DOMESTIC *TITUS*

A Thesis

by

ASHLEY MARIE BRINKMAN

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2008

Major Subject: English

DOMESTIC *TITUS*

A Thesis

by

ASHLEY MARIE BRINKMAN

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Douglas A. Brooks
Committee Members,	Craig Kallendorf
	James Rosenheim
Head of Department,	M. Jimmie Killingsworth

May 2008

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Domestic *Titus*. (May 2008)

Ashley Marie Brinkman, B.A., The University of Texas at Austin

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Douglas A. Brooks

Critical examinations of William Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* almost always occlude questions of the domestic. Yet, a major portion of the play's action takes place in a house and the methods of the characters' revenge can be construed as domestic. More simply, in *Titus*, household properties and domestic rituals are transformed into instruments of vengeance. With a particular focus on the cultural and historical conditions governing literary production in early modern England, this thesis draws on previous scholarly work and examines the intersection of domesticity and revenge in *Titus*.

The thesis is divided into two sections, each of which addresses different, though overlapping, ways in which domesticity – broadly speaking – operates in the play. The first section examines the play's two competing revenge plots, demonstrating that not only are they domestic in nature, but also that many of the play's features align closely with generic traits and devices integral to plays classified as "Domestic Tragedies." The second section focuses on *Titus Andronicus*' Senecan roots and examines carefully the function(s) of the domestic setting in *Titus* as well as Seneca's *Thyestes*, one of Shakespeare's sources. I explore the ways in which the play's domestic setting is

distinctly Senecan and discuss Shakespeare's alterations to his Latin source. While the house becomes a site of domestic and dynastic anxiety in both Seneca's *Thyestes* and Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare's play evinces a concern with domestic privacy that Seneca's does not.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS v

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. THE BUTCHER, THE BAKER, THE PASTY MAKER 4

    2.1 Tamora's Revenge: Striking It Home 8
    2.2 Titus Strikes Back 17

3. DOMESTIC AND DYNASTIC 31

4. CONCLUSION 58

NOTES 60

REFERENCES 68

VITA 80

1. INTRODUCTION

The past decade has seen a proliferation of studies on domesticity and its place within Elizabethan and Jacobean literature and culture, and the pervasive presence of household properties on the early modern stage indicates that domestic life was a feature of period dramas. *Titus Andronicus* is no exception: revenge and counter-revenge go hand-in-hand with the destruction of families and the subversion of domestic spaces; the discourses of murder, rape, and revenge intersect with those of the house and family. What is more, some of *Titus*' features – the pervasive presence of household properties, a prominent domestic setting, in addition to the play's incessant focus on the family dynamic – bear resemblance to those of domestic tragedy, a very popular genre of the period. Though not a conventional domestic tragedy, *Titus* invites consideration as such.

Oddly enough, most criticism of *Titus* eschews domesticity, even though a significant portion of the play takes place in a house and household devices and rituals aid and abet Titus' quest for revenge. Instead, critics examine Titus using other analytical lenses, including gender, politics, discourses of rape and/or revenge, as well as attend to Shakespeare's use of Ovid. Because *Titus Andronicus* has at its center a house and family and because the horror of its ending stems directly from the inversion of household rituals, my primary aim is to explore the ways in which Titus is a domestic tragedy. In short, this thesis is a substantial effort to rethink *Titus* in terms of domesticity.

This journal follows the style of *SEL: Studies in English Literature.*

Generically speaking, *Titus* is not a domestic tragedy, but, in the play, domesticity and revenge are inextricably linked, and I examine the nexus between domesticity and revenge, domestic revenge, as it were, in the following pages. Though this study is by no means exhaustive, it does look at several important junctions. Titus' house becomes the center of the play's multiple revenge plots; household conventions transform into murderous weapons; a dinner party turns into a cannibalistic feast. Rather than isolate and analyze domesticity and/or revenge separately, I look at how they cohere in Shakespeare's play. After all, an acute desire for revenge affects domestic activities. Conversely, the domestic sphere and activities is tinged with revenge, perverted for nefarious purposes. I have divided it into two sections, which examine different, though, sometimes overlapping dimensions of domestic revenge in the play. Rather than two discrete units, the two major sections of my thesis should be read as a continuum, as they are part of the same enterprise. One complements and comments on the other.

The first section, entitled "The Butcher, the Baker, the Pasty Maker," explores Tamora and Titus' revenge plots in terms of domesticity. I use domesticity and its variant "domestic" loosely in order to accommodate a discussion of the family dynamic and the domestic spaces themselves. I first look at Tamora's vengeful endeavor, her thirst to exterminate the Andronicus family line. Tamora's revenge is domestic in the sense that she aspires to destroy Titus' domestic circle as well as murder him in his home. She attacks him as both a public and private subject, and, as the play shows, to affect one's public persona is to affect their private persona (and vice versa). From

Tamora's revenge I turn to Titus'. I examine Titus' approach to undertaking revenge and the "uncanny" nature of his house against notions of conventional domestic tragedy, as they correlate closely with elements that are found in plays that have traditionally been identified as such. Focusing on Act 3.2 and the play's gory finale, I examine the house's uncanny character and Titus' inversion of domestic conventions, ultimately arguing that *Titus Andronicus* can and should be considered a domestic tragedy in its own right.

Building on observations and arguments of the first section, the second section, "Domestic and Dynastic," scrutinizes the classical roots of Titus' house and its function in the play. Looking back to Seneca's *Thyestes*, I argue that Titus' "woeful house" is Thyestean in nature. The Latin play takes advantage of both meanings of "domus" – dynastic line and dwelling space – as does *Titus*. What is more, in each case, an abode morphs into an unheimlich domain. In both plays, the distinction between "house" and "house" (or "domus" and "domus") – domestic space and dynastic line – is obscured. The domestic setting also frames the way in which characters exact their revenge, and in both cases, blatant disregard for what would be considered proper domestic comportment infuses the house with tinges of the unheimlich. Indeed, Shakespeare's house functions much like Seneca's. But, because *Titus* is of a different period, Titus' house speaks to specifically Elizabethan concerns, one of which is the porous nature of one's house. And it is with the permeable house that I close my discussion.

2. THE BUTCHER, THE BAKER, THE PASTY MAKER

Domestic tragedy remains a narrow domain, even though recent critics have interrogated and expanded Henry H. Adams' work on the genre. Adams defines "domestic tragedy" as a didactic or homiletic "tragedy of the common people, ordinarily set in the domestic scene, dealing with personal and family relationships rather than large affairs of state, presented in a realistic fashion, and ending in a tragic or otherwise serious manner."[1] Plays like *Arden of Faversham* and *The Yorkshire Tragedy* stage the undoing of a marriage and/or a family, and they take place in England. In recent years, critics attentive to cultural materialism and gender have questioned some of these basic generic assumptions and shifted the direction of critical discussions away from aesthetics, class, and didacticism. Such readings are valuable precisely because they bring to the fore cultural, historical, and gender issues that Adams brushes aside. Yet, critics like Lena Cowen Orlin, Viviana Comensoli, and Catherine Richardson keep their analyses within the narrow confines of "domestic tragedy" as conventionally defined; they challenge other critics rather than the genre itself. [2] By maintaining Adams' underlying generic assumptions –an English setting, middle class characters, a conflict that dissolves a family from within – they restrict their discussions to a narrow notion of the genre that excludes many plays, such as *Titus Andronicus,* that are profoundly domestic because they are too "orthodox."

Interestingly, the state and the domestic sphere intersect in many of these "orthodox" tragedies. Most tragedies deal to some extent with the undoing of a family or a marriage, and often familial woes are inextricably linked to the governance of the

polis. Richard Helgerson argues that, "if we think of *domus* in a slightly different way, neither Shakespearean tragedy and neither history nor Greek tragedy on which neoclassical understanding of the genre relied are any less domestic" than what are considered canonical English domestic tragedies. He continues, "They could be considered more domestic. In a great many instances, if not in all, the action of those Greek and Shakespearean plays is centered on conflicts within a particular family or 'house.'"[3] It is not that scholars neglect the domestic situation in Elizabethan and Jacobean plays. They have famously considered the domestic arrangements in tragedies such as *Hamlet* but do not classify plays like *Hamlet* as "domestic." They are tragedies of another order. Perhaps, then, "domestic tragedy," as scholars conceive of it, is at best a misnomer, or, at worst, an anachronism. With Helgerson's assertion in mind, I want to turn to *Titus* and examine it as a "domestic tragedy," though not completely in the canonical sense. My intent is neither to redefine "domestic tragedy" nor to shoehorn *Titus* into too-small a genre; rather, I suggest that the notion of "domestic tragedy" applies to more than plays concerned with the English middle class. In so doing, I propose to look at domesticity loosely, in terms of the family structure as well as domestic spaces themselves, and to explore their role within Shakespeare's first revenge tragedy.

Titus is primarily a revenge tragedy, and, as such, critical discussions often (but not always) occlude questions of the domestic. Ann Christensen has perhaps delved into domesticity in *Titus* most fully, but her study remains within the purview of gender. Her article explores the notion of "nurturing men," focusing particularly on "men's

infringement" into not only the domestic sphere but also Titus' usurpation of the maternal position as cook and surrogate mother. In short, Christensen's reading of the play examines ways in which Titus' participation in so-called feminine roles dramatizes "experiences of dislocation in the 'gender system.'"[4] Titus' adoption of both masculine and feminine roles – butcher, baker, pasty maker, and nurse to his maimed daughter – blurs gender boundaries, for it "[reflects] the ambivalent roles of women and men within the 'private' household."[5] Nevertheless, Christensen's essay sidesteps the panoply of ways that domesticity functions within the play. Domesticity, to be sure, lends itself to gender criticism. The household was (and still is) a gendered space, so it follows that investigations of the domicile, its inhabitants, and their activities would accord with gender studies. Moreover, as Wendy Wall has shown, domesticity also functions as a lens through which one can view discourses of national identity.[6] Examining nationalism within the play becomes problematic, though, as it is set in Rome, not England. Critical studies, most notably Robert Miola's, have focused on the family as a microcosm of Roman society, but, as with Christensen's study, Miola's concentrates on only a few of the ways in which discourses of family are entwined in the play. A study of the family, in this case, is made to serve a larger critical interest; it is not the main focus of Miola's discussion.[7] In *Titus*, the domestic circle and sphere play a larger role than a marker of gender relations, sexual politics, and national identity. Domestic spaces and relationships pervade the play, and to consider them outside of gender and Roman identity is to examine the multiplex ways in which domesticity functions in the play.

