rustic food. A possible source for this exchange could be Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae, a fictive account of a series of philosophical banquets from the third century AD.
Cariophyllikάς, especially with an arrière-garde that contains a Bacheracher, Hochheymer or Necker nectar?

CATHARINA It would be even better if there were some.

WORMFIRE Sweetness increases choler too much, particularly when mingled with the heat of grape juice. What do you say to a dish of morels prepared with the best wild pears, qualified with an onionish garlic-broth? Or a nice dish of Westphalian field-beans with sour milk and capers farted from a goat’s fundament, excellently spiced, hey! Alongside that a good claret of the kind that the Marburgers name after your own rigour.

[CATHARINA] Keep these dishes for your own hoggish maw, you fool! Go away, or I’ll make you clear off.

WORMFIRE There’s no need for that job, for right now I am busy preparing to make my fine companion another set of feet. But I must go in now. My lord has commanded me to go to the top chef today. Thus, honoured lady, rejoice that you have an appetite. There will be a fine dinner, the whole kitchen is polished, the servants are turning the roast like fools, the cook goes around the kitchen like a madman, the pots, kettles and pans boil, fry and foam on the fire most nonsensically. The cake pans and pastries in the

45 arrière-garde French, rearguard.
46 Baccharacher . . . Necker Wormfire mentions three wine regions in south-west Germany.
52 Westphalian from the region of Westphalia in north-western Germany.
53–4 farted . . . hey! Wormfire puns on ‘farted’ (‘gefūrzet’) and ‘spiced’ (‘gewūrtzet’).
56 your . . . rigour. Wormfire addresses Catharina as ‘Ihr Strengheit’ (‘your rigour’), a title for nobility (see Grimm, ‘Gestrenge’). Köhler (251) suggests that the wine may have been called Catharinenclaret, prompting Wormfire’s allusion.
57 SP See note at 40.
59–72 KK adds Wormfire’s vivid description of the busy kitchen in order to tease the hungry Catharina.
60–1 preparing . . . feet i.e. getting Sybilla pregnant.
oven are about to give birth and all the fine baking stuff looks delicious. In sum, Bacchus will honour Ceres, and she will refresh him with many delicacies. Today shall be better than yesterday. *Exit.*

CATHARINA If it were otherwise, to the devil with today! It is as though he wanted to kill me with hunger out of love: the beggars that came to my father’s house did better.

SYBILLA Madam, perhaps your night was better than your day?

CATHARINA May God have pity on me, so that I don’t experience such another. I did not close an eye. More such nights would soon kill me.

SYBILLA But surely he did not handle you roughly, madam. Sensible grooms do not show too much to their brides on the first night.

CATHARINA You need not address me as a married woman. He has left me all too pure so far. He did not once seem to think there was something womanly in me.

SYBILLA That’s strange, he otherwise seemed to have good inclinations.

CATHARINA I do not doubt his goodness in this thing at all, I have noticed it enough. I don’t know why he keeps to himself like this.

70—1 *Bacchus . . . Ceres* Bacchus is the Roman god of wine and drinking, Ceres the Roman goddess of wheat and agriculture.

73–6 *KK* transposes three lines from Katherina’s otherwise completely suppressed complaint to Grumio at the beginning of the scene (*TS*, 4.3.2–16, 4–6). See note at 26–37.

77–104 *KK* adds this exchange between Catharina and her maid about the newly-weds’ first night, Catharina’s continuing virginity, and her admission that she has been ‘bewitched’ by Hardman and ‘have to be gentle to him almost against [her] will’ (103–4). See Introduction, pp. 102–3. *goodness . . . thing* interest in, or ability to perform, sex. The German ‘stücke’, like the English ‘thing’ with which we translate it, may contain a phallic pun.
SYBILLA Who knows what his thoughts are in this matter. I hope and wish most heartily that his mad manner would change to a better one, since there is much pretended method in it. I wish to God you could bend your mind to his. He will surely stop his raving soon, and you will have the best of husbands.

CATHARINA I think I am bent already, but only my heart knows just how bitter I am, and those who are acquainted with the mind of women. I believe this man has bewitched me, because I have to be gentle to him almost against my will.

Enter ALFONS and HARDMAN, both bearing food, [and enter a Servant].

HARDMAN Are you here, my heart’s darling? See, how I take pains for your sake? And do you like it? Are you silent? – There, young friend, take the stuff away again. My love does not like it.

CATHARINA Wait, I like it! Leave it!

HARDMAN Even a boy would repay a small service with thanks. Shall my lady spurn mine?

He bears the bowls away.

[Exit.]

Alfons gives his to the Servant.

[Exit Servant.]

104 SD In TS, Petruccio and Hortensio enter ‘with meat’ (4.3.35.1). No servant is onstage in the equivalent passage in TS.

105–11 KK remains relatively close to the equivalent passage in TS (4.3.36–48), but omits Hortensio’s ‘Mistress, what cheer?’ (4.3.37) and Katherina’s remark that she is ‘cold’ (4.3.38).

107 the stuff the food.

111 SD–24 He bears . . . hurry. In TS (4.3.49–54), Petruccio is immediately pacified by Katherina’s thanks, remains onstage and invites her and Hortensio to eat. KK complicates the passage by having Hardman and the servant bear the food away, offering Catharina and Alfons a moment to speak amongst themselves, before Hardman re-enters, pacified, and invites Catharina and Alfons to ‘come in for the meal’ (123–4).
CATHARINA Indeed, I am thankful, my darling. It’s just that you don’t know my way of showing it.

ALFONS My dearest lady, reconcile yourself a little to his stormy manner. I assure you he loves you heartily. If you offer him friendliness, you will be able to live with him very pleasantly.

CATHARINA It’s much too difficult for a stubborn woman to change so swiftly; the transformation would have to be complete.

ALFONS If you are reasonable enough, you will be able to turn this transformation to your advantage.

Enter HARDMAN.

HARDMAN Well, my darling, and brother Alfons, come in for the meal, we have to hurry. I have much to do before our journey to your lord father’s house tomorrow. I must acquire some jewels for you today, and many other costly things for both of us, to enable the people to see that we are not of mean rank. We will walk around in our magnificence, so that they will talk of nobody but us. So, come in. Dinner is getting cold.

Enter WORMFIRE.

WORMFIRE My lord, the tailor is waiting outside, all laden with his stuff.

123–30 In the equivalent speech in TS (4.3.52–62), Petruccio revels in imagining the extravagant clothes the couple will wear upon returning to Katherina’s father, an elaborate rhetorical flight reduced in KK to the plain information that they will have ‘costly things’ (127).

126 tomorrow Hardman’s intention to leave the next day, which has no equivalent in TS, is contradicted by his later wish to ‘be gone today’ (310).

128 we . . . rank KK literally reads ‘that a donkey did not bring us to the market’ (‘daß uns kein Esel auffs Marckt gebracht’). This obscure, perhaps proverbial expression alludes to market days when sellers would show off their wares.

131–8 KK adds this short passage to the equivalent scene in TS, where the tailor simply enters (4.3.62 SD).
Kunst über alle Künste

HARDMAN  Must this fool come at mealtime? Tell the rogue, if he has fed himself, he must grant me and my love time for a meal too.

CATHARINA  He can come after the meal.

HARDMAN  Tell him to go away at once! But, wait, let the fool come in. I can jest with him during the meal.

[Enter FRITZ.]

WORMFIRE  [to FRITZ]  Move your bones inside, my thread-wise and needle-sage lord.

FRITZ  A blessed day to you, gentlemen, health and long prosperity.

HARDMAN  Let’s see what pretty stuff you have made to grace the beautiful form of my lady. What’s this?

FRITZ  Your honour, a shirt made according to the fashion, as your honour ordered.

HARDMAN  A carnival cap, a jester’s blanket around rabbit fur! Will you make fools of us? Will you dress children, and decorate dolls? Away, cover a post with your things and put it up amidst pea stalks. My love must not wear such clothes as are made by fools. Such children’s stuff is not seemly.

CATHARINA  The camisole is good, both the material and the work.

138  SD–42 TS has a haberdasher and a tailor, two unnamed figures, present their wares: the tailor enters first and is greeted by Petruccio (4.3.63), but only speaks after the haberdasher, who has entered immediately after him (4.3.64), has been dismissed (4.3.88 SD). KK simplifies the sequence by conflating the two roles into one, the tailor Fritz Thimble of Scratch-hill (see the List of Roles).

145–52  KK remains close to the equivalent passage in TS (4.3.65–70), but has Fritz offer a shirt rather than the haberdasher’s ‘cap’ (4.3.65).

147  jester’s blanket  (‘Narrendecke’)  This rare word is also used by the same author in Der Pedanthische Irrthum, 133 (see Introduction, p. 144).

150  put . . . stalks  Hardman suggests the shirt be worn by a scarecrow to protect peas from birds.

153–7  KK interpolates Catharina’s defence of the dress and Hardman’s argument against it.
HARDMAN  My heart, the material is good, I have chosen it myself for you, but this sloppy apprentice has utterly spoilt it with his work.

CATHARINA  It is well done, the way gentlefolk wear things nowadays.

HARDMAN  We must not look to become gentlefolk through garments. – What ape’s ware have you there? What can this be?

FRITZ  Your honour can surely see that it is a well-made piece.

HARDMAN  A well-made piece! A piece for a fool! An ass! Is this frippery to be worn in Tom Thumb’s place? What have you done with the sleeves, you witless block?

FRITZ  It is done the way it should be. I would like to see a tailor who can show me better work whether he had been in France or all over Europe. I know my craft as a tailor de façon should do.

CATHARINA  You talk well, Master. It is well made, and I see the dress will fit like a glove.

ALFONS [aside]  She’s getting warm. There’ll be blows soon.

158–61  It . . . garments. KK corresponds to the equivalent passage in TS (4.3.71–7), but has Catharina replace Katherina’s remark on ‘gentlewomen’ (4.3.72) by ‘gentlefolk’ (‘Edelleute’), leading to Hardman’s comment on gentility and clothes. Petruccio picks up on Katherina’s ‘gentlewomen’ by applying the adjective ‘gentle’ to Katherina (‘When you are gentle you shall have one too’ (4.3.73), i.e. a cap), playing on the polysemy of ‘gentle’ as ‘noble’ and ‘mild’. This pun is impossible in German.

161–83 This sequence of Hardman’s humorous debasing of Fritz’s work, and Fritz’s and Catharina’s defence of it has no equivalent in the corresponding passage in TS.

166  frippery  (‘Firlefantz’) The German word’s roots are obscure but originally refer to an outlandishly dressed fool figure performing strange dances (see Grimm, ‘Firlfanz’).

166  Tom . . . place  (‘an statt eines Däumlings’) Tom Thumb (in the German version, ‘ein Däumling’) is a little man the size of a thumb, popular in European folklore.

172  tailor de façon  a proper tailor, from French, de façon, i.e. in the (right) manner.
HARDMAN [to Fritz] You know your craft like a fool de façon, and you would make my love a fool. I’ll crush your brains before that happens.

