

Titus out of Joint

Titus out of Joint:
Reading the Fragmented *Titus Andronicus*

Edited by

Liberty Stanavage and Paxton Hehmeyer

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Titus out of Joint:
Reading the Fragmented *Titus Andronicus*,
Edited by Liberty Stanavage and Paxton Hehmeyer

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2012 by Liberty Stanavage and Paxton Hehmeyer and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3762-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3762-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Titus out of Joint	
Chapter One.....	7
‘At the Signe of the Gunne’: <i>Titus Andronicus</i> , the London Book Trade, and the Literature of Crime, 1590-1615	
Nadia Bishai	
Chapter Two.....	49
“Chief architect and plotter of these woes”: Body, Text and Architecture in <i>Titus Andronicus</i>	
Muriel Cunin	
Chapter Three.....	69
The Petrarchan Apocalypse of <i>Titus Andronicus</i> : Poetic Mutilation and Elizabethan Visual Culture	
Andrew McConnell Stott	
Chapter Four.....	87
Hew His Limbs and Sacrifice His Flesh: The Destruction of the Male Body in <i>Titus Andronicus</i>	
Jim Casey	
Chapter Five.....	113
Stage Hands: <i>Titus Andronicus</i> and the Agency of the Disabled Body in Text and Performance	
Nicola Imbracsio	
Chapter Six.....	125
The Female Muselmann: Desire, Violence, and Spectatorship in <i>Titus Andronicus</i>	
Emily King	

Chapter Seven.....	141
From <i>Titus</i> to <i>Titus</i> : Edward Ravenscroft’s <i>Titus Andronicus</i> and the Emasculation of Shakespeare’s Tamora Liberty Stanavage	
Chapter Eight.....	165
“Twill Vex Thy Soul to Hear What I Shall Speak”: Aaron and the Aesthetics of Discomfort Paxton Hehmeyer	
Appendix A	177
‘At the Signe of the Gunne’: Primary Sources	
Bibliography	195
Contributors.....	207
Index.....	209

INTRODUCTION

TITUS OUT OF JOINT

It is by now customary to open a collection on *Titus Andronicus* by remarking that despite the play's dismal critical reception, it has had unexpected stage success.¹ Each well-received large-scale production brings a new wave of critical essays explaining why now the time is finally right for *Titus* to be well received by the theatrical and critical public. Many of these critics have attributed the "new" stage success of the play to popular desensitization to graphic or conceptual violence. Indeed, traditionally to its detractors, *Titus*'s most glaring flaw has simply been its "unpleasantness":² that is, its lack of taste or rather its indecent "taste" for human flesh, the irresistible pun about a play that ends in cannibalism. Despite repeated critical claims that we have finally overcome our squeamishness, attempts to save the play from the charge of indecorousness have faltered in the face of *Titus*'s fragmented moral compass and problematic resolution. How to make the play work as a unified whole, or indeed even if the play can work as one, has presented a problem for numerous waves of critical methodology.

Most recently *Titus* seems to have indeed enjoyed a revival of its critical fortunes in response to Julie Taymor's powerful film adaptation,

¹ See for instance Bate in his introduction to the Arden edition of *Titus*: "Shakespeare's earliest and bloodiest tragedy has a curious history. It was hugely successful in its own time . . . but it has been reviled by critics and revived infrequently. Yet on the few occasions when it has appeared in the repertory it has repeated its original success." (Jonathan Bate, "Introduction," in William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate [Croatia: Arden Shakespeare, 2006], 1). Similarly see Hughes's introduction to the Cambridge edition: "Literary apologies for Shakespeare's play frequently fail because they do not take into account its theatrical values." (Alan Hughes, "Introduction" in William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Alan Hughes [New York: Cambridge UP, 2006], 37).

² Nicholas Brooke, *Shakespeare's Early Tragedies* (Bungay, Suffolk: Methuen & Co, 1968), 15.

which has made a first rate production widely available to students and scholars alike. Perhaps it is simply that, this time, our tastes have finally changed. It may be that shifting ideas of an acceptable level of violence and gore in popular culture have rendered *Titus* less shocking. Maybe the excess in contemporary film has made Titus's barbarism seem comparatively tame. Indeed, in Taymor's version, Anthony Hopkins plays Titus, a casting choice that evokes Hopkins's popular portrayal of the fictional serial killer Hannibal Lecter, whose own cultivated tastes include a predilection for Bach, fine wines, and human liver (paired with "fava beans and a nice chianti"). As Richard Burt points out, "The connection between Titus and Lecter is underlined by Hopkins' quotation of his role in *Silence of the Lambs* when he sucks in his spit before slitting Chiron and Demetrius's throats."³ In comparison with Hannibal Lecter, Titus seems a model, and moral, citizen; after all, he is not the cannibal here, just the cook. Maybe we have finally reached a watershed moment in American culture where even the gore and confusion of *Titus* can fit comfortably into the adoring rhetoric of Bardolotry. Maybe. However, in light of the recurring cycle of the play's reception, in which this claim has been so oft repeated, we may want to look elsewhere for an answer.

One standard trend of the play's critical reception has been to explain it away as intentionally flawed or parodic. Dover Wilson, the play's first editor for Cambridge University Press thought so, and more recently it has been Harold Bloom's erudite opinion that "Nothing else by Shakespeare is so sublimely lunatic."⁴ Critics trying to rescue the play from the label of parody or burlesque have at times gone to the other extreme, with totalizing gestures that resonate oddly with the rhetoric of the play itself.⁵ After all, on one level the play is about the disintegration of Rome and Roman values, literalized in the play's broken and mutilated bodies. Of

³ Richard Burt, "Shakespeare and the Holocaust: Julie Taymor's *Titus* is Beautiful, or Shakesploi Meets (the) Camp" in *Shakespeare after Mass Media*, ed. Richard Burt (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 308.

⁴ John Dover Wilson, "Introduction," *Titus Andronicus* by William Shakespeare, ed. John Dover Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1948), vii-lxxi. Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1998), 83.

⁵ This strategy has often been used by critics who point to the superior dramaturgy or structure of *Titus*, finding dramatic solutions that elide rather than confront persistent problems. See for instance Alan Hughes's statement quoted above (note 1) in which he implies that the play can be rescued from the failure of literary based approaches by a performance-based approach.

course, this attempt to create unity from fragments is not completely foreign to the text. Like apologist critics who try sweepingly to heal the fragmented text, Marcus rhetorically attempts a totalizing move to heal the mutilated state: “O let me teach you how to knit again/ This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf,/ These broken limbs again into one body” (5.3.69-71).⁶