I intend to focus narrowly on the ways in which the discourses of revenge, the family dynamic, and Titus' ultimate demise intersect with the domestic sphere and the dissolution of family. Once gender and questions of national identity are suspended, the play's status as a 'domestic tragedy' becomes clear. *Titus* is not merely a tragedy of a Roman general; it is the tragedy of a family: the Andronici. Though it starts and ends as a state tragedy, the near decimation of Titus' family does not undo the state. Indeed, the state fares well in *Titus*; the ruin of those in power enables a "better" government to step forward, and the play's central tragedy actually benefits the body politic's health. Titus' tragedy becomes a tragedy of domestic proportions, and it is those domestic proportions that this paper seeks to examine. (Inarguably, the state perpetually lurks in the background, even in the play's most family-oriented scenes.) In domestic tragedies proper, the family implodes. One party in a marriage defects (sometimes with outside help), and the ensuing tragic action unfolds from within the home. The same can be said for family tragedies in the classical vein, for as Aristotle observes, "What tragedies must seek are cases where the suffering occurs within relationships, such as brother against brother, son and father, mother and son, son and mother."[8] *Titus* differs from Elizabethan domestic tragedy and classical tragedies like *Oedipus*, in that the Andronici are destroyed from *without*. While it can be – and has been – argued that the tragedy in the play stems from Titus' arrogance and folly, the family's enemies orchestrate attacks on them, attacks that speed the family's downfall and contribute greatly to its ultimate downfall. It is the active assault from without that differentiates *Titus* from domestic tragedies proper. But that makes the play no less tragic. Death severs the family bonds,

and enemies attempt to destroy their domestic circle. In a sustained examination of the intersection of revenge and domesticity, I first discuss Tamora's revenge and her quest to decimate the entire line of the Andronici, attending to the empress' means of destroying the Andronici: the rape of Lavinia, the murder of Titus' two sons – arguing that they are domestic crimes – and her ultimate quest to kill Titus in his own house. Tamora's revenge is directed at Titus' dynastic line and his living space, two apparently separate entities. Yet, the two are inextricably linked, and Tamora's actions anticipate the collapse of the house-state dichotomy at the play's end. I then turn to Titus' counter-revenge, paying particular attention to Titus' house and the method of his revenge. Like Tamora, Titus seeks to destroy an entire family, but he does so in an overtly domestic way. Cooking becomes his weapon of choice. On the whole, *Titus* evinces a preoccupation with domestic relations and spaces. Via revenge, families are dissolved and the domestic space, ostensibly a place for family, becomes decidedly unheimlich.

2.1 Tamora's Revenge: Striking It Home

Titus Andronicus commences and closes as a state play. Before the play hones in on private matters, personal vendettas, and the dissolution of family bonds, issues of state establish the characters in complex social relationships, many of which are ultimately thwarted. Titus' return from war coincides with a dispute over whether Saturninus or Bassanius should ascend to the throne, a governmental question of pressing importance, for the new emperor decides the empire's course.[9] "Rome's best champion" initially interrupts the two incumbents' electoral quarrel,[10] which he ultimately settles it settles in favor of the elder son, Saturninus. The crisis is suspended,

however, as Titus arrives at his family tomb, "the sacred receptacle of [his] joys" (1.1.95), and defers its focal point from succession to burial. In both pagan times and during the Renaissance, as Michael Neill observes, many people subscribed to the superstition that "happiness beyond the grave was somehow contingent upon proper disposal and preservation of one's remains."[11] Thus, Titus cannot adjudicate Bassanius' and Saturninus' conflict until he attends to the interests of his dead sons, who "unburied yet…hover on the shores of the Styx" (1.190-91). For the general, proper disposal or burial consists of sacrificing "the proudest prisoner of the Goths" (1.1.99), dismembering and disemboweling him, and burning his remains over an open flame. The Goth's "proudest prisoner" is Alarbus, the eldest son of Tamora, the vindictive future empress of Rome, and Titus' sacrifice of him, though performed as a state function, will return to haunt him. The execution of Alarbus, though it serves a ritualistic purpose, initiates Tamora's insatiable desire for vengeance, pitting her against Titus' whole clan.[12]

When Titus bids his sons prepare Alarbus for death, Tamora begs for her son's life in the only way she can – as a mother. She beseeches Titus to heed her "mother's tears in passion for her son" (1.1.109) to no avail, and Alarbus is led away and summarily executed; his body is then brought to fuel the sacrificial fire, "whose smoke like incense doth perfume the sky" (1.1.148). The Queen of the Goths takes the sacrifice of her son as a personal affront, an assault on her brood, and as Alarbus' entrails sizzle and pop over the sacrificial fire, her incandescent hatred for the Andronici is ignited. While, through the first act, the play ostensibly hovers over state matters, Alarbus' death

sows the seeds for Tamora's revenge. Unfortunately for Titus, she obtains the chance to avenge her son's death by a stroke of luck. Titus deferentially gives his daughter, Lavinia, as part of a political tactic that he knows will "advance/ [his] name and honorable family" (1.1.242-243). Yet the fraternal conflict surfaces again, and Bassanius, who has already spoken for Lavinia's hand, elects to "bear his betrothed from all the world away" (1.21.290). He seizes her and flees. Titus, enraged, calls upon his sons to reclaim Lavinia, but they defy him and prevent him from reclaiming Lavinia for Saturninus. Bassanius' claim to and abrupt departure with Lavinia provides the impetus for Saturninus to discard Titus' entire family, which he describes as "Confederates all thus to dishonour [him]" (1.1308), and he weds Tamora at the Pantheon. It is at this point that the state takes a backseat to inter-family conflict.

Before I continue, I think it pertinent to note in passing that Tamora does not design the plot against the Andronici – Aaron does – but she participates in and unequivocally encourages it. Revenge becomes a household affair, and together the empress, her two sons, Aaron, and, to a lesser extent, Saturninus partake in "villainy and vengeance." Although Aaron is a servant and is not biologically part of the imperial family, he is a part of the imperial household, a "subject" in the terms of early modern house-holding manuals.[13] Tamora and her servant's sexual liaison results in a child with irrefutable paternity, the Moor acts as an advisor and confidant to Tamora's two sons, and Titus comments on the Moor's immediate proximity to the imperial family at least twice: once when Tamora visits him in costume and once when he kills a fly who serves to remind him of the empress' Moor.

Tamora first directs her revenge at Titus' domestic circle, and the initial strike against the Andronici is the rape of Lavinia, "the cordial of [Titus'] age" (1.1.169). While rape itself, in modern parlance, is not always considered a domestic crime, in the play's context Chiron and Demetrius' actions may be labeled as such, as it is a crime intended as an assault on a particular dynastic line. When Tamora declares to the once-saucy Lavinia

> Hadst thou in person ne'er offended me
> Even for his [Titus'] sake I am pitiless.
> Remember, boys, I poured forth tears in vain
> To save your brother from the sacrifice
> But fierce Andronicus would not relent (2.2.161-165).

she signals that Lavinia's impending doom functions solely as payback – an eye for an eye, a hand for a hand, and a child for a child. Lavinia's rape is not merely an attack on her person, or even her husband, whom Chiron and Demetrius kill and hide in a pit. It is, rather, the first move to decimate the Andronici and doubly benefits the empress' household. Eradicating Lavinia's chastity renders the paternity of her future children questionable, and it eliminates her from ever advancing the Andronici bloodline. To shame Lavinia is to shame the Andronici family through "worse-than-killing lust" (2.2.175) and to staunch one passage through which the Andronicus blood line would travel. Interestingly, Lavinia's situation parallels that of Lucrece, and Heather Dubrow reads *The Rape of Lucrece* as a narrative of domestic loss and recovery, for the "text connects the burglary of a house with the violation of a woman."[14] The same can be argued for the rape in *Titus*, as Aaron refers to Lavinia's body in domestic terms and the violation of chastity in terms of robbery. "Revel in Lavinia's treasury," he commands

Chiron and Demetrius (1.1.631). Invade and pillage her. Technically, Lavinia is Titus' property, so burgling her virtue and marring her body equates with stealing from him and staining his honor. But the rape of Lavinia does more than stain his public façade; it wounds him deeply. The rape's perpetrator, he says, "hath hurt me more than had he killed me dead" (3.1.93), and the trauma of witnessing a maimed Lavinia causes him to walk the line between sanity and lunacy, and it damages the sanctity of his dwelling place, as we shall see briefly.

Lavinia's rape represents but one face of Tamora's multifarious revenge, but it runs tangent to – indeed, becomes the vehicle for – the murder of Titus' two sons, Martius and Quintus. In one fell swoop, the murder of Bassanius takes care of both Lavinia and her brothers, for the murder allows Chiron and Demetrius free reign over Lavinia's body and the means to frame Titus' two sons as murderers. After Lavinia is ushered off-stage, her two brothers enter with Aaron, and their entrance doubles as their first steps on the path to death. As Aaron shows them the "loathsome pit," in which Bassanius' body has been surreptitiously stowed, Martius falls in, and Quintus shortly follows suit. Unbeknownst to them, their fate has been plotted and sealed, their death warrant signed. This scheme is visually represented in the appearance of a letter, or as Tamora refers to it, "the fatal complot of this timeless tragedy" (2.2.265), a subtle allusion to her nefarious plan as well as a nasty pun.[15] The counterfeit letter, which seemingly reveals Martius and Quintus' guilt, coupled with Bassanius' gored body, compels Saturninus to act. The emperor, acting as a statesman, pronounces Titus' "fell curs" guilty, has them sent "from the pit unto the prison," and sets his mind to devising

"some-never-heard-of torturing pain for them" (2.2.281-285). They did, supposedly, assault the emperor's brethren, and, as the play has heretofore shown, an assault on one's family can end deleteriously.

Saturninus has Titus' sons executed for the murder of Bassanius, and Martius and Quintus' execution serves as another blow to Titus' dynastic line, as it results in the death of two men who would pass on the family name and the banishment of another. What is more, it profoundly affects the Andronicus family's domestic sphere. Prior to the execution, Titus enters, distraught and begging for his sons' lives, in a speech that echoes Tamora's earlier plea for her son's life. While he mentions his service to Rome, he beseeches the tribunes as a father. "Be pitiful to my condemned sons," he urges. "For these two [sons], tribunes, in the dust I write my heart's deep languor and my soul's sad tears" (3.1.8; 3.1.12-13). Like Tamora's earlier pleas, his cries fall upon deaf ears, and the tribunes pass him by. He stands as a public figure, begging for a private favor, to no avail. Lucius, too, attempts to save his brothers, an effort that causes the emperor to banish him. In a final attempt to save his sons, Titus cuts off his own hand and sends it to the emperor as "a ransom for their fault" (3.1.157). A messenger enters with his sons' heads and Titus' hand, "in scorn sent to [him] back" (3.1.238). As the messenger leaves, the remnants of Titus' family remain on the stage, and the full horror of Tamora's revenge becomes visible. Two heads, a severed hand, a horribly disfigured Lavinia, a handless Titus, a banished Lucius, and a distraught Marcus are all that remain on stage. This fatal delivery causes Marcus to remark on the ruinous havoc wreaked on the family. He says to Titus:

> Now farewell flattery, die Andronicus,
> Thou dost not slumber. See thy two sons' heads,
> Thy warlike hand, thy mangled daughter here,
> Thy other banished son with this dear sight
> Struck pale and bloodless, and thy brother, I,
> Even like a stony image cold and numb (3.1.254-259).