CATHARINA I see you take me for a stupid child. You intend to cloud my reason with your strange antics. I see you have little respect for me. Your pretended love is a mere semblance.

HARDMAN What are you saying, dearest?

CATHARINA I hope I am not denied words.

HARDMAN My love is free to do as she likes. [to Fritz]

But what else do you have, you cheating rogue? Is this the skirt? Dear me, this beautiful stuff is spoilt by your thievery! You have stolen half of it. I’d rather have paid you double than have a thing spoilt like this.

CATHARINA I do not know what to say. Are you mad, or are we? I say the tailor has made no fault in anything.

FRITZ I confirm this. Sir, you’re mistaken. I have made everything according to your order that was delivered to me by Wormfire.

WORMFIRE The villain wants to make me guilty of the spoilt stuff! He lies if he says I gave him orders rather than material for the garments.

HARDMAN [to Fritz] You old goat, don’t abuse my patience, or I’ll rain blows. You have worked like an apprentice.

185 KK radically reduces Katherina’s outburst against Petruccio’s patronizing (TS, 4.3.75–82), and condenses her eloquent claim to verbal self-expression into a single line. For a similar implosion of Katherina’s eloquence, see KK, 5.2.340–1 and note.

186–90 Hardman’s renewed rejection of the tailor’s work follows Petruccio’s at TS, 4.3.88–94.

188 Dear me The German literally says ‘sorrow and damage’ (‘Jammer und Schad’). For the formulae, see Grimm, ‘Jammer’, 7.

193–201 KK follows the equivalent passage of TS (4.3.96–102) but inserts the tailor’s accusation against Wormfire and Wormfire’s response to it (193–8), transposed from a later point of TS (4.3.117–20).

196–7 guilty . . . stuff! Wormfire literally says that Fritz wants to ‘pour the spoilt stuff into his shoes’ (‘die verdorbene sache in die Schue schüten’), drawing on a proverb about incriminating somebody else for one’s actions (Wander, ‘Schuh’, 185).
CATHARINA I say he has worked well. You want to make a rogue of him, and a fool of me.

HARDMAN You speak right. It’s the rogue who wants to make a fool of you.

FRITZ She says, my lord, it is you who wants to make a fool of her.

HARDMAN O, great presumption by the shadow of a man in my own house! You lie, you lie, you thread, you Tom Thumb, you needle tip, you flaky-headed clod of earth, you! I’ll soon measure your mangy back with your mete-yard and make you remember it all your life. You’ve wasted everything that’s been put into your hands.

FRITZ May I die this very moment if all is not made as your honour ordered it through the man who stands here.

WORMFIRE I told you to make it with thread and needle.

FRITZ But it needs to be cut first.

WORMFIRE A rogue told you to cut it, now stop lying and flattering yourself, or you’ll be sorry for it.

HARDMAN Whichever of you two birds is wrong has to pay the bill.

FRITZ I am right, and the lady is well pleased with my work, let this fool say what he will.

WORMFIRE What, you miserable skeleton of a tired old goat, you quintessence of all that is mangy, you home of lice and fleas, you needle-noble and thread-honour, recorded by Grimm, composed of ‘Grind’ (a term for ‘head’) and ‘Schüppel’ (from ‘Schuppe’, ‘dandruff’).

202–18 KK closely follows the original (TS, 4.3.103–23).

203–7 fool . . . fool The threefold use of the same term corresponds to TS, but TS’s characters say ‘puppet’ (4.3.105–7) instead of ‘fool’ (‘Närrin’).

210 Tom Thumb See 166n.

210–11 flaky-headed . . . earth The German uses ‘Grindschüppel’, an obscure word that we have not found elsewhere. It may derive from (or be a corruption of) ‘Grindschüppel’, a rare term of abuse recorded by Grimm, composed of ‘Grind’ (a term for ‘head’) and ‘Schüppel’ (from ‘Schuppe’, ‘dandruff’).

219–20 KK reduces the increasingly heated exchange between Grumio and the Tailor (TS, 4.3.124–9) to Wormfire’s threat.

221–33 Whichever . . . quarrelling? A passage with no equivalent in TS.

227–8 needle-noble . . . clout-commissary Wormfire insults Fritz by relating terms of social respectability to simple objects from tailoring.
you clippers-commandant and clout-commissary whom I respect as much as a fart, do you address my reason thus? If I didn’t respect my lordship, I’d chase you out of the world.

FRITZ I’d serve you well. But what good is there in quarrelling? [holds out the paper to Wormfire] Here is your own paper. That will show the instructions.

WORMFIRE What paper? You are lying through your teeth!

HARDMAN Come, read it.

WORMFIRE But truthfully, without lies.

FRITZ ‘Extracted small memorial from the great instruction given regarding our dear and gracious lady: how the slender shaft of her noble body is to be divided, encompassed and elaborated in the nicest manner, and be concentrated in the narrowest part *memoriae juvandae.*’

ALFONS The rubric is apt.

WORMFIRE My lord, it is my own invention.

ALFONS The work shows that clearly enough.

HARDMAN [to Wormfire] Shut up, fool – and you, read on.

FRITZ ‘*Pro primus,* a conjugated fishbone breast armour

...
in linen with trunk sleeves à la mode, and euphonia gratia covered with silk which we call a ladies’ gown in our German mother tongue.’

WORMFIRE I confess, a lady’s doublet with two sleeves.
FRITZ Confess what you will, here is the letter.
WORMFIRE The letter, too, can be by a lying thieving villain like you. Shut your prating mouth.
FRITZ ‘A black silken coat with bobbinlace mingled with silk embroidered according to the craft, and an added train with a long long untapering stick, as pleases women, belonging to the bodice instead of a tunic.’
WORMFIRE I let all of this pass if only the tail of my gracious lady be well placed.
FRITZ ‘And another cape of linen hangings, covering the lower cupboard with a cloth of mixed silver and gold threads, prepared and à la mode, from German money acquired à la française, also the sun and moon entwined together in curious fabric, daintily covered and decorated. Explicatius, an undergarment with pieces of gold and silver and lace of such like material.’
WORMFIRE I grant all this. It’ll come to an end now, I hope, for fear makes time seem long.
FRITZ ‘Further, a loose-bodied gown.’

249 à la mode French, fashionable.
249–50 euphonia gratia Latin, for the sake of euphony. The words may indicate that the silk should give the gown a pleasantly rustling sound.
250 coat (‘Windfang’) literally a windscreen (Grimm A.1.c).
256–9 train . . . bodice another passage in which the sartorial description offers occasion for sexual innuendo (see 232–89 and note).
263 lower cupboard a periphrasis for ‘female genitalia’.
264 à la mode See note at 249.
265 à la française French, in the French manner; the meaning of the phrase in the present context is unclear.
265 sun and moon a proleptic allusion to the ‘sun and moon’ passage (see 4.4.11–27).
265–6 entwined together (‘spinnenmässig elaborirtem Gewebe’) literally, spider-like elaborated fabric
267 Explicatius Latin, completed.
269–70 It’ll . . . long. This sentence may be spoken as an aside.
271–89 KK remains close to the equivalent passages in TS (4.3.133–7 and 4.3.142–51).
HARDMAN  What folly is this?
WORMFIRE  Master, if I said loose-bodied, sew me into the gown and beat me as dead as a doornail with a whole spool of blue thread. I said a proper and modest gown.
HARDMAN [to Fritz]  Fool, read on.
FRITZ  ‘With a pleated body, the sleeves prettily cut.’
HARDMAN  Rogue, do you think I am a fool?
WORMFIRE  My lord, a mistake, an error in the paper, the witless thief has not understood me well. I told him to cut the sleeves and then sew them. [to Fritz] I will defend myself against you, you wasteful fly-catcher, even if all your fingers are armed.
FRITZ  What! I say it is true! And if I met you in another place, we’d have a little dance.
WORMFIRE  To the tailor’s song. But ho, come now, give me the mete-yard, you take the paper, and we’ll fence for the honour.
HARDMAN  I told you just now, Master Mex, you have spoilt everything, and shall pay me damages. My love should not wear such worthless stuff on her precious body.

He beckons Alfons to come nearer:

Get out of my sight.

274 dead . . . doornail  Wormfire literally says ‘mouse-dead’ (‘Mäuse tod’), that is, as easily killed as a mouse (Grimm, ‘mausetotd’).
283–4 wasteful . . . armed.  Wormfire insults Fritz by debasing his profession, mockingly referring to thimbles as armour, and calling him, literally, a ‘light fly catcher’ (‘leichten Fliegenfänger’), someone who is content with small exploits (Grimm, ‘Fliegenfänger’).
286 little dance i.e. they would fight.
290 Mex a derisory term for tailors, originating in a now obscure connection to goats and the sound the animals were thought to produce (Wander, ‘Mex’).
293 SD In TS, Petruccio, in an aside, asks Hortensio, ‘say thou wilt see the tailor paid’ (4.3.163), an action that is implied in KK in the present SD. Hortensio, in the subsequent speech, promises the tailor payment (4.3.165–7), just as Alfons does (KK, 295–6).
ALFONS Good master Fritz, keep the things for me. I will pay you tomorrow.

FRITZ My lord, I am content.  

HARDMAN We must travel to your people in rags, dearest Catharina. Does the covering matter if the man is good? It is better to be able to pay for costly goods than to hang them around us. Our purses shall be rich with gold; ourselves in poor clothes. Add virtue to this: the best garment to grace us both.

WORMFIRE (aside) But it’s invisible.

HARDMAN Is the hoopoe better than the lark because his feathers are more beautiful, or the snake than the eel because he is decorated with such gleaming colours? So do not be unwilling, dearest heart. It is not shameful for us to wear this mean array. If it is, blame me, I will stand for it. Let us be gone today. Brother Alfons travels with us. It is now around seven o’clock.

WORMFIRE The hand of the clock is surely ruled by a fool.

HARDMAN We can go some of the way before noon until we find good lodgings.

CATHARINA Seven o’clock? It is midday. What are you saying?

298–323 KK remains close to TS (4.3.168–95), but omits Petruccio’s mention of their means of transportation (4.3.183–5) and punctuates Hardman’s grandiloquent moralizing speech by inserting Wormfire’s deflating comments (304 and 313–14).

305 hoopoe . . . lark (‘Wiedehopff . . . Lerche’) ‘the jay’ and ‘the lark’ in the corresponding passage in TS (4.3.174). The hoopoe and the jay are both colourful birds.

306–7 snake . . . eel (‘Schlange . . . Aal’) ‘the adder’ and ‘the eel’ in TS (4.3.176). The visually striking zigzag pattern on the adder’s back means that the passage may work better in the English original than in the German adaptation.

317 midday ‘almost two’ according to Katherina in TS (4.3.188). Petruccio’s reference to ‘seven o’clock’ (4.3.186), by contrast, is faithfully preserved by KK (317).
HARDMAN   What are you saying, dearest Catharina? Always against me? I think my love for you deserves more. We will not go from here until the clock says what I say it says. Come what may.  