However, the textual and political unity that Marcus imagines as a mended body stands in stark contrast to the mutilated corpses that litter the stage by play’s end. Indeed, Marcus is compared to Aeneas telling the tale of Troy to “lovesick Dido’s sad-attending ear” (5.3.81). Rome’s comparison to Dido unsettlingly suggests that, like Aeneas, Marcus only reassures Rome now to betray her later. After all, Titus justifies Lavinia’s murder with an ironic deference to the Roman precedents that first precipitated the play’s bloody spectacle. So the play concludes with an unresolved tension between unifying gestures towards a re-knit Rome and the audience’s visceral memory of the murders and severed limbs that make those gestures impossible. This conclusion is made yet more uneasy by the play’s penultimate speech, which disturbs attempts to unwrite the tragic events of the play. Buried up to his shoulders, the play’s arch-machiavel, Aaron the Moor, delivers an unrepentant diatribe that puns endlessly on “I” and “eye,” as if now, captured and immobilized, he nevertheless recreates his destructive agency through a prosthetic gaze. Aaron’s punning foregrounds the audience’s own complicity as spectators of the play’s violence. This point has not escaped directors. The Romanian director Silviu Pucarete drew attention to this complicity by burying Aaron not onstage, but in the theater’s lobby so that as the audience left: “From his place of torment he hurled his curses at an audience made more vulnerable by the fact that the play was officially over.”⁷

As spectators, we can’t help but feel uncomfortable at the play’s ending, a discomfort that we, as critics, have largely tried to elide, mock, or ignore. But it is this discomfort that seems to hold the key to the theatrical success of the play. *Titus Andronicus* has the power to move audiences to a place of discomfort that leaves them fundamentally unsettled. In this collection, we take this discomfort as a point of

⁶ William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Jonathan Bate. The Arden Shakespeare. (Croatia: Arden Shakespeare, 2006). All references to *Titus* are from this edition.

⁷ Mariangela Tempera, *Feasting with Centaurs: ‘Titus Andronicus’ from Stage to Text* (Bologna: Clueb Editrice, 1999), 32, quoted in Alan Hughes “Introduction,” 53.

departure. Rather than attempting to reconcile the text into a uniform whole, our collection approaches the text as inherently dissonant. To this end we have chosen essays that not only work in conversation with each other, but that in particular work by complicating each other's arguments.

Our first three essays consider different material and visual contexts in which the play was approached in Elizabethan England, broadening a current critical understanding that focuses mostly on influences and sources. Nadia Bishai's essay explores *Titus* at Edward White's bookshop in St. Paul's Churchyard, where the play's first three quartos were exclusively sold. By examining the play in the context of the other materials alongside which it was sold, Bishai expands our understanding of the Elizabethan reception of the play as "literature of crime" and provides an alternative to critical approaches that have mined the play for its classical allusions. Muriel Cunin's essay takes our eyes from books to buildings, examining how Lavinia's mutilated and dismembered body paradoxically becomes a site of re-membering as a *locus memoria* familiar to scholars of Renaissance memory systems. Andrew McConnell Stott's argument parallels Cunin's focus on visual contexts, but instead locates the play's multitude of mutilated bodies as an iconoclastic rejection of embodied representation. However, rather than finding *Titus*'s iconoclasm as a product of Reformation urges, Stott entertains the connection between the play's exploration of representation and "Petrarchan apocalypse."

Critics have frequently examined the fragmented bodies in the text, reading a parallel between the state and the damaged female body. Our next four contributors provide alternative contexts for considering bodies and their reception in *Titus*. Jim Casey's essay moves our gaze from female to male bodies, which, as Casey notes, have been curiously overlooked by commentators who seem obsessively drawn to Lavinia and Tamora. Casey observes that the lack of attention given to male characters is particularly curious because, in contrast to Lavinia's offstage rape and mutilation, violence to male bodies is portrayed ritualistically onstage.

The attention to fragmented bodies on stage informs N.M. Imbraccio and Emily L. King's essays. Imbraccio's essay explores the use of stage prostheses in relation to *Titus*, following the props that transform from body parts to "stage hands." She contends that the persistence of these severed limbs, as they continue to circulate on stage, blurs the line between whole and severed body that criticism of *Titus* has traditionally draws and elides the implied power of the maimed body in the text. King's essay focuses on one particular maimed body, that of Lavinia, considering the engagement of the audience with the spectacle of this mutilated and silent body. Reading the maimed Lavinia through the lens of Giorgio

Agamben's *muselmann*, King considers the gendered complications of staging this "bare life" in the context of early modern pornography that suggests an eroticized function to Lavinia's "living death." Liberty S. Stanavage turns our attention to the reception of another female body, Tamora, and its relationship to the question of revenge that drives the play. She examines Edward Ravenscroft's changes to Tamora in his 1687 rewriting of the play in the light of changing models of gender and emotion to highlight Ravenscroft's rejection of the dehumanizing nature of revenge in Shakespeare's text.

Paxton Hehmeyer's conclusion to our volume returns our attention to Aaron and our own voyeuristic complicity in the play's spectacle, a connection highlighted by Thomas Nashe's parodic response to the play in his 1594 *The Unfortunate Traveler*. Hehmeyer briefly considers what is at stake in approaching *Titus* as a fragmented text.

In approaching *Titus* as inherently dissonant, something to be considered in multiple contexts, we have tried to collect essays that consider the play's difficulties as opportunities for interpretation, rather than simply problems to be solved. By doing so, we hope to provide a collection that recognizes *Titus*'s success as not occurring despite its "indecorousness" but precisely because of it.

CHAPTER ONE

‘AT THE SIGNE OF THE GUNNE’: *TITUS ANDRONICUS*, THE LONDON BOOK TRADE AND THE LITERATURE OF CRIME, 1590-1615

NADIA BISHAI
KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

Titus: How now, Lavinia? Marcus, what means this?
Some book there is that she desires to see.
Which is it, girl, of these? Open them, boy.

[...]

Lucius what book is that she tosseth so?

Lucius: Grandsire, 'tis Ovid's *Metamorphosis*;

[...]

Titus: *Helps her.*

Soft, so busily she turns the leaves!

What would she find? Lavinia, shall I read?

This is the tragic tale of Philomel,

And treats of Tereus' treason and his rape-

(4.1.30-32, 41-42, 45-48)¹

Tongue ripped out, upper limbs lopped off and raped at least twice, Lavinia finally identifies a means of partially communicating the truth of the crimes committed against her. Helped to sift through a pile of books, she directs her father, Titus, to Ovid's account of 'the tragic tale of Philomel'—the rape of Philomela and her glossectomy to prevent her

¹ William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate, Arden 3 (Routledge, 1995; repr. Thomson Learning, 2004). All subsequent quotations from the play-text are from this edition.

revealing her rapist's identity—thus confirming Lavinia's relatives' worst fears. A key dramatic moment in the play, this is also a key textual moment, operating on several levels within and beyond *Titus Andronicus*. By including a material copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* on stage and in the playtext, Shakespeare deliberately foregrounds a series of physical and inter-textual relationships. Most immediately, a direct link is established between the mute, mutilated body of Lavinia and the book detailing her predicament, providing meanings about her corporeality. This moment too physically links Titus—through his 'reading' the 'tale' aloud—to the same book which elsewhere details his (forthcoming) acts of infanticide.² Together, these connections point towards the importance of the *Metamorphoses* to yet another material entity: the text of *Titus* as a whole. We are alerted to this Ovidian work as a source of narratives or—in Jonathan Bate's words—'patterns' Shakespeare employs and re-writes in 4.1 and throughout *Titus*. And, through this, the final set of material and textual connections at work here becomes visible. For, besides creating links internal and self-reflexive, material and inter-textual, this copy of the *Metamorphoses* on stage and in the text gestures outwards beyond the confines of the theatre and the script to other inter-connected material, textual entities. It points to the actual copy of the *Metamorphoses* used by Shakespeare; to other Latin texts and English translations of the popular classical work circulating at the time; and, finally, to other contemporaneous English writings, dramatic and non-dramatic, similarly informed by Ovid's tales.³