By "Andronicus" Marcus could mean the family line or Titus himself, the implication of either being unfavorable. To be sure, the Andronici are decreasing at an alarming rate.With no more sons in Rome and a maimed daughter, Titus' hopes for dynastic advancement in Rome are dashed. Having misinterpreted the scenario – thinking that the dark hand of Rome, rather than simply the emperor's wife, is behind his dire situation – Titus vows revenge on the state. Regardless of whether or not the state is responsible for Titus' woes, he is profoundly affected by his sons' execution. He lapses into grief-induced madness and retreats into private life with his rapidly diminishing family. Titus' grief, as I will argue shortly, reflects onto his living space, and his house is gradually transformed into a site of horror and madness. By vindictively casting Titus' sons as murderers, Tamora has destroyed his status as a reputable state subject. But Tamora's intent is not merely to destroy Titus as a public subject; rather, she intends to eradicate him as a domestic subject, in his capacity as head of household, something to which the final phase of her revenge attests.

Tamora envisions murdering Titus and completing her revenge at his house. Clad as "Revenge" and accompanied by her two sons, appropriately attired as "Rape" and "Murder," Tamora goes to Titus' house and finds him writing in his study. Patricia Fumerton has shown that, during early modern times, architecture became more

fragmented, and this process nurtured the rise of specialized rooms like the study. It is within the context of the gradual subdivision of the house that "a growing partitioning of the self from others" emerged,[16] and privacy, marked by withdraw into a personal room, became of the utmost importance. Here we see Titus, divorced from society, a domestic subject. When "Revenge" knocks, she has to coax Titus to exit his study, which he does, papers in hand. He calls attention to his disheveled mental and physical states, pointing out that he has not only lost a limb, but that "trenches made by grief and care" (5.2.23) traverse his face. The significance of their encounter lies in its setting, and in Tamora's intentions. That Tamora elects to take her final revenge at Titus' house is importantly symbolic, for Titus' home resonates with a myriad of social and personal meanings. Because people constructed their identities around their houses in the period, murdering a person in the confines of his/her property functioned as a double annihilation. Titus' house is his refuge and separates him from the outside world, and Tamora, by finishing him off within the confines of his domicile, would not only destroy his dynastic line, but also breech the boundaries of his private space, thereby obliterating the sense of security a house's walls give. Destroying someone in his/her own home functions as an overt demonstration of power, unparalleled by a street massacre.[17] To murder someone in his/her own home is to destroy him as a domestic subject, but it is also to annihilate him as a public subject.

Tamora's revenge sets the stage for the play's subversive ending. Not only does *Titus* collapse the distinction between one's public and private persona – dynasty is deeply rooted in the domestic – but it also explodes the house-state dichotomy, popular

in early modern house-holding manuals. As part of the imperial family, Tamora is the state, a state that encroaches upon its 'good' citizens like Titus. The palpable social disparity between the two enemies ensures that Titus' revenge brings about a radical reassessment of the house-state dichotomy. Michael McKeon discusses the dynamics of the house-state sphere, arguing that once such discourse became public knowledge, it "became vulnerable to refutation."[18] In early modern parlance, the notion of house as little state bespeaks a symbiosis from which individual family and community benefit.[19] Yet *Titus* questions the salutary effect of these two spheres on each other, and rather than present the two entities as beneficial to each other, the play presents them as parasitic. The state encroaches on private life, enters one's domestic spaces, and slaughters innocent people. A private family destroys the social order, and, at times, they seem indistinguishable from each other, as the state carries out personal vendettas and the family takes justice into its own hands. In what Jonathan Dollimore calls "perfunctory closure," Titus' house becomes the state, restoring the social order. But this is just a guise, for the social critique never really disappears from the play, and "it cannot help but being reactivated by performance."[20]

Revenge, by virtue of its destructive nature, enables *Titus* to shatter the early modern conceptual divide between house and state, it subverts the social order, and it devastates two separate families. But, within the context of the play, revenge is also constructive in that it strengthens the two vengeful parties' familial bonds. In addition to striking at Titus, the planning and execution of the rape of Lavinia opens the door for perverse familial bonding. To incite her sons to action, Tamora contrives a story in

which she avers that her adversaries have called her "foul adulteress,/ Lascivious Goth, and all the bitterest terms" (2.2.108-109). She calls on her sons to avenge the wrongs heaped upon her and to prove their loyalty as her children. They immediately stab Bassanius as a sign of their loyalty and legitimacy. They then turn to Lavinia and tag team her, a joint effort that strengthens the bonds of brotherly love and family loyalty. The Andronici, too, bond over revenge acts, and this is particularly evident when Titus and his hand maiden, Lavinia, slaughter Chiron and Demetrius. "For worse than Philomel you abused my daughter, / And worse than Progne I will be revenged" (5.2.194-95), he declares. As with the Thracian sisters, revenge becomes a household affair, and it reinforces family solidarity. Titus and Lavinia collaborate on the fatal banquet, butchering the malefactors together, and through their complicity the father-daughter bond intensifies (before it breaks). In *Titus*, it seems, the family that sticks together avenges together, however untoward it may be. Revenge becomes a family affair.

2.2 Titus Strikes Back

Titus violently calls into question contemporary discourses of domesticity in terms of public and private and house and state, injecting shades of grey into prevailing dichotomies. But the play, with Titus' house placed conspicuously in the center of the second half, reveals that domesticity operates on another level within the play. Not only is Titus' domicile at the center of the action, household conventions aid and abet his pursuit of revenge. His counter-revenge is firmly rooted in his domestic space, and, within the context of the play, it comments on and engages with domestic spaces and

rituals, in that, as Titus grows madder and as he comes close to consummating his revenge, his house descends into the uncanny. Moreover, the house's transformation into an unhomely place bears resemblance to domestic tragedies proper. Titus' house embodies a highly important symbolic function on the dramaturgical level, and it provides a structural correspondence to the domestic tragedies so popular in the play.

Titus' dwelling place becomes the setting for a major portion of the play. Because the house takes precedence so late in the play, critics have argued that Titus only assumes his responsibilities as father and head of household after the atrocities committed against him, particularly after Titus receives Martius and Quintus' heads. After this gory delivery, the living Andronici make a pact for revenge in which they include the bodies of the dead. These body parts, like Gloriana's skull in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, urge the family to revenge; they cry for blood, and scholars like Brecken Rose Hancock suggest that in this scene Titus makes a shift from Roman citizen to private revenger, a transformation in which "he completely reverses his feelings about state and family"[21] and steps into his role as head of household.

Yet, it is evident that, even at the beginning of the play, Titus takes seriously his role as head of household, as he takes care of the burial of his dead sons and murders another son, Mutius, for treason against the familial commonwealth. According to Coppelia Kahn, Titus' seemingly effortless choice to kill his own son illustrates "the father's exaggerated investment in the patriarchal order,"[22] as he puts his loyalty for the state above that for his family. The general's insistence on his family's honor and advancement does contribute to the killing of his son, but it is important to note that

Titus acts in an attempt to preserve his familial integrity, and he does so in his capacity as governor of the household, albeit in the extreme. The discourse of many popular household manuals delimits Titus' action, in that they exploit the analogy of the house as a microcosm of the state. Robert Cleaver's 1598 *A Godlie form of Household Government* enumerates the means appropriate to governing a house via the metaphor of governing a state. In his manual, he lists the "special duties" of those who rule – "being such that have authoritie in the family by God's ordinance, as the father and mother, master and mistresse" [23] – and those who are ruled, or the "children and servants" (16). Cleaver's prescription for a household's governor is as follows: "If maisters then or parents doo not governe, but let servants and children do as they list, they do not onely disobey God and disadvantage themselves, but also hurt those whome they should rule" (16). It seems, then, that Titus acts in accordance with his position as the ruler of the house, though he takes domestic discipline too far. If "a household is as it were a little common wealth" (13), then it is logically subject to the same sorts of disorder and disturbances, albeit on a smaller scale, that plague the state, one of which is treason.[24] Titus views his son as mutinous; he calls him a "traitor" (1.1.301) for flagrantly violating his orders and violating the laws of the familial commonwealth. The treason, petty or otherwise, which Titus perceives Mutius as committing is a serious offence – so serious, in fact, that it earned Alice Arden a spot on a stake – Robert Devereux, the executioner's block.[25]

The murder of Mutius, though often interpreted as an act of hubris, occurs early in the play, when the family is still intact. As his family begins to disintegrate and Titus

falls out of the state's favor, his behavior becomes socially aberrant, and his focus on his position as head of household becomes more intense. In the second half of the play, extreme duress colors Titus' comportment, and he remains largely within the confines of his domicile. Beginning in Act 3.2, desire for revenge against the imperial family consumes Titus, even though he remains at home. A Folio addition to the play, the scene's critical reception has centered mostly on questions of authorship. Shakespearean or not, the scene is crucial to both the plot and structure of the play. Because Titus' revenge occurs in a domestic setting, 3.2 becomes a crucial scene. It marks what Ann Christensen calls his complete "descent into private life."[26] Here Titus completely withdraws from society. Appearing at the center of the play, it cements the play's tragic direction and reveals the domestic circle at its core. Starting with Act 3.2, Titus' house becomes both a place for refuge and the locus for revenge. Additionally, the house itself provides a link to the domestic tragedies so popular in the last decade of the sixteenth century. The most important action in plays like *Arden of Faversham*, adultery and murder, take place in houses, and, as Keith Sturgess points out, domestic tragedies are set "in a faithfully realized domestic and social ambience."[27] 3.2 offers a highly realistic domestic setting, because here the play provides a view of Titus' private self in an austere manifestation of the quotidian. There are no servants, no pomp, nothing to indicate that Titus is more than an ordinary man, suffering under extraordinary duress.

In this peculiar scene, Titus and his family simply eat dinner. That Titus acts in a domestic capacity invites a gendered reading of the scene, particularly because of his behavior as "nurturing father."[28] Yet, Titus' dialogue itself, supplemented by the staging

of this scene, offers up another reading, which accentuates the play's focus on the family unit and domestic space, via its structural positioning and dialogue. Natasha Korda argues that "During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, relations between subjects within the home became increasingly centered on and mediated by objects."[29] The table, in this scene and the final one, plays an integral role in positioning the characters in relation to each other. The table establishes the bonds that it will eventually break.

Bryan Boyd remarks that the play is concerned with kind and unkindness, or, more simply, "concern for our kind and unconcern for others."[30] Perhaps nowhere is this more obvious than in 3.2, where Titus and his family sit alone over dinner, waiting for Lucius to gather an army and attack Rome. Sandwiched between the street scene – which illustrates that Titus has no care for the state – and the scene in which Lavinia reveals her rapists' names, the positioning and staging of this scene accentuates Titus' focus on his family above all else and foregrounds what he will do in the final scenes to preserve what is left of its honor. "[E]at no more," he orders them, "Than will preserve just so much strength in *us*/As will revenge these bitter woes of *ours*"(3.2.1-3, my emphasis). At the center of the play Titus interacts with his family, and only his family. And he does so in his dwelling space. But even more than Titus' desire for revenge, the Andronicus family's behavior at the table emphasizes the concern for one's kind.