Exit.

ALFONS   Commanding the sun, that’s something new. 

Exeunt [Alfons, Catharina and Sybilla].

WORMFIRE   Not for my honourable master. I thank God it is over with Master Scratch-hill. My back was ready to be hurt.  

Exit.

[4.3] Enter FELIX [as Hilarius] and BLASİUS.

BLASİUS   I will take care of everything and settle the business to my lord’s liking. I have acted in a comedy before now.

FELIX   You must study to acquire an unstudied freedom of manner.

323 Hortensio’s equivalent speech (TS, 4.3.195), which occurs when Petruchio is still onstage, is sometimes assumed by editors to be an aside (e.g. Oxf, Thompson).

323 SD Sybilla D1 and D2 do not specify when Sybilla exits the stage. Although she never speaks after line 99, it makes sense for her to remain onstage in order to attend to her mistress. She might, however, exit at another point, for instance after line 104, leaving Catharina alone onstage to meet Hardman and Alfons, or with Wormfire at the very end of the scene.

323–6 TS concludes the scene with Hortensio’s comment, ‘Why so, this gallant will command the sun’ (4.3.195), adapted in Alfons’ speech, to which KK adds Wormfire’s humorous reflection on the escalating situation with ‘Master Scratch-hill’ (325), a reference to Fritz, the tailor.

4.3 No location is specified, but the scene is presumably set in front of Hilarius’ lodgings. It corresponds to a brief dialogue in TS between Lucentio’s servants and the false father (4.4.1–18). KK omits the subsequent passage in TS in which Baptista and the Merchant meet, verbally conclude the marriage contract, and leave for Baptista’s house in order to sign the documents in private (4.4.19–71). It also leaves out Biondello’s report of their success to Lucentio, and his advice to take Bianca to church for a secret marriage (4.4.72–106).

By omitting much of the corresponding scene in TS, KK thus asks its audience to accept as given the wedding between Hilarius and Sabina. The effect of the omissions is that KK focuses TS’s several strands of interweaving action into a single line pointing to the resolution in 5.1.

1–5 The exchange between Felix and Blasius adapts the brief dialogue between Tranio and the Merchant (TS, 4.4.1–7). In both plays, the men are rehearsing how to convince as Hilarius’ / Lucentio’s father. While TS’s Merchant is already in his role as Lucentio’s father, Blasius metatheatrethically thinks of his future performance as a ‘comedy’ (2).
Enter FABIAN.

So, what’s the answer?

FABIAN Sir Theobald has instructed me to offer his regards, and will shortly pay my lord a visit.

FELIX This respect is too great an honour for us, but since it is his wish, we must obey. Swiftly, Fabian, clean your chamber. Let’s go inside to welcome him in the best possible way.

Exeunt.

Enter ADRIAN.

[ADRIAN] Fatherly love as well as care have brought me here. My son left me some time ago, and I have no news of his fortune either from him or from anyone else. I almost fear that something bad has happened to him. His nature always tended towards virtue, so I

6–12 The passage corresponds to Biondello’s return from his errand to Baptista (TS, 4.4.14–18). While Fabian announces Theobald’s imminent visit before they ‘go inside’ (11) in preparation for it, TS’s characters remain onstage where they are joined by Baptista and Lucentio (4.4.18 SD).

4.4 The location is not specified, but the scene is presumably set on the street (1–88) and in front of Hilarius’ lodgings (89–205). It corresponds to two successive scenes in TS, Act 4, Scene 5 and Act 5, Scene 1. It falls into three parts: one, Hardman’s deliberate confusion of the sun and the moon and the party’s encounter with Adrian (1–98, TS, 4.5.1–77); two, the confrontation between the real and the fake father of Hilarius (99–175, TS, 5.1.1–99); and, three, the conciliatory dialogue between Hardman and Catharina (176–205, TS, 5.1.132–41). In its adaptation of TS, KK shows significant independence in the second part, and omits the presence of Katherina, Petruccio and Baptista at the confrontation. It replaces the increasingly violent conflict between the real and the fake Vincentio (TS, 5.1.57–99) with Adrian’s loss of consciousness (149–70), and delays the resolution of the plot through the entry of Bianca and Lucentio (TS, 5.1.100–31) by moving the announcement of the marriage of Hilarius and Sabina to the next act (5.1). KK rounds off the scene with Sybilla’s reflections on the conciliatory power of sex and marriage (196–205).

1–9 The first appearance of Hilarius’ father. Unlike his equivalent in TS, Vincentio (who first enters at 4.5.26 SD), Adrian is given a short soliloquy in which he expresses his worries about the lack of news from his son (see Introduction, p. 105).

1 SP In D1 and D2, the SP is implied in the entrance SD.
hope bad company has not seduced him into a dishonest life. The message I received from him is strange, and I need to know what is going on. But who are these people here?

Enter ALFONS, HARDMAN, CATHARINA, WORMFIRE and SYBILLA.

HARDMAN Now let us bravely ambush old Sir Theobald. How bright the moon is shining: it must be a full moon.

CATHARINA The moon? Why, darling, it’s the sun.

HARDMAN What sun? So now I can’t see straight? Wormfire, get the horses from the inn. We must go home in this moonlight which shines as certainly as my father’s son wears my own trousers.

ALFONS [to Catharina] Tell him what he wants, you know his meaning.

CATHARINA [to Hardman] Well, then, stay here in this moonlight.

HARDMAN I say it over again, it’s the moon.

CATHARINA Now I see, it is nothing else.

HARDMAN Now you are mistaken after all, it is the blessed sun.

CATHARINA Good Lord, then let it be the sun. I am content, be it a wax light, star, torch or what you wish.

ALFONS My brother may now gently lay his weapons down: the field is won.

HARDMAN That’s how the river should flow. But what’s this? [to Adrian] Good day, fairest maid. Why are you walking alone?

10–17 KK stays close to TS(4.5.1–10) but omits Petruccio’s wilful threat that ‘[i]t shall be moon or star or what [he] list[s]’ (4.5.7).

18–32 KK closely follows the equivalent passage in TS (4.5.11–28), except that it omits a short passage (4.5.20–3) and transposes the equivalent of Katherina’s exasperated admission of any name for the sun (4.5.13–15) to Catharina’s last speech in this passage (26–7).
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ALFONS    I do not understand, my lord.
HARDMAN   Tell me, dearest Catharina, have you ever seen such a beautiful maid in all your life?
WORMFIRE And you, Sybilla, are you also transformed?
SYBILLA   Yes, you have made a boy of me by attaching something of yours to me.
HARDMAN   My darling, go and greet this fair maid with a kiss.
CATHARINA I see no one maidenly.
HARDMAN   What, do you resist me in everything?
CATHARINA My darling, calm yourself. I believe the ancient sire is a beautiful maid. [to Adrian] Therefore, fairest maid, take this kiss from an unknown friend. [She kisses Adrian.]
ALFONS    Brother, leave off this joking.
HARDMAN   [to Catharina] I do not know if I am the fool or you. This is an old gentleman whom you think a maid, dearest darling.
CATHARINA I see now. [to Adrian] My lord, pardon my error. The rays of the moon-changed sun have so bedazzled my face that I can no longer tell black from white.

34–8 KK follows the beginning and end of Petruccio’s equivalent address to Katherina, asking her to greet Vincentio as a young maid (TS, 4.5.29–35), but omits Petruccio’s commonplace praise of the supposed maid’s beauty (4.5.31–3) and inserts the brief exchange between Wormfire and Sybilla.
37–8 Sybilla’s allusion to her copulation with Wormfire constitutes another addition in KK to the equivalent material in TS. The servants provide a comic reflection of the behaviour of their social superiors (see 3.2.349–98, 4.2.1–25, 5.2.345–93 and notes). Sybilla’s supposed transformation has an Ovidian flavour and is reminiscent of the third quatrain of Shakespeare’s Sonnet 20.
41 Catharina’s last moment of resistance to Hardman has no counterpart in the equivalent passage in TS.
42–53 KK stays close to the equivalent moment in TS (4.5.38–50), but inserts Alfons’ objection (46) and omits Katherina’s second polite excuse to Vincentio (4.5.49–50).
I gladly pardon you, my merry lady. I do not know how to understand your comic behaviour and speech, but it has made me laugh.

Do not resent my behaviour. My love has infected me with his merry manner.

That will show in three quarters of a year.

To avoid further confusion, I will go in and announce the arrival of my dearest.

I will follow soon. – My lord, pardon me, I beg to know your name.

I am the older Liebenthal, and have come here to visit my son.

It gladdens my heart to bid you welcome, good sir, the more so because you come on time to attend a wedding.

I don’t understand what you are saying, my lord.

I am the first to inform you that your son is a bridegroom, and will hold his wedding feast soon.

54–62 KK preserves the father’s good-humoured excuse of the prank in TS (4.5.54–5), but omits Petruccio’s invitation to Vincentio to accompany them on their way (4.5.51–3) and adds Wormfire’s bawdy aside (59–60). While Katherina remains onstage, KK has Catharina exit with Sybilla in order to go and announce their arrival (61–2).

SP D1 and D2 mistakenly assign the speech to Alfons; Köhler emends the SP. See also 1.3.404 SP and note.

Wormfire bawdily suggests that Hardman has ‘infected’ (58) Catharina with a baby, to be born in ‘three quarters of a year’.

65–82 KK adapts the equivalent passage in TS (4.5.56–68), notably by inserting into it Adrian’s expressions of incredulity and outrage (70 and 73–4). It also adds Hardman’s attempt to appease Adrian by letting him know that his son’s bride is the daughter of Sir Theobald, who happens to be Adrian’s good friend (75–9; see also 155 and note). Petruccio simply tells Vincentio that his daughter-in-law is ‘wealthy, and of worthy birth’ (4.5.66).

Liebenthal See the List of Roles.

68–9 you ... wedding In TS, by contrast, Petruccio informs Vincentio that his ‘son by this hath married’ (4.5.64). For the two plays’ different treatments of the wedding, see the headnote to 4.3.
ADRIAN  This is madness! I sent my son abroad to study, not to get married!

HARDMAN  My lord, don’t be surprised. The lady he takes is my darling’s sister, rich with gifts of both body and mind. She is blessed by fortune. Her friendship and family cannot seem unfitting to you, given that she is the daughter of Sir Theobald.

ADRIAN  Your last words give me some comfort, and will assure my son forgiveness for his fault as he is linking two intimate friends.

HARDMAN  I wish to be included in this band of friendship. Sir, I beg you to be like a father to me.

ADRIAN  I will assist you in all your desires. But, my lord, can you not tell me where my son is staying? I wish to surprise him without warning and to shock him most horribly.

HARDMAN  He may be where I am going right now. Here are his lodgings. I will accompany you, my lord, if you would like me to.

ADRIAN  I beg to see him privately first. We will speak afterwards. Meanwhile, send fair greetings to Sir Theobald.