Confronting us with the *Metamorphoses* at this exact point in 4.1, Shakespeare impresses upon us that his play, *Titus Andronicus*, does not exist in splendid textual isolation but rather explicitly and materially participates in, and contributes to, a network of textual production centered

² As Bate points out, although explicitly linked to Philomela, Lavinia is also connected to Io in the *Metamorphoses*. Unlike Philomela who weaves the identity of her rapist into her tapestry, Io (as a cow) scratches the name of her assailant in the sand (Bate, 'Introduction,' *Titus*, 92). Similarly, Titus as an infanticidal parent recalls other figures in the *Metamorphoses* like Tantalus (and perhaps, to a lesser extent—through his self-inflicted castration and therefore arguable emasculation—Medea). Later, of course, in 5.3, Titus's resemblance to Tantalus (as well as Procne) is simultaneously furthered and altered by Titus's preparation of a dish made of the bodies of Chiron and Demetrius; the children, not of Titus, but of Tamora.

³ For a complete list of the primary sources cited in this essay please consult Appendix A: 'At the Signe of the Gunne': Primary Sources.

around this particular classical text. Given this emphasis on material and inter-textual relationships here, it becomes all the more important to remember that—despite its dramatic, textual and cultural significance—the *Metamorphoses* is not the only book on stage but rather one of several Lucius drops and Lavinia goes through. To be sure, these volumes remain tantalizingly anonymous and elusive; nevertheless, their inclusion in this specific moment of heightened verbal and visual inter-textuality is extremely provocative. Indeed, it seems to me, these (purposefully?) unnamed books suggest we should think about literary contexts, inter-textual relationships and types of materialities beyond those pertaining to Ovid and the *Metamorphoses* when thinking about *Titus*.

In this chapter, then, I explore one avenue through which such re-contextualizing of *Titus Andronicus* can be conducted, mapping some of its consequences for our readings of it. More specifically, I attend to the facts, conditions and implications of the sale of all three quartos of *Titus*—among Shakespeare’s most crime-steeped plays—at a single bookshop: the Sign of the Gun, between 1594 and 1611 by one stationer, Edward White, who sells the largest, most diverse range of crime-related works among contemporaneous vendors of Shakespearean quartos and who assembles a catalogue of titles approximately one quarter of which is classifiable as literature of crime.⁴ Such attention, I argue, reveals the *Titus* quartos as materially connected to other works about crime at the Gun—through bookseller and printers—thus making the quartos visible as part of, and contributors to, a network of production and circulation of literature of crime within the London book trade. Simultaneously, recognizing the quartos as part of a distinct collection of books, and thus of an equally distinct category within this collection, enables us to begin to see initial receptions and classifications of *Titus*. These, in turn, are extremely significant in suggesting a fresh, unexplored literary context for *Titus*—viz. popular literature of crime—a context which itself offers new and revised insights into the play.

To these ends, I begin with an account of Edward White as a “citizen and stationer of London.” Using the literature of crime he sells as representative of his larger catalogue, I illustrate his practices as bookseller, licenser and printer. These enable us to see White and the

⁴ Respectively: William Shakespeare, *The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (STC 22328, 1594); *The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (STC 22329, 1600); *The most lamentable tragedie of Titus Andronicus* (STC 22330, 1611).

Gun's commercial and textual connections with the London book trade and within this, crucially, *Titus*'s own such connections as well as White's apparent reception of, and relationship to, the play. I then narrow my focus and chronological scope to the three quartos and the years immediately surrounding their printing and sale to expose material and thematic connections among *Titus* and the literature of crime in White's catalogue. Finally, I examine the text of *Titus* itself, considering notable ways *Titus* uses and occasionally questions aspects and conventions of the literature of crime in England, c. 1590-1615.

Edward White, 'Citizen And Stationer Of London,' The Signe Of The Gunne & The Literature Of Crime

Despite increasing scholarship devoted to individual early modern English stationers, Edward White remains relatively obscure. This obscurity, however, is nothing short of staggering if we consider that White's career as stationer spans about forty years; that during this time he licenses and sells numerous texts that have received considerable critical attention; and, perhaps most importantly, that White not only sells all three quartos of *Titus Andronicus* but in doing so also vends the first Shakespearean play to be printed and sold.⁵

From the extant evidence, we know Edward White (born 1548/1549?) is the son of John White, a mercer of Bury St Edmund's, Suffolk,⁶ and

⁵ There is no entry dedicated to Edward White in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter *ODNB*). Instead, White is only referred to briefly within the *ODNB*'s entries for the following six people: Thomas Arden, James Roberts, Laurence Ramsay, Thomas Salter, Thomas Nelson and Thomas Lodge. The most extensive account of White as a stationer I have located to date is in 'Appendix B' of Leo Kirschbaum's *Shakespeare and the Stationers* (The Ohio State University Press, 1955), 314–318.

⁶ The details of White's parentage, age and date of birth are derived from the entry detailing his apprenticeship in Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 AD*, 5 vols (Privately Printed, 1875-1894), vol. I (1875), fol. 130r and H. G. Aldis' comment on the common ages of apprentices in 'XVIII. The Book Trade, 1557-1625,' in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, eds. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, 15 vols. (CUP, 1908–27), vol. iv (1909), 387-388. I explain my calculation of White's age in more detail below (see fn. 10). Unless otherwise noted, all dates are given in new style.

brother to Andreas (or Andrew) White, whom he apprentices in 1576.⁷ At some stage, White marries Sara Lodge, a daughter of the second marriage of Sir Thomas Lodge, merchant and (for a time) mayor of London.⁸ Notably, through this union, White becomes brother-in-law to the well-known writer, Thomas Lodge, Sara's half-brother.⁹ The Whites have at least one child, Edward junior, who survives to adulthood. After Edward White senior's death in late 1612 or early 1613,¹⁰ Edward White junior takes over the Sign of the Gun with his mother, Widow White, until her death c. 1615. The son, however, appears to have been less successful than

⁷ Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fol. 130r. According to this entry, dated 22 October, 1576, 'Andreas white sonne of john white of sainte edmondes burye in the county of suffolk merceur hath put himselfe Apprentice of Edward White [...]' According to McKerrow *et al*, Andrew White was also a 'bookseller in London, 1584-92; At the Royal Exchange over against the Conduit, in Cornhill. [...] [Andrew] took up his freedom on August 15th, 1584 [Arber, ii. 692]. His first entry in the Registers was a pamphlet relating to a sea-fight, and was made on May 15th, 1591 [Arber, ii. 582], and his last on July 22nd in the same year [Arber, ii, 591].' See R. B. McKerrow *et al*, *A Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640* (Printed for the Bibliographic Society, 1910), 287. Remarkably, the White brothers only appear to have been professionally involved once in the production of a single text: Anon., *Articles accorded for the truce generall in France* (STC 13117, 1593), which was printed by John Wolfe for Andrew White and sold at the Gun according to the imprint.