As the scene opens, Titus directs his ever-dwindling family to gather around the table and eat. According to the stage direction, "they sit," and participate in a very intimate, though absurd, dinner, in which they eat sparingly and bond over their

wretched states. Catherine Richardson notes that a table "functions within a household to cement the bonds between individuals and to aid their formation into a community."[31] Over dinner, Titus attempts to "interpret [Lavinia's] martyred signs" (3.2.36), tends to his daughter's needs, and, after dinner, takes Lavinia and young Lucius to read "sad stories chanced in the times of old" (3.2.84). He preserves and strengthens the family bonds, because he conducts the scene so that the family acts together. Though Titus' quasi-mad dialogue dominates the scene, one gets a sense that the family is unified by their suffering, especially when a fly buzzes on stage and Titus projects his emotions onto the insect world. When Marcus "doth but kill a fly" (3.2.59), Titus reacts badly, because he sees the slaying of the "poor harmless fly" (3.2.64), as he calls it, as tantamount to "tyranny" (3.2.55) and an assault against the insect's family. His sentiments change, however, when Marcus relates that the fly "was a black ill-favoured fly,/ Like unto the empress' Moor" (3.2.67-68). One oft-remarked-upon community-building tactic is to find a common enemy and unite against it. The play has, of course, already established this enemy, which the fly unassumingly resembles through its affinity to Aaron. Marcus characterizes the fly not simply as Aaron, the malign Moor, but Aaron the "empress' Moor," and the genitive reflects the brothers' perception of Aaron as part of the empress' household. Titus then takes Marcus' knife, the very one with which he was eating, and kills the fly. In sharing a weapon and doubly killing the fly, Titus bonds with Marcus to kill their common enemy.

Lavinia's revelation of her rapists' identities – "the traitors and the truth" – functions as the impetus for Titus to strike at the entire imperial family. Curiously, Titus

and his family do not carry out "mortal revenge" on Tamora's family immediately. Such hesitation can be explained in largely generic terms: most revenge tragedies contain sustained delays before their bloody ends. The duration between Lavinia's revelation and the final act of revenge allows the Andronici to position themselves as revengers and gives them time to substantiate their claims against the empress' sons, whose guilt, though obvious to the Andronici, is "only unofficial knowledge and, as such, is extremely dangerous in imperial Rome."[32] By the time Tamora, appareled as "Revenge," absconds from Titus' house, he has contrived a plan for his own counter-revenge. This scheme, once completed, renders his domestic space frightening and unnatural. He takes the devices and activities of everyday life and turns them into weapons.

When Titus sets his plan in motion, he provides a return on his enemies' heinous deeds within the closed economy of revenge. [33] He repays Tamora's sons for the assault on his family with another domestic crime, but, rather than violently and overtly attack Tamora's family, he achieves his revenge through cookery. Frances Dolan argues that, "In representations of domestic crime, the threat usually comes from the familiar rather than the strange, the intimate rather than the observer."[34] The horror of Titus' revenge stems from its sheer uncanniness, its inversion of a very familiar domestic act. Freud likens this type of horror to "belonging to the realm of the frightening, of what evokes fear and dread."[35]

When Titus announces that he will "play the cook," he assumes a very bloody role. Besides simply cooking poultry, housewives of the period routinely slaughtered their own chickens, among other things. As Wendy Wall points out, "Emptying and

dismembering bodies when they are almost cold, trafficking in warm blood, and ripping guts from live chickens, the housewife isolated and manipulated the boundary between animation and death."[36] In short, violence was inherent to cookery in the period. For example, an anonymous cookbook gives instructions on how to boil a capon, but before one can boil it, one must "take marrow bones [and] breake them"[37] A recipe entitled "To boyle a conie with a pudding in his bellie" calls for the cook to "flea him, cleave on the eares, and wash it faire," to mix various ingredients, put them in the rabbit's stomach, "and sowe it up with a thread."[38] Titus' behavior, it seems, accords with normative household violence, but he takes the everyday act of cooking and perverts it. His dissembling brand of cookery represents a cruel joke on his guests, a manifestation of the uncanny. Indeed, he takes cooking into the realm of the (even more) grotesque. He reduces Tamora's sons to animals, butchers them, and taints his kitchen with human blood. The transformation from cookery to human slaughter reveals the gory nature of the kitchen's unconscious;[39] a proliferation of violence is suppressed by the appearance of everyday order.

Hospitality is one of the hallmarks of domestic conduct, and Titus, by allowing a parley to take place at his home, ostensibly assumes the role as gracious host. Opening one's home to the public and inviting guests in is overtly a cordial act, and, when done with the proper *sprezzatura*, an example of domestic virtue. Felicity Heal observes that early modern hospitality "in all its varied forms…seems to be bound to that of reciprocity, of the exchange of gifts and rewards to which value not simply articulated in money terms attaches."[40] Hospitality, then, is a peaceful enterprise, almost akin to gift-

giving in primitive societies, to which Marcel Mauss' study on gift-giving attests. Gifts, like hospitality, function as peacekeeping activities; they keep diverse societies and factions from war.[41] What is more, Heal argues, "Hospitality differs from the bonds of family relationships and of service in that it responds to local social conditions."[42] Titus' banquet is tailored to the situation at hand, as it surreptitiously responds to the animosity between the emperor's family and his own. To his guests Titus appears to have buried the hatchet; he conducts them with courtesy and even takes the time to serve them. Titus, however, has his enemies over as a covert declaration of war. While his guests may also have evil intentions, the outward face of the banquet at Titus' house is that of a peaceful gathering, an exchange of hostages, perhaps even a treaty. He uses the guise of hospitality and the reciprocity that it entails as a means to requite vengefully Tamora's family's actions. Vengeance is, to be sure, modeled on reciprocity, and Titus means to return the injustice done to him.[43] Over dinner, Titus repays Tamora; he serves her revenge piping hot. Tamora and Saturninus, who think that they are going to dupe the old general, fall victim to his clever trick. In a spectacular dramatic reversal, Titus inverts the concept of hospitality and serves his enemies their just desserts.

Titus improvises on the symbolic function of banquets and purposefully subverts them. The presentation of the pasties further turns normative house-holding praxis, particularly that of the early-modern dinner party, on its head, as Titus exploits the conventions of 'surprise' that are inherent to the banquet. In so doing, he shocks his guests, exposing the violence inherent in food presentation and eating. Recipes intended to deceive guests –"To make pies that the birds may be alive in them, and fly out when it

is cut up," for example – filled early modern English cookbooks. Such culinary devices were designed to "delight and pleasure shew to the company."[44] Titus capitalizes on the banquet's inherent, and expected, surprise when he serves up the meat pies. When the food actually comes out, the audience knows that Tamora's sons are in the pies, but she does not. That is, until Saturninus inquires about her sons, who have just been exposed as rapists. In the moment of surprise, Titus jubilantly proclaims, "Why, there they are, both baked in this pie,/ Whereof their mother hath daintily fed" (5.3.59-60) and stabs Tamora. Such mockery of banqueting conventions provokes a violent outburst. Additionally, the scene's yoking of the ordinary and extraordinary points out a visual association between food and death. The food in this scene conjures up a connection between dead human flesh, tombs, and other meaty dishes typical of the period. Robert Applebaum has observed that recipes for most pasties "[have] an undertone, as it were, of interment, disinterment, and embalmment; [they] even [evoke] a re-presentation of the dead."[45] Coffin-like crusts and chunks of flesh, all freshly prepared, induce the audience to associate the most basic domestic ritual with the mortuary arts. This time, the association is not simply a cognitive link; human remains actually sit on a platter. Titus' pasties cannot differ much from everyday fare in appearance or they would not deceive Tamora; Titus presents 'normal-looking' food in such a manner that it is subject to reinterpretation. It becomes an overt manifestation of the unheimlich. Such an aberrant display blurs the boundaries between appearance and reality, and human flesh is indistinct from game (or other commonly ingested meats). Shades of the unheimlich color eating, too. The violence necessary for masticating and digesting, the violence of

eating, doubles as murderous ingestion. As Tamora chews her food, she devours her sons.[46]

The final banquet scene also overthrows the bonds established during the play's previous dinner table scene. Typically, household objects "fundamentally provide a sense of permanence and stability that is invaluable to the narrative of domestic tragedies,"[47]according to Richardson. As I have argued, the table in 3.2 allows Titus to strengthen his familial bond. Around it, the Andronici come together. The table here, possibly even the same table, mediates a gathering of enemies, and rather than bring them together, it widens the chasm of their hatred for each other. At the end of the scene, Titus, Lavinia, Tamora, Chiron, Saturninus, and Demetrius' bodies embellish the table (and its surrounding area), the bonds between them (spiteful or amiable) shattered. Some of the living bonds established during the previous scene break because Titus slays his daughter, and his own death serves to winnow the Andronici to an even smaller number. On the other hand, Titus' house is triumphant. The "house" serves to bring the play's focus back to the state. The physical house yields up the imperial family's dark secrets, and the dynastic house provides Rome with a new emperor. As I have argued, the word's two connotations meet in Marcus' speech. "Have we done aught amiss, show us wherein,/ And the place from which you behold us pleading;" he promises, "The poor remainder of the Andronici/Will…make a mutual closure of our house" (5.3.129-133). Violent consumer it may be, but the house also promises hope to Rome. The death of Saturninus brings about the birth of the Andronici.

The consummation of Titus' revenge empties domestic tasks of their benign meaning, aligning their utilitarian functions with subversive intent. Perfidy, horror, and shock undermine notions of domesticity and hospitality, the very foundation of family life, and render the heimlich unheimlich. Richardson defines domestic tragedy as tragedy that "states the denial, undermining and downright disregard of the generally accepted significances of the household."[48] From living space to dying space, kitchen to crime scene, table to deathbed, Titus' house, at the end of the play, accords with Freud's designation of the uncanny, "that species of the frightening that goes back to what was once well known and had long been familiar."[49] Cookery, eating, hospitality, home – species of daily domestic life – are misdirected for a dire purpose. Eating utensils are transformed into horrifying instruments of violence. But if Titus' bloody end reshapes domestic activities, it also decenters the house. The house morphs into something antithetical to itself; rather than a nurturing environment, it is menacing, a container for madness and revenge. Or, in Cleaver's words, Titus' house represents, "[a] place where carnall Pollicie ruleth, and not the wisdome which is from above" (3).