HARDMAN  Thank you, I am at your service. – Brother Alfons, come, let’s see what is to be done within.

WORMFIRE  And I shall see what business the cup can give to my throat.

Exeunt [all but Adrian].

83–98 KK considerably departs from TS by adding Adrian’s wish to surprise his son alone, as a result of which Adrian is left onstage alone. In TS, Vincentio accepts Petruccio’s proposal to proceed jointly to go and ‘see [his] honest son’ (4.5.70), after which all the characters exit (4.5.77 SD), the last being Hortensio, who, in a short concluding soliloquy, decides to go to his widow and tame her if need be (4.5.78–80).

89–90 Here . . . lodgings. Whereas TS’s Vincentio does not meet his fake alter ego until the next scene after travelling onward with Petruccio, KK’s scene directly continues to Adrian’s encounter with Blasius, so that the scene’s location, at least from this point, must be outside Hilarius’ lodgings.
ADRIAN  Now I shall see whether my arrival brings joy
or fear. Ho, ho!

Knocks on the door.
[Enter BLASIIUS above as Adrian of Liebenthal.]

BLASIIUS  (from the window) Who is knocking so loudly?
ADRIAN  Someone who wishes to speak to Monsieur of
Liebenthal.
BLASIIUS  He cannot receive any stranger at present; he is
going about his business.
ADRIAN  Hum! And if someone came with a bag of gold
for him? What then?
BLASIIUS  He expects nothing like that, because I have
already lined his bag.
ADRIAN  You? And who are you to shower money on
him?
BLASIIUS  I take it a father will not deny his son anything.
ADRIAN  You, his father?
BLASIIUS  Yes, I am. But who are you?
ADRIAN  [aside] What devilment is this? First I am taken
for a maid. Then another man pretends to be me. I
hope to God there is nothing evil behind this.

Enter FABIAN.

99–100  SD By the time Vincentio knocks on the
door at his son’s lodgings (TS, 5.1.12 SD),
Lucentio and Bianca have hurried to church
to get married (5.1.1–5) and Vincentio has
re-entered in the company of Petruccio,
Katherina and Grumio (5.1.6 SD).
101–17  KK remains close to TS (5.1.15–36) but
omits Petruccio’s interventions (5.1.23–7,
33–4), Hardman having previously left the
stage. The Merchant’s threat to ‘[l]ay hands
on’ Vincentio (TS, 5.1.35) is replaced by
Adrian’s puzzled aside (115–17).
101  SD Similarly, the Merchant in TS ‘looks
out of the window’ (5.1.14.1).
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[4.4].118

[FABIAN] What, do I see ghosts?
ADRIAN You monkey, where do you come from?
FABIAN Monkey? What Anabaptist are you?
ADRIAN Listen. What’s happening in your master’s house? Rascals are dwelling in there.
FABIAN What, rascals? That word will cost you dear. My master’s father does not belong to such a guild.
ADRIAN But who is this honest father? Do you not recognize me?
FABIAN I have never even dreamt of you. I swear I’ve never seen you in my life.
ADRIAN A curse on you, do you still know my hands at least, you mad bird?

He beats him.

FABIAN Help, ho, help! The man is mad!

118–31 KK roughly corresponds to the equivalent passage in TS (5.1.41–53), climaxing in Adrian/Vincentio beating Fabian/Biondello (130 SD / 5.1.51 SD). KK retains the gist of the misunderstanding in TS while verbally departing from it. The passage contains no trace of Biondello’s report of having ‘seen [Bianca and Lucentio] in the church together’ (TS, 5.1.37–8), and of his realization that their scheme will be discovered when he recognizes his old master (5.1.38–40).

118 SP In D1 and D2, the SP is implied in the preceding entrance SD.

119 monkey (‘Meerkatze’) A more common term of abuse than TS’s ‘crackhemp’ (5.1.41), although it was generally applied to women (Grimm, ‘Meerkatze’, 2).

120 Anabaptist (‘Wiedertäufer’) The Anabaptists, members of a radical Protestant movement, were often persecuted in various parts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe.

118 SP] Köhler; no SP D1, D2
BLASIUS *(runs out)* What! Treating my servant thus?
ADRIAN Who are you, slave, to bewitch this rogue in order to impersonate me?
BLASIUS What? Addressing a gentleman like this? If you’re mad, you rogue, you should be bound in chains.
ADRIAN Thus honest people are insulted abroad. You’ll regret these words, and my son will regret consorting with such guests and playing such tricks.
FABIAN *(aside)* I fear this business will have a bad end. 140
ADRIAN Where is this honest son?

*Enter FELIX [as Hilarius].*

BLASIUS There you have him.
FELIX *(all aghast)* O, I wish I were far from here!
ADRIAN *(shocked)* This one may be your son if you are a brush-maker. But these garments are not suitable for him.

---

132–70 *KK* considerably transforms and shortens the equivalent passage in *TS* (5.1.57–131). In *TS*, the Merchant appears on the main stage in the company of Baptista and Tranio (as Lucentio) (5.1.56 SD), and the conflict over who is Lucentio’s real father intensifies until an officer arrives who is charged by Tranio and Baptista to take Vincentio to jail (5.1.57–97). The entrance of the newly-married Lucentio and Bianca (5.1.97 SD) results in the flight of Biondello, Tranio and the Merchant ‘as fast as may be’ (5.1.101.1) and clears up the misunderstanding regarding Vincentio’s identity. In *KK*, the conflict between Lucentio’s real and his fake father, Adrian and Blasius (131–41), is cut short when the arrival of Felix as Hilarius (141 SD) makes Adrian suspect that his son has been killed (149–50), so that he swoons (150 SD1). Fabian, Felix and Blasius exit (150 SD2), like their equivalent characters in *TS*, but the arrival of Hilarius and Sabina is postponed until the next scene. Instead, Theobald and Hardman arrive (150 SD3) and help Adrian recover (151–70).

132 SD ‘*Läuft heraus*’ in the German text, which suggests that he comes to the main stage in a horizontal, not in a vertical, movement. Blasius has been speaking ‘from the window’ (‘*Aus dem Fenster*’) since 4.4.101 SD. Shakespeare’s editors usually assume that the Merchant, when he ‘looks out of the window’ (TS, 5.1.14.1), finds himself above, and that he later re-enters ‘below’ (TS, 5.1.56.1). What exact movement is involved when Blasius ‘*runs out*’ remains unclear, but it should not be taken for granted that a space above from which he descends is involved.
BLASIOS What, a brush-maker? Neither the elder nor the younger Liebenthal will tolerate this!
ADRIAN O Justice, unsheathe your sword! These knaves must have strangled my poor son and now –

He falls in a swoon.
Exeunt Blasius, Felix and Fabian.

Enter THEOBALD and HARDMAN.

HARDMAN Father, what’s this? What has happened to this honourable old man? Why do these rogues run for their lives?
THEOBALD These things are killing me!

They shake [Adrian].

My bosom friend! My other self! And do you give me grief, though I come to rejoice with you? O, it is true, he’s dead and gone. O, how this fair day is darkened! How joy turns to sorrow!

They rub him with balm. He recovers a little.

HARDMAN Father, there is no need to grieve. Life is still in him.
ADRIAN O, my son! My only comfort!

He sinks down again.

THEOBALD O, my brother! My dear close friend! How painful to lose you!
HARDMAN Father, do not mourn for those who are still alive as if they were dead. – [to Adrian] I will call the

155 My bosom . . . self! Whereas Baptista in TS is taken in by the Merchant (4.4.19–71) and considers Vincentio a madman whom he wants taken to jail (5.1.57–97), Theobald happens to be a good friend of Adrian’s, as we found out earlier in the scene (see 77–82).
servants so that you can be carried inside where you will be better looked after. – Ho! Servants, boys, come out here!

Enter Servants.

THEOBALD Take up this honourable old man, and carry him gently inside.

Exit with [Adrian and the servants].

HARDMAN This is a mad thing. What could be behind this? I will see what is the matter at my brother-in-law’s lodgings.

Exit.

[HARDMAN] re-enters shortly after.

The nest is completely empty, and the birds flown. Something is the matter.

Enter CATHARINA and SYBILLA.

Now the hen follows the rooster. This is a fine thing. Where are you going, my darling, where?

CATHARINA Where but to you.

HARDMAN Then come and kiss me heartily.

CATHARINA What, in front of all these people?

HARDMAN Are you ashamed of me? I don’t deserve that.

– Sybilla, call my servant.

171–5 Whereas the newly-married Lucentio and Bianca have appeared onstage by the equivalent point in TS (5.1.97), Hilarius and Sabina have not been onstage since 4.1 and will not reappear, newly married, until the next scene. The present passage reminds us of their prolonged absence and creates a certain suspense.

176–95 KK adapts the equivalent passage in TS (5.1.132–41). Notably, KK expands Petruccio’s couplet which ends the scene – “Is not this well? Come, my sweet Kate. / Better once than never, for never too late” (5.1.140–1) – into a fuller passage about Hardman and Catharina’s reformation and newly-found peace.

180 all . . . people Only Sybilla is onstage with Catharina and Hardman, so Catharina may be gesturing to the audience.
CATHARINA  How strange. I am not ashamed of you, except in front of these people. But let shame be put away.

She kisses him.

HARDMAN  Do you see now, my love, that this is much better than when we are at odds? So let us put away all tricks and stubbornness, and live in peace and pleasure after wearing down our horns. I will chase away the mad Hardman, and you must chase away the bad Catharina. Thus we shall be an honourable couple renowned in all the world.

CATHARINA  I am content with you if you are content with me.

HARDMAN  Amen.  Exeunt [Hardman and Catharina].

SYBILLA  Well, I take it she is content with him now. She has had better nights than the first. I’ve heard the *instrumentum pacis* is a pretty thing. But I do wish to be bound to my man as well, even though this obstacle doesn’t hinder us. It doesn’t hinder me much for I live more safely than when I lacked a man to cover me, but we must be honourably conjoined. Our guests shall feast at young Sabina’s wedding banquet, and my dear fiancé will not lust after the bride because I shall already have said yes to him.  Exit.
5.[1]  

*Enter* ADRIAN and THEOBALD, sad.

THEOBALD  I am so shocked and truly sorry, I do not know what to say.

ADRIAN  O, I am sad indeed, that at my age, expecting extreme gladness, I must exchange it now for deadly sorrow.

THEOBALD  I do not know what hope still sustains me.

ADRIAN  O miserable hope.

THEOBALD  Let hope not leave us before we capture the deceitful birds. They shall not slip through our fingers with unplucked feathers. O, how timely that this fraud was discovered before my daughter was given to a brush-maker’s son, an eternal insult to nobility.

ADRIAN  My bosom friend, at least you can console yourself. I cannot do the same since I have lost all; you nothing.

THEOBALD  I lose as much as you do in losing a dear son.

ADRIAN  O, pity, pity, pity.

*Enter* HILARIUS and SABINA, both well dressed, and accompanied by HARDMAN and CATHARINA.