McKerrow *et al* also include entries on Edward White senior and Edward White junior; both entries, however, are brief and the former is identified as 'deal[ing] largely in ballads' (*Dictionary*, 288).

⁸ See Alexandra Halasz, 'Lodge, Thomas (1558-1625),' *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16923>, accessed 3 May 2011] and Anita McConnell, 'Lodge, Sir Thomas (1509/10-1585),' *ODNB* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16922>, accessed 3 May 2011].

⁹ Indeed, White is apparently the first stationer to enter a work by Lodge; namely, *[An epitaphe of the ladie Anne Lodge by T Lodge]* (Entered by White, 23 December, 1579). Given their close family connection, it is rather odd that White is not more involved with Lodge's output. The *Epitaphe* is the only work by Lodge that White licenses and he only markets two other works by Lodge: *Prosopopeia* (STC 16662a; 16662b, 1596) and *A treatise of the plague* (STC 16676, 1603), co-selling the latter with Nicholas Ling.

¹⁰ Edward White senior's final entry in the *Registers* is dated 12 August, 1612. The next White-related entry is that of Sara White, 'mistres white wydowe,' dated 12 January, 1613. See Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. III (1876), fols 224r and 233r, respectively.

the father, for in 1619 the Gun seems at least partially taken over by John Grismand.¹¹

If details of White's personal life remain fairly thin, those of his career are not. Both his rise through the Stationers' Company's ranks and his commercial activities can be more precisely charted and strongly point to White as a successful, industrious member of the London book trade. Beginning his career in 1565 (aged seventeen?) as William Lobley's apprentice,¹² White is likely made a freeman of the Company by the end of 1572 or sometime in 1573.¹³ By 1576, White is well-established enough to take on his first apprentice and in 1577 he enters his first copy in the Stationers' Registers.¹⁴ Just over eleven years later in 1588, White is

¹¹ In 1619, texts begin appearing which identify 'John Grismand' as 'dwelling at the little north door of St Paul's Church at the sign of the Gun.' Court Book C, however, shows Edward White junior was still assigning licenses in that year. See William A. Jackson, ed., *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1602-1640* (Bibliographic Society, 1957), 112-113.

¹² Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. I (1875), fol. 130r. Although White's apprenticeship is entered on 22 July 1566, the entry states his apprenticeship had begun the previous year on 'the feaste of sayncte mygchell [29 September] anno 1565 (ibid.)'. According to Aldis, '[t]he term of apprenticeship varied from seven to eleven years, so arranged that the apprentice should reach at least the age of twenty-four years before the expiration of his term.' See Aldis, 'XVIII. The Book Trade, 1557-1625,' 387-388. If this is true in White's case, then he would have been 24 at the end of his apprenticeship in either late 1572 or early 1573 (see below) and therefore 17 when he began it in 1565.

¹³ The uncertainty of the precise date is a consequence, as Arber notes, of the lack of 'detailed annual Wardens' accounts' spanning the period between '22nd July 1571 and the 20th July 1576.' See Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. I (1875), fol. 209v.

¹⁴ The names of Edward White's apprentices and the years in which they enter into their apprenticeships are as follows: Richard Burnham (1579); Oliver Willoughby (1583); John Lastlis (Lascels?) (1584); Ralph Glazier (1589); John Crompton (1589); Richard Sawyer (1594); John Wright (1594); William Rocket (1595); Bartholomew Sutton (1601); William Blanchard (1602); and William Byard (1604). For individual entries, see respectively, Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fols. 27v; 42v; 44v; 61v; 62v; 78v; 80v; 85r; 112r; 116v; 125v. On average, White has three apprentices at any given time. There are, however, a few instances when the number either drops below or goes over three when there are gaps or overlaps between old and new apprentices. In 1588 for example, Oliver Willoughby is the only apprentice at the Sign of the Gun between March and June, whereas, in the summer of 1595, White has four apprentices: Glazier, Crompton, Sawyer and Rocket. For White's first entry of a copy, see Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fol. 137r.

“chosen and admitted into the livery of” the Company, taking his oath in June.¹⁵ In 1600, White serves as under warden, becoming a senior warden in 1606.¹⁶ By the end of his career, then, White arrived at the highest post within the Company bar one: Master, indicating White’s hard work, canny business sense and close working relationships with fellow stationers.

Unsurprisingly, these indications are borne out by White’s profile as bookseller, licenser and printer as evidenced by the imprints of extant works identifying him in some capacity, the White-related entries in the *Stationers’ Registers* and the composite picture they form.¹⁷ But, before studying these, two things need clarifying. As mentioned above, my account of White as a stationer is derived primarily from his collection of works about crime. This is largely because this section of his catalogue is most relevant to the current discussion and because, while (roughly) a quarter of White’s entire catalogue, the literature of crime is representative of White’s general activities as a stationer. It is also, to a lesser extent, the

¹⁵ Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fol. 415v.

¹⁶ Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), 838, 841, 790. See also W. W. Greg and Eleanor Boswell, eds, *Records of the Court of the Stationers’ Company, 1576 to 1602, from Register B* (Bibliographical Society, 1930), xxxii; 48; 77.

¹⁷ As imprints of early modern texts are sometimes incomplete or unclear, I have used the *English Short-Title Catalogue* (hereafter *ESTC*) as my primary source for the bibliographic details of extant texts with which White is associated. Furthermore, when carrying out searches using the *ESTC*, I have searched for variant spellings and abbreviations of ‘White’ (including the various combinations of ‘Edward,’ ‘Eedward,’ ‘Edvvard,’ ‘Edwarde,’ ‘Edvvarde,’ ‘E.,’ ‘[E.],’ ‘White[s],’ ‘VWhite[s],’ ‘VVhyte[s],’ ‘Whyte[s],’ ‘VVhyt[s],’ ‘Whyt[s],’ ‘W[hite],’ ‘W[hites],’ ‘VV[hites],’ ‘VV[hite],’ ‘[White],’ ‘W.,’ and [W.]’) since the *ESTC* still does not automatically or systematically look for variants. Two other things must be noted here. (1) In arriving at my conclusions, I have included all of the entries to White in the *Registers*, even if there is no extant copy and in the knowledge that all such texts may not have been printed. I have done so since to ignore these texts is to ignore evidence of the types of texts that White licensed and which serve as crucial indicators to the types of texts he actually spent money on; whether because he intended, at that point at least, to sell them, or, perhaps because he was attempting to prevent other stationers from licensing them. (While there is no immediate evidence of the latter, it remains one viable motivation for stationers to purchase licenses). And (2), while my account here of White’s activities as bookseller, licenser and printer is extensive, it is not-indeed, cannot be-exhaustive. As White’s own catalogue demonstrates, not all printed texts were licensed and, in these cases, if the text in question is no longer extant, short of a reference being made to it elsewhere, all traces of such a text have been lost.

consequence of the overall size of White's catalogue whose vastness precludes an adequately comprehensive account of it here.

