

and extras dispensed with. She also argues that it is not the victorious Titus Andronicus that is depicted but the Roman emperor, to whom the kneeling queen (not of the Goths but of Ethiopia) is doing homage. Folding her hands is claimed to be not a sign that she is pleading but "a gesture of obeisance" (Schlueter 1999, 175).¹ This interpretation does not accord with the theatrical code of the baroque era as recorded by D. Franciscus Lang. In accordance with Lang's description, Tamora's gesture is one of pleading (see Lang 1975, 186). Peacham even differentiates very clearly – as has already been stressed – between the theatrical sign of pleading (Tamora) and that of submission (Chiron and Demetrius). Moreover, Schlueter herself states that the text she envisages as the basis for Peacham's sketch presents problems, as Andronica, the daughter of Titus, is not there. In the *klägliche Tragædia*, however, it says: "*Auch da ist die Andronica*" ("Also present is Andronica"). Schlueter attempts to save the situation by suggesting that Andronica must have left the stage before Peacham drew his sketch.² In this case the artist would indeed be able to dispense with the stage direction: "[Titus] Presents his daughter to the Emperor. The Emperor takes her by the hand." However, when a further clear direction ("[Titus] takes the Queen [by the hand] and leads her to the Emperor") is not reflected in the drawing either and Schlueter has difficulty in offering an explanation,³ scepticism seems advisable. The lack of a figure to sustain the action and the absence of essential movements or gestures in Peacham's sketch show that the artist cannot have worked from a performance of *Eine sehr klägliche Tragædia von Tito Andronico*.

Another reason why Schlueter's thesis is untenable is that it does not conform with the historical facts. The play she proposes as Peacham's source was performed by English actors in Germany and first printed in 1620 in the collection *Engelische Comedien und Tragedien*.⁴ Thus Peacham cannot have seen this play on the stage unless he attended a performance in Germany, a possibility that can be discounted. Nor can he have had access to the text of the play, which was first published in 1620.⁵ But he did have access to the 1594 London stage performances of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* and to the text of this early revenge tragedy, which also appeared in print in 1594. The date of Peacham's famous sketch – 1594 – actually fits the historical context exactly. The drawing, which has Shakespeare's text appended to it, depicts Richard Burbage in the role of Tamora, the queen of Goths, as the forensic comparison of pictures carried out by experts of the Bundeskriminalamt proves.⁶ Thus it seems certain that William Shakespeare played the part of Titus and as such also features in Peacham's sketch. If this latter supposition is correct, Peacham drew the leading actors of the Lord Chamberlain's Men, a company which had been formed in 1594 and was subsequently to become the most successful and the most prominent London theatre group.

1 . According to Schlueter 1999, 175 this corresponds with the text in *A Very Lamentable Tragedy*: "We submit ourselves to your Majesty as your most humble servants. Dispose of us as you please".

2 . She writes: "If [Andronica] moved into the tableau [...] to take the Emperor's hand, she would have moved out [...] before Peacham took his drawing" (179).

3 . According to Schlueter 1999, 179, this would be "a move that would similarly interrupt the tableau".

4 . The subtitle states: "zuvor nie im Druck aussgangen" ("never before printed").

5 . That the (lost) play "titus & vespacia" registered by Henslowe in 1592 might have been the English original of *Eine sehr klägliche Tragædia von Tito Andronico* (cf. Schlueter 1999, 173) cannot entirely be excluded, but is nonetheless conjecture. This play has been associated with, among other things, a drama about the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus.

6 . See: Altmann 1995, text section 4-5; picture file, nos. 1, 2 and 3).