That Titus' house becomes a house of death invites a reassessment of the tomb scene at the beginning of the play, a scene I will examine briefly before closing. While not a dwelling place per se, the tomb is a moribund extension of Titus' domicile, for it represents the dead's "latest home" (1.1.86). Titus refers to the tomb in language that reminds the witnesses of this burial that it is a place for family, as no one but "ancestors," "brethren," and many of Titus' sons rest within: it is a type of home, and in so doing emphasizes that it is his family's exclusive domain. Within the tomb, there is a

place for nurturance. Titus "takes care" of the dead; he "appeases their shadows."[50] Margreta de Grazia suggests that the fight over Ophelia's grave is itself a struggle for property, as Ophelia's grave represents both "a nuptial bed and a family house."[51] The tomb brings into focus Titus' sense of family integrity, for the "sumptuously reedified" building represents, as Michael Neill points out, "a great family's honor and fame,"[52]which provides a space for family cohesion. The role of the tomb within the play is more complex than simply that of a domestic space for the dead, for it materializes Titus' domestic space and its morbid associations early on. It frames the play's action in such a way that it accentuates death and the dwindling numbers of Andronici, two hugely important elements in the play. The tomb itself, coupled with the burial of Titus' sons' slain in battle and the execution of Mutius, prefigures the dissolution of the Andronici. At the end, Titus' actual home becomes a receptacle for the dead, tomblike. The house, strewn with bodies, the dwelling place for the living, is filled with the corpses. It functions as an eerie type of domestic space within the tragedy. And so, the play comes full circle, ending where it began.

From beginning to end, *Titus Andronicus* maintains a sharp focus on the domestic sphere and the family dynamic. In *Titus*, as in conventional domestic tragedies, a family circle dissolves and much of the play's action takes place in a personal residence, which gradually becomes uncanny. But revenge alters *Titus*' affinity to domestic tragedy in that it introduces a multi-family conflict, contains upper-class characters, and causes families to be destroyed from without. To be sure, an insatiable desire for revenge governs Tamora and Titus' actions, but the revenge itself mediates the

play's relationship to Elizabethan discourses of domesticity as well as colors the domestic circles, spaces, and rituals with shades of the uncanny. While Tamora's revenge ostensibly destroys the Andronicus family's public reputation and seeks to destroy its private residence, Titus employs household objects and rituals in his counter-revenge. Issues of house and state inherent to Tamora's vengeful scheme allow for a critique of the house-state dichotomy, while Titus' house creates a dynamic space on which the Andronici construct their subjectivities, carry out bloody deeds, and destroy others. The confluence of domesticity and revenge in the play operates subversively, rupturing personal and social relationships as well as public and private milieus. But this peculiar intersection also evokes horror, for it inverts the quotidian, drives the action of the play, and constitutes a powerfully destructive force.

3. DOMESTIC AND DYNASTIC

In the Preface to an English edition of Seneca's tragedies, David R. Slavitt writes, "We can all agree, perhaps too easily, that bombast is bad. Sanity and proportion are better than madness and exorbitance, and therefore Seneca, being bombastic exorbitant, and extravagant, if not actually crazy, may be dismissed."[53] And, it seems, he has been grossly understudied, at least in terms of Shakespeare studies. Although it is an illuminating enterprise, reading Shakespeare against Seneca is not an especially popular critical practice. But it should be, particularly in criticism of Shakespeare's tragedies. Seneca's influence on the English stage was immense. His tragedies were well-known in the period, and Shakespeare would have read them in grammar school.[54] The impact of Seneca's tragedies on drama of the period is perhaps most obvious in revenge tragedies, of which *Titus* is one. This section of my thesis offers a fresh look at the oft-neglected Seneca and *Titus Andronicus*.

In recent years, critical studies of *Titus* have shunned Seneca and turned to Ovid, emphasizing the *Metamorphoses* as the play's most important source. Jonathan Bate exemplifies the critical tendency to focus on *Titus*' Ovidianism. He argues,

> The play's classical allusiveness is deep, not wide. It relies on sustained involvement with a few sources – Ovid and a little Livy, the most famous part of Virgil, some Plutarch, and the odd tag from Seneca that might well be derived second hand – not a deployment of a Jonsonian range of learning.[55]

Ovid is indubitably a major stage presence in Shakespeare's play – the *Metamorphoses* appears on stage, after all – but so is Seneca, in general – as a dramatic tradition – but in

particular, his *Thyestes.* Indeed, there exists a strong overlap in plot and form in Shakespeare and Seneca's plays – sexual indiscretion, revenge, domestic setting, and cannibalistic feasts, to name a few. In Aaron's words, "Complots of mischief, treasons, villainies / Ruthful to hear yet piteously performed" (5.1.65-66) appear in both. Bate is right, in that Jonsonian *Titus* is not, but, as scholars like Robert Miola have shown, the play's Senecanism extends beyond an odd tag. "Directly or indirectly," Miola writes, "*Thyestes* lies behind the action of Titus Andronicus, a deep source of its energy and its aesthetic of violence."[56] To ignore Seneca and focus solely on Ovid as *Titus*' structural model is to neglect an important link in an intertextual chain, one which sheds light on Shakespeare's first revenge tragedy.[57]

When focusing on Titus' revenge plot, even careful readers like Karen Robertson overlook *Titus Andronicus*' affinity to Seneca's *Thyestes*. Robertson pays exclusive attention to *Titus*' Ovidianism and focuses narrowly on gender and revenge in the play, discussing the implications of Shakespeare's reappropriation of Progne's revenge. She claims, "In refashioning the classical story for the Elizabethan stage, Shakespeare deliberately changes the source," the source being Ovid's account of the rape of Philomela. In so doing, Robertson avers, Shakespeare removes the female revenger from the plot and thereby effaces "feminine indignation at rape and agency in its punishment." Thus, "Vengeance becomes the responsibility of the male revenger of blood" rather than that of the female.[58] Though Robertson's reading is thorough, she commits an oversight; she assumes that Shakespeare rewrote Ovid without consulting other texts, texts which may have re-appropriated his rape narrative and changed the revenger's gender.

Robertson's study forgets that, after Ovid but before Shakespeare, Seneca adapted Ovid's tale for the stage and in so doing, cast a male in Progne's role in *Thyestes*.[59] In *Thyestes*, Atreus, whom Joost Daalder designates "more insane than Hamlet," alludes to Ovid while planning his revenge.[60] Jasper Heywood translates Atreus' evocation of Ovid as follows. "The Thracian house did see / Such wicked tables once: I graunt the mischiefe great to bee, / But done ere this," Atreus exclaims. "Some greater guilt and mischiefe more, let me / Fynde out." Asking to be filled with the malice of Progne and Philomela and thus aligning himself with them, Atreus continues, "The stomacke of thy sonne O father thou enspyre, / And syster eke, like is the cause: assist me with your powre, / And dryve my hand."[61] The connection between Ovid's text and Seneca's consists of more than a haphazard allusion, however. As part of a sustained examination of *Thyestes*' intertextual connection with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Alessandro Schiesaro flushes out deep-seated links between the two plays and demonstrates that, through an invocation of Ovid's text, "Atreus … is a new avenging Procne, but also represents himself as a female victim – a battered Philomela. It is through allusion that Atreus' protestations about his own rights acquire the special emotional value warranted by Philomela's innocence."[62] Considering himself victimized, although not directly assaulted, Atreus regards his wife's adulterous alliance with his own brother as a personal affront. He blames his brother rather than his wife for the deceit and purports that "no part" of his life is free from treachery[63] (just as no part of Progne, Philomela, Titus, or Lavinia's life is). To be sure, Titus patterns his behavior after his literary antecedents, but one wonders which one: Seneca or Ovid. Does Titus act in a feminine

revenger's capacity, because Progne's behavior provides him with what Rosalie Colie calls a "frame or fix on the world" or does his vengeful comportment derive from Atreus, who finds inspiration in Ovid?[64] More simply, it is possible that, when Shakespeare displays his knowledge of Ovid, he might actually (or also) be displaying knowledge of Seneca. And so, one question remains: When Titus declares "For worse than Philomel you abused my daughter, / And worse than Progne I will be revenged" (5.2.194-95), does he allude to *Thyestes*, Ovid's account of the rape of Philomela, or both?

Proving that Titus' revenge is either Ovidian or Senecan is a difficult task, namely because Ovid and Seneca's texts share many features with each other and with Shakespeare's play. In both classical stories, an illicit sexual encounter incites revenge, and, in both, vengeance takes the form of a cannibalistic feast, wherein are served innocent victims. Similarly, in *Titus*, a rape catalyzes a revenge plot that ends in a banquet of human flesh. There are some marked differences between the three texts, however, and a *prima facie* reading seems to indicate that Shakespeare crafted his drama in an Ovidian framework. For one, rape plays an integral role in Shakespeare and Ovid's narratives, whereas in Seneca, the debauchment of Atreus' wife, though essential to the storyline, appears at the periphery of the story; it has already occurred. What is more, Seneca gives his banquet of human flesh sustained attention, describing it in great detail – Thyestes is described as grossly surfeited and belching (5.909-19), for example – and thus positions it as a bloody crescendo to an already rhetorically bombastic closet drama. Shakespeare and Ovid, on the other hand, assign the banquet a relatively short part in

their plots. In Ovid, after Philomela shoves "the bloudy head / Of Itys in his fathers face" (6.833-34), Tereus, disgusted with the fare, "with yawning mouth he proves / To perbrake up his meate againe, and cast his bowels out" (6.838-39).[65] He then chases Procne and Philomela, and they all three morph into birds in a matter of a few lines. Shakespeare's ending, too, focuses less on the bloody meal than the restoration of social order. After Titus' jubilant revelation –

> Why, there they are, baked in this pie,
> Whereof their mother hath daintily fed,
> Eating the flesh that she herself hath bred.
> 'Tis true, 'tis true, witness my knife's sharp point
> (5.3-59-62).

– a bloody skirmish ensues, and the play quickly shifts its focus to matters of state. Shakespeare and Ovid emphasize the dinner of human flesh in their respective works so that it evokes a feeling of horror, but they conceive of it as an intense finale rather than an extra-gory and lengthy conclusion. Yet, the fact remains that the plot of all three stories runs parallel, and there are just enough allusions and formal correspondences to *Thyestes* in *Titus* to induce the reader to contemplate the revenge as both Senecan and Ovidian. Though Ovid seems to be predominant in *Titus*, the mode and source of Titus' revenge, I think, are more complicated than they seem, as is *Titus*' relationship to both Latin texts.

Rather than try to untangle the Senecan threads of Titus' revenge from the Ovidian ones, I intend to focus narrowly on a single Senecan influence within *Titus Andronicus*. More specifically, I want to focus on the relationship of Seneca's *Thyestes*' to Shakespeare's first revenge tragedy in terms of the plays' respective settings. *Titus* is

indeed eclectic in its sources, and thus *Thyestes* cannot be considered the sole Senecan dimension in the play, but, because *Thyestes* is the most discursively obvious of the play's Senecan influences (and perhaps the most illuminating), I have elected to focus exclusively on its relationship to *Titus*.[66] My discussion centers on the role of the house, or *domus* as it were, in each play, and I suggest that Shakespeare modified the Senecan house – Atreus' *domus* – and examine the significance of Shakespeare's alteration of his source. In *Thyestes*, the domus plays a dramaturgical and symbolic role, and, so too, the house functions in *Titus*. While *Titus* does not call explicit attention to its use of Seneca's domestic setting, as it manneristically does to many of its sources, this essay seeks to illustrate that the domestic setting in *Titus* is distinctly Thyestean. In the pages that follow, I articulate *Titus*' relationship both to Seneca generally and *Thyestes* particularly, for Shakespeare was working both within a broader dramatic tradition and directly with Seneca's Latin text. I then discuss Seneca's use of the *domus*, its significance, context, and function as a site of domestic and dynastic anxiety. Finally, I turn to Shakespeare and explore his use of the house compared to Seneca's. Like Seneca, Shakespeare uses a domestic setting to convey both dynastic and domestic anxiety. But the symbolic and dramaturgical function of Titus' house extends beyond household concerns and angst over perpetuating a dynasty; the Andronicus family home is a fraught space, a site where Elizabethan apprehensions over the porous nature of the home become visible.