The other necessary elaboration here is my understanding of the 'literature of crime.' Literary critics widely (and correctly) take the literature of crime to refer to the immensely popular early modern pamphlets, ballads and (often) plays dealing with serious offences like murder, treason and witchcraft, those who commit them and (frequently) such offenders' judicial punishments and executions. But, as I argue at greater length elsewhere, the current remit of this literary category is limited, requiring reassessment and considerable expansion.¹⁸ My grounds for this lie in corrections and fresh insights offered by several recent revisionist historical studies of early modern crime, most notably by J. A. Sharpe, Cynthia Herrup, Malcolm Gaskill and Marjorie McIntosh.¹⁹ As Sharpe and Gaskill observe, the early moderns had a distinctly different understanding of crime to us. Most pivotally, they had, as Sharpe puts it, "not so much a willingness to criminalize sin as [...] a widespread inability to [distinguish] between the two."²⁰ Sharpe, Herrup and McIntosh have also collectively shown the importance of (recognizing) the different categories of crimes: serious crimes, including felonies like murder, treason and witchcraft; petty crimes, including petty theft, scolding and defamation; and social misdemeanors, like night-walking and eaves-dropping. Furthermore, these historians demonstrate that court records reveal petty crimes and social misdemeanors are more common than serious crimes and that, with social misdemeanors, types of behavior viewed as socially deviant could be brought to trial despite there being no

¹⁸ See Nadia Bishai 'Blacke Bookes,' in *Encountering Ephemera: Scholarship, Performance, Classroom*, eds Joshua B. Fisher and Rachel Steinberger (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, forthcoming); *Bodies of Evidence: Women, Writing and Crime in Early Modern England* (forthcoming).

¹⁹ Respectively: J. A. Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, 2nd ed., Themes in British Social History, ed. John Stevenson (Longman, 1999); Cynthia B. Herrup, *The Common Peace: Participation and the Criminal Law in Seventeenth-Century England*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History, eds. Anthony Fletcher, John Guy and John Morrill (CUP, 1987); Malcolm Gaskill, *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History, eds. Anthony Fletcher, John Guy and John Morrill (CUP, 2000); Marjorie Keniston McIntosh, *Controlling Misbehaviour in England, 1370-1600*, Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time, eds. Roger Schofield et al, vol. 34 (CUP, 1998).

²⁰ Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, 8.

(current) legislation to deal with such disruptive behavior. Given all this, our understanding of the popular literature of crime needs to be expanded in accordance with these revisions of the historically different, specific understandings of and actual engagements with crime and criminals in the period. Consequently too, we should include more general writings about offences of all types since such writings are produced by, and contribute to the continued circulation of, these conceptualizations and interactions.

Bearing such re-definitions in mind, when we return to White's catalogue, we discover a large number of texts immediately classifiable as literature of crime in the traditional sense: popular literature—pamphlets, ballads and plays—dealing with serious offences, serious offenders and their (usually fatal) judicial punishments. Most frequently, we encounter works detailing three of the most widely reported crimes and criminals at the time: treason, traitors, heresy, heretics, murder and murderers in their various forms. We find prose accounts of the traitorous, rebellious and seditious actions of the Babington Plotters as well as the trials and executions of heretics like Edmund Campion along with exposés of their heretical views.²¹ Similarly, we find accounts of homicide in pamphlets like that on *VWilliam Sherwood* and plays like Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish tragedie* and *Titus*; petty treason, or the murder of a husband by his wife, in the fact-based drama *Arden of Feuersham*; and infanticide in *Titus* and Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, part 2.²² Likewise, White stocks

²¹ Respectively: Thomas Nelson, *A short discourse: expressing the substaunce of all the late pretended treasons against the Queenes Maiestie* (STC 18425.5, [1586]); *A short discourse: expressing the substaunce of all the late pretended treasons against the queenes maiestie [...]* *Ballad* (STC 18426, [1586]); *A proper newe ballad declaring the substaunce of all the late pretended treasons against the Queenes Maiestie [...]* (STC 18426.5, [1586]); Anthony Munday, *A discoverie of Edmund Campion, and his confederates* (STC 18270; 18270.5, 1582). See also, for works on treason, Thomas Churchyard, *The moste true reporte of Iames Fitz Morrice death, and others the like offe[n]ders* (STC 5244, 1579 [?]); Anon., [*An excellent dyttye made as a generall reoiycinge for the cutting off [f] of the Scottiche queene*] (Entered by White, 27 February, 1587); C. C., trans., Gerard Proninck, *Short admonition or warning, upon the detestable treason wherewith Sir William Stanley and Rowland Yorke* (STC 23228.7, 1587); and for works on heresy, see Anthony Munday, *The araignement, and execution of a wilfull and obstinate traitour, named Eueralde Ducket* (STC 18259.3, 1581) and Stephen Bredwell, *A detection of Ed. Glouers hereticall confection* (STC 3598, 1586).

²² Respectively: Anon., [*A true report of the late horrible murther committed by VWilliam Sherwood, prisoner in the Queenes Benche*] (STC 22432, 1581); Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish tragedie* (STC 15086, 1592; 15087, 1594); Shakespeare, *Titus*

accounts of witchcraft, including the popular prose pamphlet about *Doctor Iohn Faustus*, and robbery as well as reports of criminals' executions and 'last dying speeches'.²³

Importantly though, in addition to such conventional crime-preoccupied works, White's catalogue includes texts concerned with petty crimes and social misdemeanors; texts demonstrating the slippage between 'sin' and 'crime'; and texts delineating legal, spiritual and social behavioral guidelines. We encounter ballads 'warninge' 'curst wyves,' advising adherence to established gender norms and modes of acceptable social (sexual and verbal) behavior; ballads dealing with prostitution and fraud; and ballads evidencing divine punishment for anti-social and sinful

(STC 22328, 1594; STC 22329, 1600; STC 22330, 1611); Anon., *The lamentable and true tragedie of M. Arden of Feuersham* (STC 733, 1592; 734, 1599); Shakespeare, *Titus*, *op. cit.*; Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Greate [...]* *The second part* (STC 17428a, 1606). In the second half of this chapter, I consider at much greater length the ways in which the crime-related content of and textual conventions employed in *Titus* situate the play within the category of literature of crime.

For additional works in White's catalogue on homicide, see Anon., *The arraignment, examination, confession and iudgement of Arnold Cosbye: vwho wilfully murdered the Lord Burke* (STC 5813, 1591); on fratricide, see Anon., [*the true historie and faythfull relacion of a most horrible murder committed by Alphonse Diazius*] (Entered by White, 21 July, 1577); on petty treason, see Anon., *The trueth of the most wicked and secret murdering of Iohn Brewen* (STC 15095, 1592); and on suicide, see Anon., [*the fall of th[e]rle of Northumberland yat killed him self in ye Tower*] (Entered by White, 1 August, 1586); William Averell, *An excellent historie [...] of Charles and Iulia* (STC 980, 1581); and Anon., [*A ballad of Malmerophus and Sillera*] (STC 17212, 1582 [?]).

²³ Respectively: P. F., trans., Anon., *The historie of the damnable life, and deserued death of Doctor Iohn Faustus* (STC 10711, 1592; 10712, 1608; 10712.5, 1610); Anon., [*A dolefull Discourse or sorrowful sonnet made by one Edward Ffallowes who lately sufred death at Sainct Thomas wateringe for a Robberie*] (Entered by White, 30 August, 1578); Anon., [*a Dittie of a prisoner that suffered deathe at Leicester in lent 1586 at th[e]assises*] (Entered by White, 8 August, 1586).