---

5.1 No location is specified, but the scene is presumably in front of Sir Theobald’s house, and corresponds to TS, 5.1.102–31. It falls into three short parts: in part one, Theobald and Adrian comfort each other for the supposed death of Hilarius (1–17); part two includes the revelation of Hilarius’ disguise scheme and his marriage to Sabina (18–56); and in part three, Catharina and Hardman make a pact of peaceful communication (57–70). *KK* adapts some of part two from TS (5.1.102–31) but adds parts one and three, and inserts a dialogue into part two on the happy union between the two families (37–56) in a general movement towards reconciliation and acceptance that is absent from TS.

1–17 Before returning to TS for the resolution of the plot, *KK* adds a dialogue between Theobald and the revived Adrian about the supposed murder of Hilarius (see 4.4.149–50), whom they had hoped to see as Bianca’s husband (see line 16).

12 brush-maker’s son i.e. Felix (see 4.4.141–8).

17 SD The entrance of the two sisters and their spouses, with the newly-weds ‘well dressed’, creates an image of balance and harmony, a ‘pageant’ (18) which strikes the onlookers with wonder.

---

5.[1]  *this* edn; Die fünfte Handlung. *D1, D2, Köhler*
18–56 KK transposes the revelation of the disguise scheme from its original context in TS (where it occurs as the conflict over the fake and the real father of Lucentio comes to a head; 5.1.102–31) to a separate, subsequent scene. This has allowed the two fathers to meet and discuss the seemingly shattered union between their children. The recovery of seemingly lost children, typical of the romance genre, results in paternal appeasement and harmony, whereas TS’s fathers storm off-stage ‘to be revenged for this villainy’ and ‘sound the depth of this knavery’ (5.1.126–7), and Gremio leaves in frustration (5.1.130–1).

18–25 In the equivalent passage in TS, Lucentio and Bianca simply ask their respective fathers for ‘[p]ardon’ (5.1.102, 104).

20 SD Whereas the Folio spells out the fact that Lucentio kneels, the same action is implied here by Adrian’s ‘Stand, my son’ (25).

28–30 In TS, Lucentio, not Bianca, answers Baptista’s question (5.1.106–8) and dispels the confusion over the disguises.

28–9 this . . . gentleman i.e. Hilarius.

29 tutor (Pedanten) See 1.2.20n.

31 KK preserves a version of Baptista’s question, ‘is not this my Cambio?’ (TS, 5.1.112), but omits Lucentio’s explanations about his disguise scheme with Tranio (5.1.114–20).
ADRIAN  I love most dearly my lovely daughter who gives me my son again, and my son who brings me such a daughter.

THEOBALD  And I must approve of my daughter’s otherwise culpable behaviour for the sake of such a dear son, and am glad about these events. But why was the need for such disguises?

HILARIUS  Father, you will hear this with amusement. I must now also beg forgiveness for all those who have acted in this, for my sake, as others than themselves.

ADRIAN  They should at least be frightened, especially that fool who wanted to make me mad.

HARDMAN  This day is a day of joy. We should mingle nothing upsetting or grievous with it.

ADRIAN  Then they should undergo an amusing kind of punishment, and all for their own good.

THEOBALD  I add my voice to this, because my house ought to be a place of pleasure and gladness. So bring them all in, please.

Exeunt [all but Catharina and Hardman].

HARDMAN  Come here, my lovely little Trina. We two fare best in the end, because we have proceeded in the best way. The beginning was rough and hard, but it has improved in the very fairest manner. Let us continue in this vein.

CATHARINA  And let us not think about the past, and inflict punishments because of it, or do the same when we disagree.

37–56 In TS, both fathers continue to be shocked at the disobedience of their children and servants (5.1.121–9). KK turns their barely suppressed violence into forgiveness and joy.

57–70 KK adds a dialogue between Hardman and Catharina which enlarges the scene’s themes of peace, forgiveness and cooperation.

57 little Trina (‘Trinchen’) the diminutive of the shortened form of Catharina’s name Hardman used at 2.1.286–97. See 2.1.286n.
Kunst über alle Künste

HARDMAN If I do so, I won’t sleep with you. If you do so, you shall lie alone.

CATHARINA I am content. But I will take heed of what you say, since I am no longer used to sleeping alone.

HARDMAN Me neither. This is how it is when both know what they have in each other.  Exeunt.

[5.2] Enter ADRIAN, THEOBALD, SEBASTIAN, ALFONS, EULALIA, HARDMAN, CATHARINA, HILARIUS and SABINA. They sit.

Enter VEIT.

THEOBALD Gentlemen, if it is your pleasure, let us view the criminals and give them their sentence.

ADRIAN It will please everybody.

THEOBALD You, Veit, order them to appear.

VEIT I leave to obey my master’s order.

Exits and re-enters.

Here they come.

Enter BLASIUS, FELIX, FABIAN and WORMFIRE, who acts as bailiff.

THEOBALD [to Blasius, Felix and Fabian] You three, your crime is so great that it must not go unpunished.

5.2 No location is specified, but the scene is presumably set in Sir Theobald’s house, and adapts TS, 5.2. The scene falls into five parts: the mock trial (1–193), the confrontation between Catharina and the widow (194–216), Felix’s hunting song (217–66), the wager about which wife is most obedient (267–344), and a final sequence with the four servants, including Fabian’s song (345–93). The first, third and fifth parts have no equivalent in TS. The second and fourth parts are fairly close adaptations of TS (5.2.1–49, 64–141), although KK strikingly replaces Katherina’s long and eloquent speech on wifely obedience (5.2.142–85) with a brief statement (340–1).

0 SD EULALIA The first appearance of the ‘widow’ mentioned earlier by Alfons (see 4.1.51 and note). See also the List of Roles.

1–193 The mock trial and the betrothal of Wormfire and Sybilla have no equivalent in TS.
As justice requires, hear this judgment, and bear your punishment.

**WORMFIRE** Be merry, there are still things to be done!

**THEOBALD** Sir Sebastian, read the judgment, loud and clear.

**WORMFIRE** But without glasses.

**[SEBASTIAN]** The three accused are present, namely Master Blasius Nosewhite and Felix Muchwind, who, having credited themselves, contrary to all laws, with the honour and character of nobility, the last-named meeting his master face to face, have severely transgressed against holy justice and their superiors and lords. They will therefore be stripped of their honours as punishment and as an example to others. Master Blasius Nosewhite and Felix are condemned to sweat out the nobility they wrongfully assumed in a hot bath house for three days. Fabian will wait upon them and serve them food, but no drink.

**[FELIX]** I’d rather die! O, O! No drink! Brother Wormfire, beg for me!

**WORMFIRE** It is not my current duty. – But, O, gentlemen, the poor devil cannot bear it. Condemn him rather to sit in a wine tub, and make me the gaoler.

**BLASIUS** I hope, setting aside all strict justice, that the power of mercy will do some good. I will therefore

---

14 **glasses** (‘Brill’) perhaps an implied SD (Sebastian may look for his glasses).
15 SP D1 and D2 mistakenly assign the speech to Sabina; Köhler assigns it to Sebastian. See also 1.3.404 SP and note.
20 **hot . . . house** (‘Badstube’) a public bath with hot steam, a sauna.
25 **I’d . . . die!** (‘Lieber Tod!’) The German is ambiguous and, literally translated, could mean either ‘dear death!’ or ‘rather death!’.

---

5.2.15 SP] Köhler; Sabina D1, D2  27 SP] this edn; Fabian D1, D2, Köhler
ask the old gentleman whom I have insulted to intercede for me.

FELIX My master, for whose service I did it all, will speak for me.

FABIAN My comrade has already presented my dearest desire.

THEOBALD Today shall be a day of joy, so let the punishment to the accused not be grievous; instead turn mercy into merriment.

[SEBASTIAN] Gracious Mercy has seen that strict justice has committed some errorem calculi in the conferring of this punishment and has not applied its legal rule well. Taking this into consideration, she has corrected correction, and turned its rough side inwards and its soft side outwards. Here follows her judgment to the effect that rather than three days in a hot bath house, Master Blasius shall join Ceres and Bacchus, and make friends with them for eight days and longer in Sir Theobald’s lodgings in tolerable temperatures. To repair and augment his little honour, he shall act as quasi-marshal at Sir Hilarius’ wedding, grace the office with his usual dexterity, and introduce Sir Gelasium in his pleasant manner. Felix will hear an acceptably merciful judgment from his own master,
and will behave like a modest guest. Fabian, on the other hand, will be handed over to Wormfire for his excesses, who will put him into the pillory, and run wine through him until he falls to the ground powerless, having done his duty to justice. When he has recovered his modest standing, he shall be made an inspector over the law of the jug. He shall diligently pour the cups overfull. They will be drunk to the bottom, and he shall not forget himself in his duty. He may remain in further expectation of what will be done to him.

BLASiUS Thanks be to holy justice for this mercy.

FELIX I would never have expected anything else from my lordship.

FABIAN [to Wormfire] Brother, do your office.

WORMFIRE It shall not lack through any fault of mine. But holy law has not yet closed justice’s case, and so I have to praemissis praemittendis, et vel quasi prettily omnibus solennibus requisitis introducendibus introductis. And I must confer another more or less dirty thing to the Sacro-Sanctae Justitiae in

60 put . . . pillory literally ‘put him into the Bacheracher neck-iron’ (‘Er jhn erstlich an das Bacheracher Hals-Eisen stelle’). The ‘neck-iron’ was an iron chain that attached the neck of criminals to the pillory for public shaming (Grimm 1, ‘Halseisen’). ‘Bacheracher’ was a wine (see 3.2.250n). Sebastian says that Fabian will be punished by being made drunk.

61 wine The German literally reads ‘a Roman from Heilbronn’ (‘Heylbronner Rörmern’), a kind of wine (Grimm, ‘Römer’, 2), here from the city Heilbronn, a Roman settlement in the south-west of Germany.

64 law . . . jug (‘Kannen-Recht’) literally, jug-law. The word may pun on ‘jus canonicum’, canon law.

65–87 Wormfire struggles to be clear about Sybilla’s pre-marital pregnancy and hides his embarrassment in confusing syntax, dic-
tion and Latin, with the result that Hardman, like the audience, fails at first to understand.

75 praemissis . . . quasi. Latin, the things that are requiring to be sent out in advance having been sent out in advance, or the like. Here and in what follows, Wormfire’s pseudo-learned language is meant to impress but often fails to make good sense and is not properly integrated into the text in English.

76–7 omnibus . . . introductis Latin, all solemn requirements having been introdu-
duced that are requiring to be introduced.

77–8 another . . . thing an oblique reference to Sybilla’s pre-marital pregnancy.

78 Sacro-Sanctae Justitiae Latin, sacro-
sanct Justice.
order to wash the chambermaid. The *dominationibus permission* to effect the like I have lately acquired.

HARDMAN What is it you say, fool?

WORMFIRE Nothing much understandable. But now to the wisest and foolishest in the world: it concerns a lawful thing. Another interested lady is required, so I request permission once again to introduce such a one, and to propose my pretty thing, to acquire orally a benevolent rescript.