Seneca's influence on the early modern theatre ran the gamut of Elizabeth's reign (and beyond). Initially only available in Latin, each of Seneca's tragedies, save the

Thebais, was translated into English individually, beginning in 1559. In 1581, an anthologized text, *Seneca his Tenne Tragedies*, appeared, compiled by Thomas Newton but translated by several hands.[67] *Thyestes* first appeared in 1560, Englished by Jasper Heywood. Heywood's translation remains relatively faithful to Seneca's Latin, except for the ending. Heywood's ending strays from Seneca's. The Latin *Thyestes* ends abruptly, something which must have vexed Heywood's Elizabethan sensibility, for he supplemented the text, adding a final soliloquy, which gives the play closure that Seneca's Latin version does not.[68] After being translated, Seneca reached a wider audience than he did in Latin; many playwrights of the period were familiar with his Latin tragedies and alluded to them in their own works, since, as Howard B. Norland rightly points out, "For Renaissance schoolboys, tragedy would have been virtually synonymous with Seneca." Translating the tragedies was a part of the upper-form grammar school curriculum, after all, and even writers as late as Milton identify Seneca as a "Tragedian."[69] Elizabethan literary critics admired Seneca the tragedian and touted what they considered to be his exemplary skill in their own writings. Sir Phillip Sidney, for instance, lauds *Gorbuduc* as one of the few plays whose "stately speeches and well sounding Phrases, "climb to the height of *Seneca* his stile."[70] Thomas Nash also praises Seneca in his preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, noting that "English *Seneca* read by candle light yeeldes manie good sentences, as *Bloud is a begger*, and so foorth; and, if you intreate him faire in a frostie morning, he will affoord you whole *Hamlets*, I should say handfulls of tragical speeches."[71] Focusing on the passage I have just quoted, Jessica Winston distinguishes between the earlier and later Elizabethan uses of Seneca. "Later

playwrights drew upon [Seneca's] tragedies to add life to their drama, [and] the earlier Elizabethans aimed to animate and sustain [Seneca's] tragedies themselves."[72] In short, performance, translation, and very close imitation of Seneca's plays largely within an academic setting marked the early Elizabethan period, whereas the later period, after the opening of the public theatres in 1576, bore witness to the alteration and piecemeal use of Seneca's texts on the popular stage.

By the time Shakespeare was writing, Seneca-influenced tragedies of blood, including *Titus Andronicus*, were performed with increasing popularity in the public theatres. While not always an explicit presence, Seneca permeated the early modern stage discursively and thematically, underwriting many of the period's most noteworthy revenge tragedies, *The Spanish Tragedy* being a prime example.[73] Seneca, of course, was not the only shaping force acting on dramatic works of the period, and his influence on the English theatrical tradition is multifarious and complex, to say the least. H. B. Charlton notes in an early study of English Senecanism, "The period from 1590-1603 is that of the highest achievement of English tragedy; and in that achievement Seneca, through Shakespeare and lesser men like Marston, has his share, often fragmentarily but palpably, often extensively but obscurely."[74] Not only did Elizabethan playwrights emulate Seneca's ghosts, bloody spectacles, and revenge plots, they also took quotations from his plays, stripped them of their contexts, and inserted them into their own – "line by line and page by page," as Thomas Nash puts it ruefully.[75] Because the fabric of Seneca's dramatic corpus is rich and inextricably linked to the Elizabethan tradition, it can be said that there are many Senecan traditions, some of which have been studied

(and others that remain un-researched). Gordon Braden, for instance, isolates the Senecan tradition in the Renaissance writer's response and attraction to an "autarkic selfhood distinctly characteristic of classical civilization," manifest in the "rage that is the all-consuming subject of Senecan drama."[76] Robert Miola, on the other hand, contends that s the "essential dynamic of Elizabethan revenge tragedy as it derives from Seneca" is "the revenge dynamic of rending and reintegration."[77]

That Seneca's *Thyestes* influenced the composition of *Titus Andronicus* is indubitable, and critics have mapped out intertextual connections between the two plays. Robert Miola hones in on the revenge elements in the two plays, arguing that Shakespeare alters his dramatic template, dividing Seneca's single revenge plot among three characters: Tamora, Aaron, and Titus. In *Thyestes*, there is a single revenge plot. Atreus, enraged at his brother for sleeping with his wife and stealing his property, aims to seek retribution, whereas in *Titus* there are multiple revenge plots. Accordingly, Miola contends, "This division multiplies rather than diffuses the shock value and allows for a greater complexity of perspective."[78] Indeed, the multi-layered revenge plot in *Titus* allows for a complicated and gory spectacle typical of the early modern stage. Niall Rudd also locates intertextual connections between *Titus* and *Thyestes*. The messenger's chilling display of the severed heads of Titus' sons – "Here are the heads of thy two noble sons / And here's thy hand in scorn sent to the back" (3.1.237-38) – coupled with the messenger's grim comment

> Thy grief their sports, thy resolution mocked,
> That woe is me to think upon thy woes
> More than remembrance of my father's death (3.1.239-41).

not only indicates Tamora's malicious intent, but also evokes and corresponds to *Thyestes*. After Thyestes has ingested his sons, Atreus presents their heads to him on a platter. "Open your arms for embrace: come. Surely you recognize your children," he says diabolically.[79] "In both plays the moment is a terrific *coup de théâtre*," Rudd notices.[80]

Interestingly, Seneca seems to color even the most Ovidian moment of *Titus Andronicus*. In an important essay, Michael Pincombe elucidates a relevant link between *Thyestes* and *Titus*, suggesting that "even where Shakespeare himself seems to tell us he is using Ovid as a source, in fact, he is reading Ovid 'through' Seneca."[81] Pincombe's essay attends to the 'gloomy woods' in which Lavinia is raped, and he persuasively argues that Seneca rather than Ovid, is the source for the scene of the crime. The woods which Titus declares, "Patterned by that the poet here describes, / By nature made for murders and for rapes" (4.1.57-58), are in fact reminiscent of the scene of Atreus' revenge and evoke Seneca's Latin.[82] I would suggest that, in close proximity to Titus' observation about the "gloomy woods," there appears another echo of Seneca. Directly after Lavinia calls attention to the story of Philomela in Ovid, she writes "Stuprum – Chiron Demetrius," on the ground (4.1.78). Emily Detmer-Goebel astutely remarks, "When Lavinia writes 'Stuprum' in the sand, she uses the term for rape not found in Philomela's story." 'Stuprum,' she notes, appears in the *Metamorphoses* only once, in the context of the story of Callisto, a member of Diana's entourage of virgins, who was raped by Jove and eventually bears his child. Thus, Detmer-Goebel alleges that Lavinia's use of 'Stuprum' is "suggestive not only of her sense of shame; it also testifies

to the consequence of her defilement."[83] "Stuprum," however, is an important word in Seneca's Latin version of *Thyestes*. It is, in fact, a 'stuprum' that is the impetus of Atreus' revenge plot, as Schiesaro reminds us. "The deep-seated causes of Atreus' anger and violence are Thyestes' incestuous relationship with Aerope and the consequent uncertainty about the true paternity of Agamemnon and Menelaus."[84] Atreus refers to the possible pollution of his dynastic line and his brother's deceit as a "stuprum." "*Coniugem stupro abstulit*," he says (222): "He took [my] wife by adultery." Thyestes seizes Atreus' conjugal property by means of an illicit sexual liaison, thereby polluting his bloodline, just as Chiron and Demetrius damage Titus' filial property and confound the Andronicus dynastic potential by means of a rape. In both cases, a 'stuprum' complicates issues of domestic life and dynastic future, as well as initiates a bloody revenge plot. While 'stuprum' is morally ambiguous in *Thyestes* – the last lines of the play suggest that Aerope has conspired with Thyestes – rather than the outright moral outrage it is *Titus*, as a transgression it carries a similar gory force of punishment: it incites revenge.

The connection between *Titus* and *Thyestes* runs deep, deeper, perhaps, than meets the eye. Seneca's play lurks in the background of Shakespeare's in terms of revenge. But I would like to explore the possibility that *Thyestes* colors other aspects of *Titus'* setting, besides the ill-fated sylvan scene. Titus' house functions as a point of comparison between the two plays, even though Shakespeare's play does not contain a direct allusion to the Senecan house. The connection, then, is thematic but no less real, given that Shakespeare was intimately familiar with *Thyestes*. In both plays, the house

resonates with social and symbolic meanings; the house as setting is crucial. In both cases, characters obsessively call attention to their respective dwelling places, and such attention operates as a means to convey domestic and dynastic concerns. Also, in both, a house constitutes an unnatural – indeed, unheimlich – place wherein butchery and cannibalistic feasts occur. To be sure, Ovid's narrative takes place in a house, and it can even be considered a "domestic tragedy."[85] Progne and Tereus' house does overlap with Titus' and Atreus' in social and symbolic function, but Ovid's rape narrative does not contain the intense focus on the domestic environment that Seneca and Shakespeare's works do. It is my contention that Shakespeare tapped into Seneca's focus on the house and fit it to an Elizabethan context.

Before I turn to Shakespeare, however, I want to discuss the *domus* in *Thyestes*, focusing on the way it functions in Seneca's text. Atreus' house is the primary setting of *Thyestes*, and, in the play, both the Fury and Atreus repeatedly emphasize the setting. In so doing, they bring to the fore issues of a family curse, dynastic anxiety, and the uncanny nature of the house. By virtue of its connotations, *domus* becomes a trope that articulates not only dynastic woes, but also calls attention to domestic issues. Yvon Thébert reminds us that, in Roman times, "People and their dwellings were indistinguishable: *domus* referred to not only the walls but also to the people within them."[86] When Seneca's characters refer to the *domus*, then, their remarks connote both the dwelling space and the dynastic line. But the house, as a material structure, also plays a crucial role within the play, as it frames the action. A house, as a socializing form, is governed by particular (spoken and unspoken) 'rules' or 'laws' that regulate

behavior and discursive practices for residents, guests, etc. The house as a space, in the words of Michel de Certeau, is a "practiced place," which is "constituted by a system of signs."[87] The domestic setting, as a socializing form, colors how Atreus conceives of and carries out his methods of revenge. (Additionally, the domus and its expectations also bear on the audience/reader's reaction to the text.) Atreus flagrantly disregards the comportment expected from such a form and transgresses the rules associated with his own dwelling space. His violation of the 'laws' inherent to his abode accentuates the atrocities committed in the play.