For other works in White's catalogue on witchcraft, see Anon., *A detection of damnable driftes, practized by three vvitches arraigned at Chelmifforde in Essex* (STC 5115, 1579); Anon., [*ye skratchinge of ye wytche*] (Entered by White, 19 August, 1579); and Anon., *A rehearsall both straung and true, of hainous and horrible actes committed by Elizabeth Stile* (STC 23267, 1579).

behavior like drunkenness.²⁴ By the same token, White sells plays, like Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris*, which centralize linked sins and crimes including sexual immorality, heresy and murder.²⁵ He also vends prose fictions, like Robert Greene's *Philomela*, which include numerous misdeeds, malefactors and judicial processes as well as instances of real and false accusations of sexual immorality; non-fictional prose news pamphlets relating war crimes; and prison writing.²⁶ And, lastly, White's catalogue holds works of religious instruction, like Leonard Wright's *Summons for Sleepers*, critically singling out sinful behaviors—many classifiable as social misdemeanors—like gambling, sexual immorality and the corruption of clergymen and officers of the law.²⁷

White's catalogue of crime-related works—including the three *Titus* quartos—is thus made up of texts falling into both traditional and revised definitions of 'literature of crime'. Beyond this, though, a survey of these materials reveals three other facts relevant to our understanding of *Titus* in this context. Firstly, *Titus* emerges as part of a collection of works whose crime-specific contents variously reflect those of the play. We also find

²⁴ Respectively: Anon., [*A warninge or fayringe to curst wyves &c*] (Entered by White, 1 August, 1586); Anon., [*An example to all lewd huswyues &c.*] (Entered by White, 1 August, 1586); Anon., [*Twenty Orders of Calettes and Drabes*] (Entered by White, 3 July, 1601); Anon., [*a Cosener of Antwerpe*] (Entered by White, 16 August, 1586); Anon., [*A ballad shewing how a fond woman falsely accused her self to be the kinge of Spaines daughter and beinge founde a lyer was for the same whipped through London the xiiijth of December 1592 beinge known to be a butchers daughter of London*] (Entered by White, 18 December, 1592); Anon., [*Th[e]example of Gods wrath ouer ij drunkardes at Nerkershofen*] (Entered by White, 1 August, 1586).

²⁵ Christopher Marlowe, *The Massacre at Paris* (STC 17423, 1594 [?]).

²⁶ Respectively: Robert Greene, *Philomela. The Lady Fitzvaters nightingale* (STC 12296, 1592); T. D., trans., Anon., *A true discourse of the most happy victories obtayned by the French King, against the rebels and enemies of his Maiesty* (STC 13143; 13143.3, 1589); Thomas Saunders, *A true discription and breefe discourse, of a most lamentable voiage, made latelie to Tripolie in Barbarie [...]* *Set foorth by Thomas Saunders, one of those captiues there at the same time* (STC 21778, 1587). For other crime-related prose works in White's catalogue see, for example, J. Hammon, trans., Barthelemy Aneau, *Alektor* (STC 633, 1590); Anon., *The assise of bread* (STC 876, 1608); Anon., [*The sudden death happeninge at Exeter [as]sises 1586*] (Entered by White, 1 August, 1586).

²⁷ Leonard Wright, *A summons for sleepers* (STC 26035, 1596). See also Martin Parker, *Admonition [...] to all suche as shall intende hereafter to enter the state of matrimonye godly and agreablye to lawes* (STC 19288, [1605?]).

that, generically speaking, the vast majority of these works are popular literature: ballads (thirty-six), pamphlets (thirty-three) and plays (twenty).²⁸ *Titus*, therefore, is part of a considerable cluster of crime-related popular literature available at the Gun. Perhaps most importantly, however, this survey reveals the regular availability of crime-related works at this bookshop between 1577 and 1612. For, out of these thirty-five years, twenty-seven of them evidence White licensing literature of crime and selling it at the Gun. Put slightly differently, there are only eight years-specifically, 1585, 1588, 1595, 1597, 1598, 1604, 1607 and 1609-in which White does not license nor does he appear to print or have reprinted a crime-related work. Crucially, however, I believe that in addition to being exceptions that prove a rule, these eight years hold a different type of evidence of the presence of literature of crime at the Gun. Close scrutiny of these years of apparent inactivity shows that they are almost all preceded or followed by notable movements within White's collection of crime-related materials. 1588 and 1595 are preceded by spikes in the number of works of crime licensed, printed and sold: seven items in both 1587 and 1594, while 1585, 1598 and 1604 are each followed by a notable influx of literature of crime: nineteen items in 1586 and six in both 1599 and 1606. Taken together with White's regular sale of such works, therefore, these eight years do not bespeak a lack of crime-related materials at the Gun but strongly support the opposite; that during these eight years, White is moving (or trying to move) existing crime-related stock before introducing more. And, as we will shortly see, both the consistent sale of literature of crime at the Gun and the real likelihood of stock overflow are pivotal to the immediate textual contexts in which the three *Titus* quartos are sold.

From his catalogue, then, White clearly has a vested interest in (various types of) literature of crime throughout his career. However, his catalogue evidences more than this, providing valuable insights into White's practices as printer, licenser and bookseller. Of all three, printing is either the area in which White is the least active or for which there is least proof. Certainly, the extant works White licenses, sells or both suggest White does not print much. With only four texts apparently co-printed by White,²⁹ the overwhelming majority of this material including the three

²⁸ The rest are works couched primarily in religious discourse (six), prison writings (two) and a work of legal history.

²⁹ Respectively: Anon., *VVilliam Sherwood* (STC 22432, 1581); Munday, *Eueralde Ducket* (STC 18259.3, 1581); and T. D., trans., Anon., *French King against the*

Titus quartos is produced for White over the years by seventeen printers.³⁰

rebels (STC 13143; 13143.3, 1589). The first and second seem to have been printed by White and John Charlewood, and the third and fourth by White and John Wolfe.

³⁰ These printers and the years in which they produce crime-related materials for White are as follows: Felix Kingston (1579); John Kingston (1579); Robert Waldergrave (1581); John Charlewood (1581, 1582); George Robinson (1586); Thomas Purfoote (1586); John Wolfe (1586, 1589, 1590, 1591); Richard Jones (1587); Thomas Orwin (1590, 1592); Edward Alde (1591, 1592, 1594?, 1599, 1602, 1605, 1606, 1610, 1611); Robert Bourne (1592); John Danter (1594); Abell Jeffes (1594); Adam Islip (1596); William White (1599, 1610?); James Roberts (1599, 1600); and John Windet (1608). It is worth noting here that several of these printers also regularly print non-crime-related materials that White either licenses or which White simply sells, most notably John Charlewood (1578-1582; 1584, 1588), John Wolfe (1582; 1586-1593), Edward Alde (1586?-1594; 1596-1600; 1602-1612), Adam Islip (1594-1601) and James Roberts (1595-1596; 1598-1602). (Note: All of the above dates refer only to the years in which these printers produced materials for White. The number of texts printed by each printer *per* year, both crime- and non-crime-related, varies dramatically).