THEOBALD You have pleasant permission. All must be entertained today. Exit Wormfire.

Something fine may be afoot.

*Enter Wormfire with Sybilla.*

WORMFIRE Here comes one *membrum* of my plaint, I am the other. *Salvis salvandis Titulisque titillandis.* Honourable gentlemen, through seduction of that cursed rogue, the old Adam, of my own flesh and of the lusty world, my maid here, I mean my lady comrade, for one must not lie at a trial, and my flesh

---

79 *wash . . . chambermaid* i.e. to regularize Sybilla’s situation through marriage?

79–80 *dominationibus permission* garbled Latin (‘permisso’ would be Latin but ‘permission’ is not), the permission of the powers, of those who hold power.

80 *to . . . like* (‘solches zu effectuiren’) Wormfire rephrases his plan to regularize Sybilla’s situation in stilted language.

83 *wisest . . . world* presumably a reference to Wormfire himself (‘the wisest’) and to Sybilla (the ‘foolishest’).

84 *lawful thing* marriage (see Wormfire’s subsequent speech).

86 *pretty thing* presumably a reference to Sybilla.

86–7 *to . . . rescript* presumably an oblique reference to his and Sybilla’s lawful marriage by a priest (see Wormfire’s subsequent speech).

88 *pleasant permission* (‘Vergnügungstigung’) Theobald puns on ‘permission’ (‘Vergünstigung’) and ‘amusement’ (‘Vergnügen’) by conflating the two words.

91 *membrum* Latin, part, limb.

92 *Salvis . . . titillandis* Latin, those things being safe that are required to be safe and titles requiring to be tickled. The exact meaning of Wormfire’s Latin is again obscure.

93–5 *through . . . world* Wormfire seems to explain Sybilla’s pre-marital pregnancy as a result of original sin, of his own lust and, more generally, of lust in the world.

95–6 *my maid . . . trial* Wormfire means that it would be a lie to claim that Sybilla is still a ‘maid’ (i.e. virgin).
and blood have come together, which has produced a conjunction that will separate itself in three quarters of a year from my modest companion. In order that this conjunction may not part from honour, and because it originated in the unchaste marriage bed, we both pray that priestly glue may agglutinate and conjugate us so that thereafter no error may separate us. We pray, expecting what is right from the helpful officio Judicis, being the viceroy of holy Astraea herself.

THEOBALD This is a matter of the highest importance which concerns the women. We will therefore hear their voices through what the youngest has to say, and draw our conclusions from that.

SABINA I think they ought to be put into the hole for a time, and they can be together afterwards.

WORMFIRE (aside) The former happened a long while ago, and I will continue it.

HILARIUS I think they ought not be permitted to be bedfellows after this wedding.

WORMFIRE O, please! No, I pray you!

SYBILLA And I pray you even more. [to Sabina] O, dear lady, mercy, mercy!

WORMFIRE O, merciful lord, mercy!

CATHARINA What can you do with whores and knaves? Have them married.

SYBILLA Great thanks for this judgment.

101 unchaste . . . bed before wedlock.
104 officio Judicis Latin, the office of the judge.
105 Astraea A goddess symbolizing innocence and just judgement.
110–39 This passage was omitted in Köhler’s edition; see 2.2.19–23n.
110–13 Sabina uses ‘hole’ to refer to the prison (Grimm, ‘Loch’, 4), while Wormfire thinks of the physical orifice in Sybilla’s body.
115 wedding (copulation) See 3.2.189n.
HARDMAN  I am of my Cathy’s opinion concerning the coupling. But after that, give the honest groom a fine strong purgation, good food and drink aploenty. The chaste bride must keep him in her lap the whole night without getting up once.

WORMFIRE  Sir, sir, the purgation and the food are good.

EULALIA   I will be merciful to them and deliver them to the priest.

ALFONS   I will not gainsay my dearest, and Sir Wormfire is my good friend.

SEBASTIAN I think it would be advisable to cater for the groom with bread and water after the coupling.

WORMFIRE (aside)  He’s an old thief.

[SEBASTIAN]  And to rub the bride’s ticklish flesh with nettles.

SYBILLA (aside)  And to clean your mouth with them afterwards, you old shitter.

[THEOBALD]  After hearing everyone’s voices, Sir Adrian and I will pronounce the sentence.

WORMFIRE  O merciful, wise lord, if you have reason, pronounce the best.

SYBILLA   I also humbly beg for this.

THEOBALD  It will be what is just.

---

123 Cathy’s (‘Käthen’) The only occurrence of this form of Catharina’s name in the play (cf. 206). Elsewhere, Hardman calls her ‘Trina’ (‘Trine’; see 2.1.286n) or ‘little Trina’ (‘Trinchén’, 5.1.57n), although he most commonly uses her full name. See also the List of Roles.

136 SP D1 and D2 assign this speech to Sabina, but Sebastian seems to continue his judgement begun at 133–4, and Sybilla is unlikely to call her former mistress an ‘old shitter’ (139). See also 1.3.404 SP and note.

140 SP As at 136, the speech is mistakenly assigned to Sabina in D1 and D2. Wormfire’s response to the ‘wise lord’ (142) makes better sense if addressed to Theobald, who pronounces the sentence from line 161. Köhler assigns the speech to Sabina but correctly mentions in the notes (256) that the words are no doubt spoken by Theobald.
WORMFIRE  Sybilla, did you not notice whether the good tease us more than the bad?
SYBILLA  Who can tell me that? As long as there are no nettles. O, how I would like to shit into the beard of this old fantastico.

WORMFIRE  My darling, think of drinking water for three days. If you wish, keep remembering his words, for the purgation could also mean good food for us.
SYBILLA  Let us ask the old fantastico to be our guest.
BLASIIUS  *Silentium, silentium*.
WORMFIRE  That’s school-boy Latin. Listen diligently, Sybilla, in case something good is coming.
THEOBALD  Because we are more mindful of joy than sadness these days –
WORMFIRE  That’s a good start.
THEOBALD  Ludolf Wormfire and Sybilla Fleafur will be coupled with each other, and handed over to the priest. Furthermore, these two will not bring together their maidenheads in the wedding bed, but will be burdened with having to act as honourable spouses and shall lead the dance. For this, Wormfire will borrow the short frock and the ruff. When his helper is lightened of her load, this whole company shall serve as godparents.

146–54 This passage was omitted in Köhler’s edition; see 2.2.19–23n. Wormfire and Sybilla are likely to talk aside, unheard by the other characters.
149 shit Sybilla uses the word ‘hoﬁeren’, which originally connoted ‘to woo’ but had evolved into ‘to shit’ (Grimm, ‘hoﬁeren’, 9).
150, 154 fantastico (‘Fantasten’) See 1.1.97n.
152 keep . . . words Wormfire literally says ‘don’t forget his maw’ (‘Drum vergibß jhm / meinetwegen / deß Mauls nicht’).
155 Silentium Latin, silence.
156 Wormfire literally says ‘that sounds well pro primus’ (i.e., first of all), in German ‘Das lautet pro primus wohll’.
167 ruf Theobald says that Wormfire can borrow the ‘paper lapel’ (‘papiernen Kragen’), referring to the expensive fashion accessory of the higher classes.
167–8 When . . . load when Sybilla will have given birth.

146–54 not in Köhler
WORMFIRE  Not couple in bed? Is this a good decree?  170
SYBILLA   I think it is. Go, and thank them.
WORMFIRE  Dear Lord Justices and assistants of this  175
tribunal, which is hard as a bone and painful, you are
by diamond chains insurmountably linked to dear
Justice. Quantas, quam solidas, solidiores, solidissimas,
maximas, debitissimas agam gratiarum gratiosè
gratias gratus, nescio. Hum! Latin suddenly sticks in
my throat at the moment when too much of it wants to
get out. I’ll say the rest in German. My mistress, à la
française, and I are extremely content with the
sentence, particularly concerning point one. There is
no need for point two, for we have already done it. In
order to fulfil point three, we would like to assume the
title Juris de Edendo, and add that of de Bibendo, both
of which we will illustrate most prettily. We will
dutifully exercise point four with the agility of our
joints and it will be decorated with fitting ornaments.
For the last and fifth point, you recommend to us what
the wisdom of our brain has already concluded,
because est, interest regit dativum: we thus thank you
being gratefully grateful, I do not know. Wormfire’s Latin is again more designed
to impress than to make sense.
179–80  à la française  French, in the French
manner. The meaning in the present con-
text is unclear.
181–2  There . . . it. Wormfire is saying that
Sybilla and he have already brought
‘together their maidenheads’ (163–4).
183  point three  i.e. ‘act[ing] as honourable
spouses’ (165).
184  Juris de Edendo  Latin, the Judge of
Eating.
184  de Bibendo  Latin, of Drinking.
190  est . . . dativum  Latin, ‘est’ and ‘interest’
take the dative case. Wormfire’s Latin
phrase seems another non sequitur here.
most prettily, and rest obliged and dutifully bound to our masters in all similar cases. Dixi.

THEOBALD Now all is joyful, and will be amicable.

ALFONS [to Hardman] That would be a pretty word, would it not, brother?

HARDMAN I think you are afraid of your wife.

EULALIA He whose head is dizzy thinks the whole world is going round.

CATHARINA What do you mean by this?

EULALIA Your darling understands me well enough.

CATHARINA And I not a bit more clearly.

EULALIA He thinks that because he has received something bad, my husband has done so too.

CATHARINA That would be a simple opinion and utterly groundless.

HARDMAN To her, dear Cath!

ALFONS To her, defend yourself, my dear!

EULALIA I do not want to be your fool any longer. Exit.

CATHARINA I must find out what’s the matter with her. Exit swiftly.