Most obviously, *domus* refers to Atreus' dynastic line and his dwelling place. Atreus' house is both cursed and disturbed, for he is genetically linked to the Tantalid line, and his brother, Thyestes, partook in the pleasures of his wife's bed, something that calls into question the legitimacy of his sons. As I showed in the first section of my thesis, in a dramatic context, domestic space is directly affected by whatever happens to the members of the dynastic line. The house, that is, cannot be peaceful when the characters are moved by issues of dynasty or threatened by forces (from within or without). The play commences with the ghost of Tantalus, whom the fury incites to "First disturb the house (domum), and bring with you battles and evil love of the sword in kings."[88] With Tantalus' bloody prediction, the play announces its unnaturally disordered setting, a setting that contains a man distressed by fraternal indiscretion and who will avenge himself using domestic measures. From the play's beginning, the situation does not portend well.

On the most local level, Thyestes' sexual indiscretions have compromised Atreus' domestic circle – the integrity of his son's blood – and thus the tranquility of his living space. Fraternal discord will, as the play unfolds, throw the house into disarray and make it resemble less of a home than a slaughterhouse. By the end of the play, Atreus has maniacally slaughtered Thyestes sons and served them to his brother, who unknowingly sates himself on his own progeny. Atreus voices concern about the paternity of his children: "[My] house (*domus*) is diseased, [my] blood uncertain; nothing is certain,"[89] he alleges, and tension stemming from the uncertainty of the situation causes him to fly into an acrid furor. Responding to what he perceives as an offense against his house – domestically and dynastically speaking – Atreus devises and performs his own paternity test, asking his children to summon his brother. A refusal on his children's part, he believes, will indicate that his children are not his own. After Thyestes has devoured his own children, Atreus determines that his home test has positive results, asserting jubilantly, "Now I believe my children born to me."[90] The malignant scheme, which Atreus concocts and enacts, can be seen not merely as blood-thirsty revenge, but also as an attempt to re-order his disordered home. Thus, his execution of and reaction to the bloody banquet simultaneously signals an attempt at both restoration and destruction. Atreus desires to ascertain the truth about his children's paternity, to ease his mind, and the consumption of Thyestes' children becomes proof of the "real" paternity of Atreus' children, and as such stabilizes his dynastic hopes and living space (for the time being, at least).

Domestic disorder extends beyond Atreus' dwelling space and the families depicted in the play, however. As part of the Tantalid line, Atreus is only one point on a line of evil-doers, and mention of his relatives reminds us of his nefarious lineage. His progenitors and his descendents participate in acts that disturb their respective domestic environments, something of which the play makes mention. The presence of Tantalus' ghost evokes the family's cannibalistic past, and the ghost himself foretells of future horrors. During the interchange between the Fury and Tantalus' ghost, wherein the Fury instructs Tantalus' ghost to goad the house into vengeful disorder, both the Fury and Tantalus separately refer to dire, forthcoming happenings. Tantalus avers, "Now, from us, a rising crowd, which will outdo its own kind, approaches, and it will render me innocent and dare the un-dared."[91] He continues, "While the house (*domo*) of Pelops stands, Minos will never be empty handed."[92] The Fury also forecasts future events. "Let the children perish by evil means, yet be born more vilely; let a wife's treachery overhang a man; in this impious home (*domo*), let adultery (*stuprum*) be the least villainy."[93] The children to die a horrible death are Thyestes' sons; the birth to which she refers is that of Aegisthus, a product of incest; and the "rancorous wife" is Clytemnestra, who murders her husband – a crime worse than incest.[94] Bennett Simon, in a discussion of tragedy and the family, suggests that tragic drama centers on anxieties inherent to perpetuating a dynastic line. [95] The questions the play poses about the paternity of Agamemnon and Menelaus, supplemented by the plays mention of the dynastic curse, accords with Simons observation. While the conversation between the Fury and Tantalus' ghost bring to the fore Atreus' position on a chain of unpleasant familial, and

therefore domestic, intrigues and debacles, it also sheds light on his biological proclivity for violence and adds credence to his capabilities as a villain and revenger. Though the play hones in on Atreus' immediate crisis, the violence in which Atreus participates did not start, nor will it stop, with him. The play's opening foregrounds Atreus' actions in his family's past and future history and becomes a way to represent dynastic anxiety on a larger scale.[96]

Atreus' house is, of course, the setting for most of the play, so, in addition to evoking domestic and dynastic concerns, to borrow a phrase from Charles Segal, "the dangerous luxury of a rich urban place" functions as a way for Seneca to amplify the barbarity of Atreus' actions.[97] As in *Titus Andronicus*, the house in *Thyestes* is an uncanny place in the Freudian sense – "that species of the frightening that goes back to what was once well known and had long been familiar"[98] – and the ironically unheimlich setting increases the impact of the play's gory denouement, as the rituals and behavior particular to a home become void of their meanings. In both plays, civility goes out the window. Discussing *Thyestes*, A. J. Boyle asserts,

> In Acts 3 to 5 central rituals of political, religious, and social life, emblematic of civilization's controlling forms, are used not to promote community, not to confirm socio-religious realities, not to harness individual differences and instinctual energies into a larger, more stable entity, but to implement savagery.[99]

Boyle's argument can be extended to the play's domestic space as well, for the house as a civilizing form and a political structure in its own right should promote fraternal harmony.[100] But it does not. Atreus' home fosters murder and treachery.

Houses are social forms. Douglas Bruster reminds us that forms are "materially productive," meaning that they have a "particular character, nature, structure, or constitution."[101] Bruster's discussion centers on literary form, but his point holds value for material forms: in this case, one's house. Houses facilitate specific social actions, and they have their own behavioral conventions, including hospitality, deference to one's superiors, and harmony.[102] (In early modern England, many of these household conventions were codified and put into householding manuals.) The particular set of behaviors that a house calls for separates it from other social forms like, say, a business, the Roman Curia, or the court. Atreus' comportment in a dwelling place breaches the social and behavioral expectations of a dwelling space. Such an outright perversion of household conventions calls attention to the specific practices associated with daily life in a house, such as cookery and hospitality, as well as brings to the fore the devices that are employed for the wrong purposes. Atreus' conduct defies the conventions governed by a house's constitution, structure, and nature. Like Titus, Atreus empties the house and its associated practices of their meanings, staining what should be civil actions with the blood of children. Both Atreus and Titus make the very thing they are trying to protect an instrument of revenge, and their homes are rendered unhomely.

Thyestes, like *Titus Andronicus*, is about more than simply revenge. It is about the anxieties inherent to propagating royal blood and reinstating the tranquility of one's disrupted living space. It is in this way that Seneca's play is about the *domus*, both in the dynastic and domestic sense. Blood distinguishes Atreus' family from others, and the house forms a barrier that separates it from the outside world. But bloodline and home –

domus and *domus* – are threatened in this play. Thyestes' lust has compromised both. Atreus, then, fights to maintain the integrity of both, and his house literally takes revenge. *Titus Andronicus* shares *Thyestes*' preoccupation with living space and bloodline. It, too, is about houses. The conflation of domestic space and dynastic line – "house" and "house" – is integral to the plot and structure of *Titus.* Indeed, the play's final scene becomes highly symbolic in that the new dynasty assumes its power directly outside the Andronicus family home. What is more, as I discussed above, conventions of domestic life become instruments of revenge, and a bloody banquet ultimately helps to quench Titus' thirst for incandescent rage, incited by the imperial family, for it becomes the vehicle to serve them their "just desserts." *Titus*, too, is about houses. The Andronicus home becomes a barrier between his family and the outside world, and it mediates his relationship with the state; it informs his method of revenge.

Tamora's accession to the throne marks the beginning of the Andronicus downfall. The throne secured, Tamora gravely vows to

> Find a day to massacre them all,
> And raze their faction and their family,
> The cruel father and his traitorous sons
> To whom [she] sued for [her] dear son's life (1.1.455-458).

Tamora's earnest avowal acts as a subtle harbinger of her perfidious intentions, and it reveals that her desire for vengeance encompasses destroying the Andronici on two levels. Her assertion – that she will "raze" the Andronici – has both dynastic and domestic connotations. She wishes to annihilate the father and his sons, the carriers of the family name, and ultimately she wishes to seize their living space. While Tamora

does not explicitly mention that she wishes to destroy Titus' domicile, "raze" does have architectural overtones and therefore can be read as the empress' surreptitious positioning of herself to attack Titus domestically. As the play progresses the line between "house" and "house" – living space and dynastic line – becomes obscured and paves the way for the play's subversive denouement.

At the play's end, Marcus's speech conflates the two meanings of "house." He insists that if the Roman people find the Andronicus family's conduct unacceptable,

> The poor remainder of the Andronici
> Will hand in hand hurl [themselves]
> And on the ragged stones beat forth [their] souls
> And make a mutual closure of [their] house (5.3.130-34).

"House" here connotes dynastic line, but it also carries with it resonances of the domestic. Indeed, the play has just shifted focus from domestic affairs to matters of state, the setting from inside to outside, but, more importantly, "outside" is in front of Titus' home. "House" also calls to mind the architectural valence of Tamora's earlier vow for blood revenge, and Marcus' words remind the audience of what the play has demonstrated: "house" as a social construction – the dynastic line – cannot viably exist without a domestic circle at its core. But the use of "house" also alludes to plays in the classical vein, as it encapsulates both dynastic line and domicile, a double which, I have shown, is traceable at least to Seneca.[103] In *Thyestes*, public and private, state and house, dynastic and domestic are inextricably linked, as they are in *Titus*. There are, however, some marked differences between the Roman play and the Elizabethan one, namely that in Seneca's play the conflict is fraternal, not inter-familial. Even though *Titus* focuses on two families instead of one, both plays show that the house is the seat of the dynastic

line, and to destroy one is to destroy the other, whether the family in question runs the state or not.

Other points of comparison between Atreus' and Titus' house exist, strengthening their structural correspondence. One similarity worth noting in passing is that in both plays the houses are represented as taking on the characteristics of their owners, an affinity which strengthens the structural correspondence between the two plays. In the beginning of the play, the Fury tells Tantalus' ghost, "Distribute this very frenzy throughout the entire house."[104] The Fury orders Tantalus' ghost to kindle the preexisting enmity between Thyestes and Atreus, thereby creating strife not simply in the context of sibling rivalry. The Fury insinuates that the house itself will experience discord, and, indubitably, the madness that leads up to the final banquet scene permeates the dwelling place itself. Witness the Fury's comment to the Ghost of Tantalus, "The house feels your entrance," she says, "and shudders completely with this horrible contact."[105] In contrast, after Titus' retreat into private life, his close association with his dwelling place becomes clear; his domicile is reflective of his mental state. Titus' house embodies a highly important symbolic function on the dramaturgical level. It takes on the characteristics of the residents themselves.[106] "Welcome, dread fury, to my woeful house" (5.2.82), Titus tells "Revenge," and Marcus refers to the house as "sorrowful" (5.3.141). If the house is woeful like its residents, then it is also vengeful. When "Revenge" leaves her ministers to "abide with [Titus]" (5.2.137), Titus exterminates them within the walls of his domicile. The house consumes them; it becomes their first grave, the site and mask for Titus' personal vendetta.