The limited evidence of White-as-printer notwithstanding, it is important to observe that the *Registers*' fines sections and the records of the Stationers' Court do suggest White's more frequent involvement in printing than the extant material since such entries explicitly refer to White fined for 'printing' rather than 'selling'—a distinction the fines sections in the *Registers* regularly make. On 24 February, 1583, for example, Richard Jones is fined 'for printinge a ballat without order,' whereas on 15 September, 1589 Jones is fined for 'selling of a booke contrary to order.' In keeping with this, if rather more dramatically, we find that on 25 June, 1600, Edward Alde and William White are fined five shillings each for 'print[ing]' 'a Disorderly ballade of the wife of bathe,' while Edward White is fined ten shillings for 'selling it' and is given a suspended prison sentence. Respectively: Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fols 409v; 413v; 398r.

As well as suggesting White's more frequent engagement with printing, his fines may also help explain why so little material evidence of White-as-printer remains. Six out of the seven occasions White is penalized (as illustrated collectively in the fine entries in the *Registers* and *Records of the Court*) pertain specifically to his printing of a ballad, suggesting that ballads are a type of text that White prints. Indeed, the only text which seems to evidence White as sole printer is a ballad: Anon., *An excellent new ballad, shewing the petigree of our royall King Iames* (STC 14423, [1603]). If we then add to this the facts that the ballads which White regularly enters form the single largest group of non-extant texts licensed by White and the fairly low survival rate for these single sheets, it is feasible we do not possess more evidence of White-as-printer because he most consistently devoted himself to the material production of a highly ephemeral form.

Contrastively, White's licensing and sales practices are much more certain and his involvement in them far more substantial. Generally, in the *Registers*, White is the sole licensor of titles of his collection of crime materials (and indeed everything else).³¹ Nevertheless, White is not an entirely solitary licensor, occasionally sharing rights of texts with other stationers-including, it is worth noting, his co-acquisition with Thomas Nelson of Robert Greene's *Notable Discouery of Cosenage* in 1591.³² Interestingly, a similar trend emerges from White's sales practices. Almost 70% of the crime-related works White markets are titles for which he is the sole licensor and seller, while the remaining 30% are mostly works licensed by other stationers. Importantly, though, this 30% also contains a handful of instances where White does things differently; namely, a few texts White co-sells with other stationers and other texts for which he holds (part of) the license but does not sell. Significant in themselves, these exceptions are supremely relevant to our understanding of the *Titus* quartos at the Sign of the Gun for three inter-related reasons. First and foremost, it emerges that the quartos themselves are, in many respects, among precisely such exceptions within White's catalogue. Secondly, and more generally, these exceptions reinforce the overall emerging sense that White actively acquires a catalogue over which he largely assumes considerable control even as he works with fellow stationers. And thirdly,

³¹ Most commonly, White licenses texts directly, but he also buys licenses from, or is made the assign of, other stationers. Notably however, apart from one exception, neither of the two latter practices occurs in relation to the literature of crime. The exception in this instance is P. F., trans., Anon., *Doctor Iohn Faustus* which White first sells in 1592 and which is then entered to White on 5 April, 1596, White 'havinge th[e]interest of abell Jeffes thereto' (Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. III (1876), fol. 10r). For a complete list of works assigned to and from Edward White, see Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. V (1894), cix.

³² Greene, *A notable discouery of coosenage* (STC 12279, 1591). Within his collection of literature of crime, the other text White co-licenses (with Robert Jones) is Thomas Saunders' account of his imprisonment in *A True Description [...] of a lamentable voyage [...] to Tripolie* (STC 21778, 1587). See Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fols 282v and 217r, respectively. It should be observed that there are considerably more examples of White co-licensing elsewhere in his non-crime related catalogue including Anon., *A myraculous, and monstrous, but yet most true, and certayne discourse, of a woman* (STC 6910.7, 1588) (Entered to Thomas Orwin, Edward White, Richard Jones and Henry Carr, 28 October, 1588); and William Heane, ed., *Lilies Ryles Constrved* (STC 15633.4, 1603) (Entered to Thomas Dawson, Edward White, W. Leake and Cuthbert Burby, 29 November, 1603).

it is, I argue, through a consideration of these two factors, the tensions between them and their consequences that we can begin to reconstruct White's relationship to, control over and even view of *Titus*.

As a text sold by White but licensed by another stationer, *Titus* immediately falls into the smaller group of 30% and thus the group over which he has less control. John Danter, of course, first enters *Titus* the play (and the ballad) on 6 February, 1594.³³ And, at some point—probably between February or March 1597 (when Danter's press is dismantled) and 1602—Thomas Millington acquires the license to *Titus* since he assigns it to Thomas Pavier on 19 April, 1602.³⁴ But, beyond being a work marketed but unlicensed by White, the title page of Q1 with its reference to Thomas Millington places the Shakespearean play within an even smaller subgroup in White's catalogue of crime: works which White co-sells. Together, these two facts intimate White's control over *Titus* is comparatively limited by his standards. However, as we know, White commissions and vends a second and third printing of the play in 1600 and 1611. Moreover, on the title pages of Q2 and Q3, the only stationer's name involved with these editions appearing in full is Edward White's. Q2's imprint refers to the printer using only his initials 'I. R.,' while Q3's makes no verbal reference to the printer, Edward Allde, at all.³⁵ Hence, neither Q2 nor Q3 mention the license holders (whether Millington or Pavier) thus privileging White's connection to the play. Suggestive in itself, such privileging of White—and, by extension, his degree of control over *Titus*, and the value he attaches to it—is considerably furthered upon closer inspection of the title pages of all three quartos, notwithstanding questions they variously raise.

In many respects, the title page of Q2 is the most curious because of the absence of Millington's name in 1600, the oddity of which becomes apparent when seen in light of the following. Firstly, from Q1, we know Millington is involved in the earlier co-sale of *Titus* (a fact deserving further scrutiny as I explain below). Secondly, we know that between 1594 and 1603 Millington is involved with six Shakespearean quartos including Q1, three of which are printed in 1600. Thirdly, the title pages of all these

³³ Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. II (1875), fol. 304v. For a recent revised account of Danter's entry of both and of the relationship between the play and the ballad, see Richard Levin, 'Titus Andronicus and "The Ballad Thereof",' *N&Q*, March (2000) 63-68.

³⁴ Arber, ed., *Registers*, vol. III (1876), fol. 80v.