---

192 Dixi Latin, I have spoken.
193–216 While the previous material in this scene has no equivalent in TS, the confrontation between Catharina and the widow adapts TS (5.2.1–49).
193 In TS, it is Lucentio who announces the happy resolution and invites the company to his house (5.2.1–11).
194–6 KK remains close to the equivalent exchange between Hortensio and Petruccio (TS, 5.2.15–16).
194 word As in the equivalent passage in TS (PETRUCCIO Padua affords nothing but what is kind. / HORTENSI) For both our sakes I would that word were true.’, 5.2.14–15), ‘word’ (‘Wort’) seems to refer not to a single word but to the preceding utterance more generally.
197–209 KK adapts the confrontation between Katherina and the Widow fairly closely (see TS, 5.2.17–35), but omits word play on ‘conceive’ (i.e. having ideas as well as getting pregnant; see 5.2.23–5) that fails to work in German.
206 Cath (‘Cathrinchen’) The only occurrence of this form of Catharina’s name in the play. See 123 and note.
206–9 After Petruccio’s ‘To her, Kate!’ and Hortensio’s ‘To her, widow!’ (TS, 5.2.34–5), Katherina and the Widow have no scripted reaction. ‘Katherine may chase the Widow . . . or otherwise physically intimidate her’ (NOS), but there is no exit SD, and editors since Nicholas Rowe usually assume that they do not depart until later, with Bianca (TS, 5.2.49 SD). Eulalia and Catharina, however, leave earlier and separately, after their respective short speeches.
HARDMAN But without help. I know she’ll put her down. 210
ALFONS That’s usually my duty. [to Sabina] But my lady bride, why so quiet? You are surely tired.
HARDMAN She is also somewhat hit. The little bird must not go home alone.
SABINA If I were a bird, I would fly to a bush so that you could not hit me.
FELIX In order to show my penitence, I have composed a little wedding wish in prison. Please observe my good intentions, not the bad words.
HILARIUS I thank you most amicably, and know that your heart and words are good. Rest assured of my eternal favour towards you. But now, read us your invention.
[FELIX] The tale that I must tell you is a story of the chase
In which three gallant huntsmen set out upon the trace

put ... down (‘leget sie nieder’) The ambiguity of the phrase – carried over from Petruccio’s ‘my Kate does put her down’ (TS, 5.2.36) – as meaning either ‘winning an argument’ or ‘dominating during sex’ equally works in German. Alfons activates the second meaning in his response.
213–16 The passage adapts the exchange between Petruccio and Bianca at TS, 5.2.45–8.
217–66 The passage with Felix’s song replaces suggestive banter between Petruccio, Hortensio, Lucentio and Tranio (TS, 5.2.50–63).
224–55 The German song consists of fairly rough octameter couplets, with a caesura dividing each octameter into two tetrameter half-lines. Our English translation approximates this form by using fourteeners (with occasional variation in the syllable count), with the aim of providing the impression of a fairly rudimentary verse technique. The fourteeners usually fall into two half-lines, the first with four stresses or feet and the second with three. End-rhymes in the German original are usually full, but are translated here by a mixture of full and half-rhyme.
224–45 The main part of Felix’s song uses a transparent hunting conceit to summarize the plot: a ‘hind’ (226; Sabina) was hunted by ‘three ... huntsmen’ (225), ‘one [who] was old’ (227; Sebastian) and two ‘youths’ (228; Hilarius and Alfons), of whom one (Hilarius), who had ‘a helper’ (232; Felix), won ‘the prize’ (238). The ‘second’ (239; Alfons) also ‘found a prey’, though less ‘lovely’ (242; Eulalia, the widow), yet still better than ‘the wild beast’ (243; Catharina) found by ‘the stern huntsman’ (243; Hardman).
Of a fair hind untamed and free, a prey they prized the most,
But one was old already, and his hunting skills were lost.
The other two, however, were lusty youths and strong,
And when they shot an arrow it never went far wrong.
Yet one surpassed the other in hunting of this kind,
Choosing to stalk the deer himself and leave the dog behind.
He also left a helper, whom he trusted with the work
To stop all rival huntsmen from intruding in the park,
If thus he should desire; and his wishes were obeyed
By that same second huntsman who was ready with his aid.
As for the old companion with his white and feeble staff,
The faithful helper soon arranged for him to be sent off.
It was the first best huntsman who won the prize he sought;
His efforts were rewarded. The second too had thought
To catch the deer but failed because his strategy was wrong,
For he was too impatient and could not wait so long.
Yet he, too, found a prey, though not so lovely as the hind
Nor yet as bad as the wild beast that the stern huntsman found
Deep in the bush and firmly bound. Now they all have their part;
Except for one who was too fast and another slow to start.
But still the fast one made a catch and he is well content,
Because through him his master gained the prize for which he spent
So many drops of burning sweat that streaked his frozen skin.
Thus he who sends down wagon loads of all good things throws in
A goodly dose of what’s called luck, and the man that has that name
Hopes that he’ll be remembered then and that he will remain
Fixed in his master’s favour and never be betrayed.
By him to whom his loyal vows of endless faith were made;
And if such trust is so rewarded and his hopes fulfilled,
Then will he always follow him and be his servant still.
But now, you other hunters:
Follow your hounds while they are fresh and while the woods are green
Range through the flowering forest, and let it not be seen
That when you shoot an arrow your strong stiff bow goes soft:
To get your fill of pleasure prepare another shaft.

245 **one . . . start** Felix and Fabian.
246–55 This part of Felix’s song is a plea to Hilarious for continued patronage and employment.
249–50 **luck . . . name** The name ‘Felix’, a common cognomen since Roman times, means ‘happy’ or ‘fortunate’.
256–60 Felix’s song concludes with advice to other ‘hunters’ (256; i.e. men) for successful wooing, with suggestive phallic puns on ‘arrow’, ‘stiff’, ‘soft’ and ‘shaft’ (259–60). The passage may well be an address to the audience.
HILARIUS The invention is good.
HARDMAN Only that it’s a little too like doggerel.

[SEBASTIAN] Everyone has their fortune expressed in it, and I most of all, because I have not caught anything. But I prefer this to getting something I’d be frightened of.

THEOBALD [to Hardman] Son, that’s a reference to you, since I believe you have obtained the worst thing.

HARDMAN I do not believe so, and let us prove it. Let every man send for his wife, and we shall see which comes most obediently.

HILARIUS Here, I bet twenty ducats that I win.

ALFONS I bet as many.

HARDMAN What, twenty, I bet as many on my whippet. A hundred is not enough.

HILARIUS Content, here is my hand. – Fabian, go and tell my love to come to me.

FABIAN I go, my lord. Exit.

THEOBALD I’ll bet half with you, good son, she’ll come at once.

HILARIUS I do not seek halves. A whole, or none.

[Enter FABIAN.]

262 doggerel (‘hündisch’) The German word was generally used in reference to the abject qualities of dogs (Grimm, 2), not, like the English ‘doggerel’, specifically in the context of verse.

263 SP D1 and D2 assign the speech to Sabina, but it makes better sense when given to Sebastian, who has ‘not caught anything’ (264), i.e., has no wife, unlike Hardman, Hilarius and Alfons. See also 1.3.404 SP and note.

267–308 With few exceptions, the wager passage follows TS (5.2.64–112) speech by speech and often word for word: KK slightly rearranges and condenses the negotiations of the terms of the wager (269–76; TS, 5.2.67–76), but has no equivalent for Baptista’s interjection when Katherina enters (‘Now, by my halidom, here comes Katherina’, 5.2.105), and adds Wormfire’s words at 297 and Catharina’s confident assertion that she will ‘know how to tame them’ (307), i.e. Sabina and Eulalia.
FABIAN  My lord, she sends word she is busy and cannot come.

HARDMAN  What, she is busy and cannot come? Is this an answer?

SEBASTIAN  Yes, and a kind one. How will yours be?

HARDMAN  Sir Sebastian always tries to fool us. Wait for the end.

ALFONS  Go, and tell my wife I entreat her to come.

[Exit Fabian.]

HARDMAN  I entreat her to come, O, O!

ALFONS  Yours will surely not come upon any entreaty.

[Enter Fabian.]

Well, where is she?

FABIAN  She says you must be jesting and bids you come to her.

HARDMAN  Graver than grave! You, Wormfire, go tell my wife to come to me at once.

WORMFIRE  Incontinently, swift as the wind.

[Exit Wormfire.]

ALFONS  I know her answer. She’ll not come.

HARDMAN  Then no one wins the bet. But she’ll come with another answer.

Enter Catharina.

CATHARINA  What is your will, my darling?

HARDMAN  Where is your sister, and the wife of brother Alfons?

CATHARINA  They are sitting outside clattering away.

HARDMAN  Fetch them in. Should they resist, carry those disobedient women here.

287 Incontinently The German text has ‘Incontinent’, from Latin ‘incontinenter’, i.e. instantly.

294 clattering away (‘bey der Klappermühle’) literally, at the clapper-mill (see Grimm, ‘klapper’, II.2).
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CATHARINA  I know how to tame them.  
[Exit Catharina.]

HILARIUS  If we must talk of miracles, here is one.

THEOBALD  My son, your effort must be rewarded.  
Another daughter, another dowry. I add 5,000 ducats 310 
to the previous one. Look, how she brings them in 
like prisoners!

[Enter CATHARINA with SABINA and EULALIA.]

SABINA  I don’t know if she is mad or not.

HILARIUS  I wish we were mad. Your wisdom costs me 
too much.

ALFONS [to Eulalia]  You could have saved me a hundred 
ducats; I have bet and lost because of you.

EULALIA  Why are you such a fool then to put such trust 
in me?

ALFONS  I admit I feared what I had nothing to worry 320 
about, and by trusting one I have been cheated by 
both.

[SEBASTIAN]  I thank God that the goat I made gardener

309–12 Theobald’s speech adapts that of 
Baptista (TS, 5.2.117–21), who promises 
‘twenty thousand crowns’ (5.2.119). KK 
omits TS’s preceding speech, Petruccio’s 
rhapsody on married life with a tamed 
wife (5.2.114–16), as well as his slightly 
later request for Katherina to trample on 
er her cap, eliciting scorn in Bianca and the 
Widow (5.2.127–31).

311–12 Look . . . prisoners! In TS, the 
equivalent announcement is made by 
Petruccio: ‘See where she comes, and 
brings your froward wives / As prisoners 
to her womanly persuasion’ (5.2.125–6).

313–19 closely adapts TS (5.2.131–5) but 
assigns part of the hostile exchange 
between Lucentio and Bianca 
(5.2.133–5) to Alfonso and Eulalia.

320–2 Alfonso’s slightly cryptic sentence 
seems to acknowledge that he has been 
wrong about both Catharina and Eulalia, 
leading to his loss of the wager.

320–34 ALFONS . . . that. This passage seems 
to have no equivalent in TS.

323 SP D1 and D2 mistakenly assign the 
speech to Sabina. Köhler (259) rightly 
observes that the SP does not 
fit the speech but unconvincingly suggests that 
the speaker may be Theobald. See also 
1.3.404 SP and note.

323 the . . . gardener (‘der Bock / den ich 
zum Gärtners gesetzt’) refers to Hilarius 
through whose proxy Sebastian sought 
to woo Sabina. Sebastian may allude to a 
proverb according to which goats make 
for poor gardeners since they eat the 
plants instead of caring for them 
has become the master. My horns would otherwise have been far too weak.

ADRIAN   It may be true that all maids are pious.

HARDMAN   Then their husbands would need to make them bad afterwards. But it is not so.

HILARIUS   That one had as his symbol *Non cernuntur et adsunt*.

THEOBALD   I am overjoyed by my new daughter.

CATHARINA   I hope I will be doubly obedient towards my father because I sinned before.

THEOBALD   You will renew my old age through that. O, what an excellent thing it is when children are obedient.

HILARIUS   But it is very gross when wives are stubborn.

HARDMAN   My dear Catharina, give these shrewish women a lesson.

CATHARINA   Let me put it briefly. You men, love your wives. And you women, obey your husbands.

THEOBALD   You make a good conclusion, daughter. So let us now make a good beginning to our joy. Gentlemen, you are warmly invited inside.