³⁵ Both Q2 and Q3, though, do bear their printer's title borders and devices, respectively.

six quartos (including Q1) name Millington whether he sells the play on his own or with others and regardless of the plays' availability at Millington's shop.³⁶ And fourthly, we know Millington is the license holder of *Titus* for a period of time prior to 1602. All this, therefore, makes the fact that in 1600 Millington is not named on the title page of Q2 of *Titus* notable, provocatively pointing to Millington's limited or even non-existent control over, involvement in or claim to the play. One particularly intriguing possibility suggested by the absence of Millington's name in 1600 is that he does not yet own *Titus*' license. If so, this gestures towards a dip in Millington's fluctuating involvement with and control over the play. It may also illuminate the time-frame within which the license changes hands. For, if Millington does not have the right to *Titus* when Q2 is printed, then he must obtain it at some point after this printing but before 19 April, 1602 when he passes it on to Pavier. Such a scenario, though, while narrowing the window of Millington's acquisition of *Titus* also raises the unanswered (unanswerable?) question of who has *Titus*' license between 1597 and Millington's obtainment of it c. 1600-1602. Another intriguing possibility raised by the absence of Millington's name in 1600 is the non-existence of his claim to or involvement in the re-printing and re-sale of *Titus*. If so, this may mean that in 1594 Millington only purchased a limited right to co-sell *Titus* from Danter. Or, Millington may have bought a limited right to co-sell *Titus* with White from White, who had purchased outright from Danter the entitlement to market the play. Alternatively, in 1600, it is feasible that while Millington had some claim to *Titus*, it was significantly weaker than White's and thus one White overrode. It seems, therefore, that whichever way we look at it, the absence of Millington's name on the title page of Q2 points to Edward White having (acquired?) more control over the play than his previous co-seller.

This suggestion of White's (growing?) power over the play is strengthened by the title page of Q3. Like Q2, the only stationer's name appearing in full on Q3's title page is White's. And, as with Q2, when seen in conjunction with several factors, this is very interesting. Firstly, in 1611, *Titus*'s license is—and has been for nine years—held by Thomas Pavier. Secondly (and curiously like Millington), not only has Pavier been

³⁶ Namely, William Shakespeare, *The first part of the contention* (STC 26099, 1594); *The true tragedie of Richard Duke of York* (STC 21006, 1595); *The cronicle [sic] history of Henry the fift* (STC 22289, 1600); *The first part of the contention* (STC 26100, 1600); *The true tragedie of Richarde Duke of York* (21006a, 1600).

involved in the production of Shakespearean (and erroneously Shakespearean-attributed) quartos prior to 1611, but also, like Millington, Pavier's name has appeared on all these plays. In other words, the absence of Pavier's name on Q3's title page in 1611 deviates from Pavier's practices up to this point. Indeed, given Pavier's sale of *Henry the fifth* in 1602 and *The Yorkshire Tragedy* (falsely claiming Shakespearean authorship) in 1608, it also seems strange Pavier—the clear license holder of *Titus*—never has this play printed for himself.³⁷ Once again, then, with Q3, the title page intimates Edward White has more control over *Titus* than might initially appear.

It is, of course, entirely feasible that, for all three quartos, White simply paid the appropriate license holder of *Titus* for the right to (co-)sell and then for the rights to have the play re-printed and to market it exclusively, thus explaining White's prominence on the title pages of Q2 and Q3. It also possible that White's considerable seniority within the Stationers' Company contributed to the format of the latter two title pages. Far more certain though is that whatever the reasons behind them, the absences of Millington and Pavier's names on Q2 and Q3's title pages increase *Titus Andronicus*' association with Edward White and the Sign of the Gun. However, this association does not begin with Q2 but with Q1. And although the title page of Q1 seems more straightforward than those of Q2 and Q3, closer attention reveals what I believe is a telling oddity about Q1, tying it to White and the Gun.

This oddity emerges when Q1's title page is situated among the rest of the imprints of White's own catalogue, both crime- and non-crime-related. Unsurprisingly, since White rarely co-sells texts, the overwhelming majority of the imprints of extant texts vended by him (whether White holds the license or not) refer to 'Edward White' and 'the Signe of the Gunne,' while a few simply refer to 'Edward White' in conjunction with

³⁷ Respectively, William Shakespeare, *The chronicle history of Henry the fifth* (STC 22290, 1602); Thomas Middleton, *A Yorkshire tragedy ... VVritten by VV. Shakespeare* (STC 22340, 1608). The strangeness of Pavier never—as far as we know—having *Titus* printed increases if we succumb to the temptation of seeing this in the light of Pavier's future, if incomplete, project of producing a collection of ten Shakespearean plays with William Jaggard in 1619 and the spate of Shakespearean quartos with false imprints; a project suggesting, if not implicitly acknowledging, the commercial value of Shakespeare's plays and Pavier and Jaggard's awareness of this.

(but not always) the name of the printer.³⁸ In cases where White apparently co-prints and perhaps co-sells texts, White's name appears with that of the other stationer, but no mention of the Gun is made.³⁹ Where White seems merely to co-sell a work, we find either (a) two versions of the same text with different bookshops cited in the imprints⁴⁰ or (b) a single version of

³⁸ There are only two clear exceptions to this; i.e. imprints which explicitly name the licenser as well as the printer and White as the bookseller: Anon., *Nevves out of the coast of Spaine* (STC 12926, 1587) and Anon., *Iohn Brewen* (STC 15095, 1592). It is absolutely crucial, though, to note that neither of these imprints implies, nor can be read as implying, that the licenser has any connection or affiliation to the Gun and the sale of the text in question. It is also important to observe that while there are a number of texts White sells for which the printer and licenser are one and the same, it is the other stationer's role as printer-not licenser—which is alluded to in the imprint if, indeed, the other stationer is named at all.

³⁹ Respectively: Anon., *VVilliam Sherwood* (STC 22432, 1581) and Munday, *Eueralde Ducket* (STC 18259.3, 1581). Both the title page and colophon of the *Eueralde Ducket* and the *VVilliam Sherwood* texts respectively state they have been 'Imprinted by Iohn [John] Charlewood and Edward White' without any reference to either stationer's bookshop.

⁴⁰ One example of this is Thomas Nelson's versified account of the Babington Plot against Elizabeth I, *A Short Discourse*. Licensed by George Robinson, Nelson's pamphlet was sold by White at the Gun (as STC 18425.5) as well as by Nelson himself at his shop (as STC 18425). The latter, STC 18425: Thomas Nelson, *A short discourse: expressing the substaunce of all the late pretended treasons against the Queenes Maiestie*, is licensed by George Robinson and printed 'By George Robinson for Thomas Nelson and are to be solde at his shop vnder London Bridge.' The former, STC 18425.5: Thomas Nelson, *A short discourse: expressing the substaunce of all the late pretended treasons against the Queenes Maiestie*, is also licensed by George Robinson and printed by him 'for Edward White and are to be solde at his shop at the sign of the Gun.' The verse within this pamphlet then gets turned into a single sheet, of which there seem to have been two separate print runs as two versions of this ballad exist: Nelson, *A short discourse [...] Ballad* (STC 18426, [1586]); *A proper newe ballad* (STC 18426.5, [1586]), both of which are produced for White (according to their imprints) by two printers: Robinson and Thomas Purfoot, respectively.

For two other similar instances, see John Nicholls, *The oration and sermon made at Rome* (STC 18535; 18536; 18536a, 1581) and Anthony Munday, *[B]reefe aunswer to two seditious pamphlets* (STC 18262; 18262a, 1582). Licensed and printed by Charlewood, we find two versions of Nicholls, *Oration* (STC 18536 and 18536a) advertising their sale by White at the Gun, whereas the other (STC 18535) simply identifies Charlewood as 'seruant to the right Honourable the Earle of Arundel.' By the same token, Munday's *[B]reefe aunswer* exists in different forms printed by Charlewood: STC 18262 and STC 18262a. STC 18262 is sold by 'Iohn