*Exeunt [all but Wormfire, Sybilla, Fabian and Felix.]*

327–8 The implication, to which Hardman objects, is that married women are no longer pious.

329 That one It is not quite clear to whom Hilarius refers: to himself, present but not seen because of his disguise?

229–30 Non . . . adsunt Latin, they are not seen, and yet they are present.

334–7 O, . . . stubborn. In *TS*, the equivalent passage occurs after Katherina’s long speech, and the first statement is made by Vincentio, not by Baptista (5.2.188–9).

338–9 This speech adapts Petruccio’s request to Katherina to give the ‘headstrong women’ a lesson in wifely obedience (5.2.136–7).

340–1 *KK* compresses Katherina’s elaborate and multi-layered defence of female obedience in marriage (5.2.142–85) into a brief and sober speech. Its content and balanced grammatical structure are indebted to St Paul’s Letter to the Ephesians: ‘Husbands, love your wives . . .’ (5.25); ‘Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands . . .’ (5.22).

342–4 *KK* replaces a dialogue between the three husbands about their respective marital success (5.2.186–95) with a more peaceful conclusion by Theobald.

344 SD Among the characters who exit are Hardman and Catharina. According to the early editions of *TS*, Petruccio leaves separately (5.2.193 SD), before the other characters (5.2.195 SD), although editors since Rowe have usually emended the text to give Petruccio and Katherina a joint exit (see Ard1, 306–8).
WORMFIRE The sequence is now ours.

FABIAN Ho, brother; first you must see my learned invention. Felix should not think he is the only one who has sucked up wisdom. I can do something, too.

WORMFIRE Well then, let us hear what little learning you have to offer. I wonder how the horse of Bacchus inspired the lustfulness of your folly.

FABIAN You’re mad, my brother Wormfire, yes, mad as a storm, With horns on head so high
They almost touch the sky. This was your finest sport, To climb into the fortress. O then you were warm When your vigorous third arm Pushed hard into the press; And though it felt the stress, It chose to make no stay Until it forced its way Along the secret ditch, The watery passage which

345–93 *KK* adds a concluding sequence with four of the play’s servants. For the play’s interest in the servants as foils and comic mirrors of their social betters, see 4.4.37–8n. The passage was omitted in Köhler’s edition; see 2.2.19–23n.

345 sequence (sequens) a musical term, originally designating a chant that followed (Latin, sequi) the Alleluia in the liturgy of the Eucharist.

350–1 I wonder . . . folly. Wormfire encourages Fabian so that, literally, ‘Pegasus of Bacchus makes your Venus’ folly flow’ (‘wie das Bacchi Pegasus die Venam deiner Würmerey in den Fluß gebracht’). Wormfire seems to suggest that the composition was shaped by Fabian’s drinking and lust. For Wormfire’s other references to Bacchus, see 4.2.70–1n and 5.2.50n.

352–79 Fabian’s poem, addressed to Wormfire, deals with Sybilla’s possible marital infidelity. Its fairly stumbling trimeter couplets have been translated here into lines of the same length, with the exception of the final couplet which has an extra foot.

354 horns (‘Hörner’) The traditional cuckold’s horns introduce the poem’s themes of marital infidelity and cuckoldry.

356–68 The barely disguised conceit is that of Wormfire’s sexual penetration of Sybilla.

345–93 not in Köhler
Is where it caught the hare,
Fresh, young and sitting there,
Fool, croaking in the reed.
Your hen now croaks indeed,
So cry as cuckolded do,
Get down to work anew,
Run after those bold men
Who are ahead, and lend
You cuckoo’s eggs. I too
Found your dove and played cuckoo
So merrily that after
She almost burst with laughter.
So take your turn and have your due
As I, and all kind cousins do.

WORMFIRE  I admit it is prettily elaborated, and well worth pricking, I mean, printing. [to Sybilla] But now, my darling, come inside, our shameful wedding day has arrived. I hope nobody will raise verbally what they secretly have in mind. I doubt I lack cousins.

SYBILLA  When a man seeks to be happy, he must not believe this or think about it.

WORMFIRE  Well, it comes without our bidding. But who

369–77  Fabian claims to be one of the men who have cuckolded Wormfire with Sybilla.
379  all . . . do (‘nach Schwagers Brauch’) ‘Schwager’ could mean brother-in-law as well as, more generally, any relative acquired through marriage; here the ‘cousins’ stand for Wormfire’s sexual rivals. See also 384–7n.
380–1  well . . . printing. Wormfire literally says that the song is ‘well worth giving over to the dirt (inquam [i.e., I mean] printing)’ (‘wohl werth daß es in den Dreck (inquam Druck) gegeben werde’). The pun relies on phonetic similarity between ‘Dreck (‘dirt’) and ‘Druck’ (‘printing’). For a similar slip of the tongue by Wormfire, see 170.
382  shameful . . . day  (‘schändlicher Ehren-Tag’) ‘Ehren-Tag’, literally ‘day of honour’, designated the wedding day (Grimm), resulting in an oxymoron, a shameful (given Sybilla’s pregnancy) day of honour.
384–7  I doubt . . . bidding. Wormfire seems to fear being cuckolded by Sybilla who tries but fails to reassure him. According to D1 and D2, he does not doubt he lacks cousins (i.e. sexual rivals), but the passage makes better sense without the negation (see also 379n).
amongst the two of us will lift the shirt tonight?

SYBILLA   I think whoever comes first.

FABIAN    I would gladly be of service.

WORMFIRE Yes, at the halter of a gallows’ bell. But it is

\[
altem tempus, claudiem javos prueri sat prata
biberunt, et plaudite.
\]

Exeunt.
APPENDIX

Doubling charts for Tito Andronico and Kunst über alle Künste, ein böses Weib gut zu machen

The following doubling charts rely on the assumption that the plays were performed with as few actors as possible. Like Scott McMillin, we ‘never count immediately juxtaposed roles as fit for doubling’ (185), and we follow William A. Ringler in assuming that ‘a plural for mute “attendants”, “soldiers”, etc., should usually be interpreted as no more than two’ (115).

SYMBOLS

- enters after the scene begins
- exits before the scene ends
? presence on stage uncertain

female
male
mute
TITO ANDRONICO

*Tito Andronico* may be staged by a minimum of ten actors, who would perform the three female parts (Aetiopissa, Andronica and the Midwife), the eleven male speaking parts (Tito, Vespasianus, Victoriades, the Emperor, Morian, Saphonus, Helicates, Andronica’s Husband, Tito’s Messenger in Act 5, Tito’s Messenger in 8.1, and the Soldier who arrests Morian in 7.1), the ‘Romans’ who acclaim the new Emperor in 1.1, and the three mute parts (the attendant in 5.2 and the two soldiers in 7.3).¹ The scene with the greatest number of actors on stage is the first one, and it is noticeable that Victoriades (unlike Marcus in *TA*) is absent from the scene, perhaps because the actor was needed to double as a Roman citizen. The same actor may have performed the attendant in 5.2. In 6.1 the Midwife may have been doubled by the actor playing Andronica (though not by Aetiopissa, who is onstage at the end of Act 5).² In the final scene the servants preparing the banquet who bring out the pies may be doubled by the actors performing Helicates and Saphonus (who were killed in 7.3), with the added irony that the pies contain some of the brothers’ remains.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Mor</th>
<th>Morian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aetiopissa</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
<td>Andronica</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td>Saphonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>Sol</td>
<td>Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>Helicates</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Tito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hus</td>
<td>Andronica’s Husband</td>
<td>Ves</td>
<td>Vespasianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>Victoriades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Shakespeare’s play requires a considerably larger cast: ‘thirteen adults, three boys, [and] at least four extras’ (*NOS CRE*, 1.143).

² As a rule, ‘British troupes on the continent had no actresses before the 1650s’ (Katritzky, ‘English’, 38).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>6.1</th>
<th>7.1</th>
<th>7.2</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>8.1</th>
<th>8.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>Ves-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ves</td>
<td>Ves</td>
<td>-Ves-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>Emp-</td>
<td>Emp-</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Emp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>Tit-</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Tit</td>
<td>Tit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>And-</td>
<td></td>
<td>And-</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>-And</td>
<td>And</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
<td>Aet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>Mor</td>
<td>Mor</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mor</td>
<td>-Mor</td>
<td>Mor-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mor</td>
<td>-Mor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>-Hel</td>
<td>Hel-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Hel</td>
<td>Hel-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hel-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td>-Sap</td>
<td>Sap-</td>
<td>-Sap</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Sap</td>
<td>Sap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>-Vic</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>-Att</td>
<td>-Sol</td>
<td>-Sol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Hus</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mes</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Sol</td>
<td>-Sol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Mes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KUNST ÜBER ALLE KÜNSTE

Kunst über alle Künste can be performed with fifteen actors, four of them female.¹ Act 5, Scene 2 is the scene with the largest number of actors onstage at the same time. There are various doubling options. For instance, Patient Job can be doubled by Hardman; the servants in Act 3, Scene 3 by Theobald, Sebastian and Hilarius, and Matz by Felix in Act 3, Scene 3 and Act 3, Scene 4; Fritz can be doubled by Veit and the servant by Sebastian in Act 4, Scene 2; the servants in Act 4, Scene 4 can be doubled by Veit and Sebastian.

Abbreviations

A  Actor  Fri  Fritz  Se1  Servant 1
Adr  Adrian  Har  Hardman  Se2  Servant 2
Alf  Alfons  Hil  Hilarius  Se3  Servant 3
Bla  Blasius  Job  Patient Job  Syb  Sybilla
Cat  Catharina  Mat  Matz  The  Theobald
Eul  Eulalia  Sab  Sabina  Vei  Veit
Fab  Fabian  Seb  Sebastian  Wor  Wormfire
Fel  Felix  Ser  Servant

¹ Performances of The Taming of the Shrew probably required a cast of at least fifteen (see the Appendix on ‘Casting’ in Ard3 7S, 399–402).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sc.</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>4.4</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>Se1-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
<td>-The-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>Cat-</td>
<td>Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
<td>-Cat-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>Seb</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>Se2-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
<td>-Seb-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>Alf</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>Alf</td>
<td>Alf</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
<td>-Alf-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 6</td>
<td>Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
<td>-Vei-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7</td>
<td>Fel</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Mat-</td>
<td>Mat</td>
<td>Fel</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
<td>-Fel-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>Se3-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
<td>-Hil-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>-Fab</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
<td>-Fab-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>Wor</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
<td>-Wor-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 11</td>
<td>Sab-</td>
<td>Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
<td>-Sab-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 12</td>
<td>-Syb-</td>
<td>-Syb-</td>
<td>Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
<td>-Syb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 13</td>
<td>Bla</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
<td>-Bla-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 15</td>
<td>Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
<td>-Eul-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

Quotations from and references to works by Shakespeare are from The Arden Shakespeare Third Series.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>app.</td>
<td>appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conj.</td>
<td>conjecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edn</td>
<td>edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig.</td>
<td>figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn.</td>
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