Because there are some important differences between *Titus Andronicus* and *Thyestes*, I want to consider how Shakespeare reappropriated the Senecan house. Though Shakespeare's house functions in many of the same ways that Seneca's does, it is of a different period, and as such speaks to concerns of England in the 1590s. Titus' house is not the exclusive setting of the play, as is Atreus', and, since the location of *Titus*' action varies, Shakespeare's play voices concerns about public and private that Seneca's does not.[107] I suggest that Shakespeare improvised on his classical model, adding variety to the setting. Thus, Titus' house is seen in light of and defined against other public and private settings – including a battlefield, a family funerary monument, the emperor's palace, and the streets of Rome; in the play, we see its public facade and private dimensions. It occupies a unique, almost characterologic, role in the play and becomes a dramatic *locus* where Elizabethan anxieties about the porous nature of the house are staged.[108]

Titus shares an anxiety about the permeability of the house with period pamphlets of various genres. As I illustrated in the first section of my thesis, the play calls into question the public-private and house-state dichotomies in the period. I would like to expand my previous argument in relation to *Titus* here, specifically in terms of public and private. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century householding manuals, like R. R.'s *The House-Holder's Helpe for Domesticall Discipline*, suggest that raising children well ensures future public advantages like "outward wealth and honour."[109] Private conduct affects public standing and merit, and, sometimes, unseemly private behavior requires public intervention, something that *Arden of Faversham* dramatizes. The house,

then, is not simply a barrier separating its residents from the outside world; it is permeable. Privacy, in some cases, is an illusion. As David Cressy aptly notes, in early modern England, "There was no place where public activity did not intrude. Even within the recesses of domestic routine, every action, every opinion, was susceptible to external interest, monitoring, or control."[110] Period concerns about the thin line between public and private were not limited to private comportment entering the public domain and reflecting upon public persona. Indeed, extant Elizabethan pamphlets evince anxiety about intruders breaching a house's walls and disrupting its order. A brief look at two pamphlet genres – one from the so-called "strange and wonderful" variety and one from the "home invasion and murder" type – will serve as examples of the kinds of explorations of public and private that came off of the popular press.

A True Discourse of Such Straunge and Woonderfull Accidents, as hapned in the house of M. George Lee … is representative of a genre of pamphlets that tell of unfounded and disruptive preternatural events in private homes. The pamphlet tells of the seemingly supernatural appearance of "divers stones of contrarie bignes, some weighing a pound, some two, some three, some foure, and some two and twentie pound."[111] These stones were seen to "fall verie straungely, or to bee violently flung (as it were) thorow the top or roofe of [George Lee's] hall" (A3r). Lee, disturbed by the stones, cannot find an explanation or a source for them. He gathers his neighbors and "gentlemen of worship" togther, neither of whom can explain the peculiar lapidary precipitation. The presence of the stones, and other strange and terrible sights – such as what appears to be "like a great brinded curre dogge, with a broade face like an ape,

mighty broade eies, having neither eares, feete, nor taile, but glided along on his bellie" (C2v) – throw the house into disarray and render it unhomely and frightening, the talk of Oxford county. Lee's house does not protect him; indeed, sometimes "when maister George Lee was in the house, then fell the stones in most violent sorte, and (as it were) followed him" (C3r). The house's walls no longer offer a barricade separating it from the outside world, and only after Lee's death the house reverts to normalcy. In this pamphlet and others like it, supernatural forces breach the boundaries of the house, and its status as a barrier from the outside world from the outside world, a sort of prophylactic as it were, becomes essentially meaningless.[112]

In a different vein, *A Most Straunge Rare, and Horrible Murther Committed by a Frenchman* ... recounts the murder of one neighbor by another. In early modern England, pamphlets that narrated a home invasion followed by a "bloudy murther" proliferated, and this particular pamphlet is representative of the genre. The Frenchman in question is "too or three and twenty yeres, being maried and keeping house, and bearing malice in his mind and indignation in his hart, against a neighboure of his,"[113] who runs a tavern. One night, in an attempt "to revenge some secret hatred," the Frenchman procures a hatchet, enters the tavern keeper's home, and hacks his neighbor's entire family to death. He burns down the house "to asswage the malice of his stomacke." The Frenchman then returns home, "making semblance of an honest man." Unfortunately, the authorities suspect and arrest him, he confesses to the heinous deeds, and the court convicts him and sentences him to a slow and painful death. The pamphlet describes the first part of his execution as follows. "He with nippers and pincers whot

and sharp, was there pinched and nipped by little and little and so one part of the flesh torne from the other …on the buttocks and brests … arms and other places." Afterwards, he was "tormentingly was handled and laide on the wheele, and there had his joints severally broked, and so ended his lyfe for a final punishment of so heinous a deed." In this case, as with the above cited pamphlet, the house becomes porous. While the writer makes it clear that entering a house, killing its residents, and destroying its physical structure are morally reprehensible, it still presents the personal residences as susceptible to annihilation, not as an impenetrable safe haven.[114]

The pamphlets I have just described depict peculiar incidents after an outside entity and/or party impinges on a private residence, contravening its boundaries. The aftermath of such an uninvited entry is not pleasurable, albeit not necessarily catastrophic, for the residents. More importantly, though, it renders the formerly peaceful domestic sphere unhomely, as it disrupts the routine of domestic life. These pamphlets, and others like them, illustrate that homes are not inviolable and question period notions of privacy. Print, too, makes private life public. Indeed, the press opens up the interior of George Lee's home to the outside world. Like the above pamphlets, *Titus* deals with issues of domestic privacy, and the permeability of household boundaries is seen as a real threat. Titus' enemies penetrate – literally and figuratively – his dwelling space; their "entrance" into his home and their actions profoundly affect him. This is most evident in two places. The first is the so-called "fly scene," which features Titus' anxiety about the imperial family's intrusion into his abode. The second is the play's final scene. At the play's end, Titus house becomes fully porous: the public

and private spheres seep into each other. The treacherous actions that took place inside of his house are shown to the people of Rome. Domestic affairs become part of the public domain.

I have already discussed 3.2, the "fly scene," in some detail. As I argued earlier, it stages Titus' growing paranoia, accentuates the Andronicus family's domestic cohesion, and provides a powerful parallel to Elizabethan domestic tragedies. But it is through an emphasis on Titus' madness and the family circle that this scene dramatizes Titus' fear that his enemies will impress upon his living space. In one sense, the imperial family has already infiltrated the walls of his house, something to which the diners attest. Titus and Lavinia are horribly maimed and the family has been reduced in size. The wounded father and daughter serve as a perpetual reminder of the imperial family's violent capabilities, a reminder of their deadly grasp. Yet, the dialogue, particularly surrounding the execution of the fly, suggests that he views the insect as a surrogate for the imperial family and manifests his concern about the imperial family physically entering his home (which, of course, they eventually do at Titus' behest). When Titus begins to knife the pesky fly gratuitously, likening it to Aaron, he exclaims, "There's for thyself, and that's for Tamora" (3.2.75). And he joyfully continues to beat it with his eating utensil. Of this Marcus remarks "He takes false shadows for true substances" (3.2.81). Titus, in mortally wounding the fly, simulates warding off home invaders.

In the final scene, Lucius and Marcus stand outside of Titus' home and address the populace. Their purpose is to reveal the cause of Rome's "civil wound" (5.3.86) – which also happens to be the cause of the Andronici family woes – thereby legitimating

the slaughter of the imperial family by positioning themselves as victims. More importantly, however, their address opens up the Andronicus house to the general populace. The public bears witness (albeit via the ear) to the carnage strewing the domicile. But if the public gains some sort of entrance into Titus' house, conversely, the Andronicus family's private life becomes part of the public domain; his personal business is taken to the streets. Indeed, to prove the verity of their woeful tale, Marcus and Lucius must call Aaron out of the house to corroborate their story. "The villain is alive in Titus' house" (5.3.122), Marcus says. Titus' house becomes the receptacle of the imperial family's secrets: Tamora's adulterous liaison, her endorsement of rape, the false conviction of Titus' sons, and the banishment of Lucius. The opening of Titus' house momentarily disrupts and effaces the boundary between public and private, reminding us that the house is not impervious to invaders. At the same time, the "moral" stigma attached to the invaders – something made evident the manner of their "burials"– in the words of Catherine Richardson, "keeps the household private, and prevents the penetration of its boundaries." [115]

The imperial palace offers an interesting counterpoint to Titus' house, and, before closing, I would like to consider it as such. Saturninus, too, is concerned about protecting the barriers of his palace from intruders, particularly because of his precarious political situation. When Titus, together with a group of his comrades, aims letter-laden arrows at the sky in order to "solicit heaven and move the gods" (4.3.51), he actually shoots the missives into Saturninus' court. The emperor reacts badly to the epistolary bombardment, exclaiming, "Why, lords, what wrongs are these! Was ever seen / An

emperor in Rome thus overborne …What's this but libeling against the senate / And blazoning our injustice everywhere?" (4.4.1-18). The clown, whom Titus sends to Saturninus with a letter, only compounds the emperor's fury. Upon reading the message, Saturninus orders that he be hanged immediately (4.4.44).[116] The emperor's behavior suggests that he is worried about his unjust behavior becoming public and the smattering of his reputation. He takes the letters and the clown as outside invaders and reacts to the threat violently. Saturninus' fears will, of course, be realized. His injustice will be blazoned everywhere. But Saturninus' concern about intruders in the imperial palace forms a double to Titus' preoccupation regarding his domicile. That said, in voicing concern about unwarranted entrances into their respective dwelling places, Saturninus cares more about preserving his reputation, and Titus his family.

The house(s) in *Titus Andronicus* are a rich site for analysis. The imperial palace functions as a correlative to Titus' private domain, and both residences become *loci* of contestation, where public and private encroach upon each other and the distinction between them seems about to collapse. *Titus*' roots are in the classical tradition. Like the house in Seneca's *Thyestes*, one of Shakespeare's major sources, Titus' abode is a fraught space, the peace of which has been disrupted by sexual indiscretion. "House," though, does not simply signify the physical structure. Indeed, as Matthew Johnson notes, "The frame of the house … [loses] social meaning to the objects within it."[117] The house takes its meaning from everyday life. But "house," by virtue of its definition, encompasses the residents. And *Titus*, like *Thyestes*, is about living spaces as well as the people inside They are both domestic and dynastic plays.

4. CONCLUSION

Titus Andronicus engages with contemporary discourses of domesticity in interesting and exciting ways. Titus' house itself, cookery, tables, revenge, a focus on the family: without all of these things, *Titus* would not be what it is.

In this thesis, I have tried to show that Shakespeare's first revenge tragedy can and should be treated as a 'domestic tragedy.' Tamora and Titus' aim their individual revenge plots at family circles; they commit domestic crimes; and in *Titus'* case, domestic routines are transformed into blood-soaked methods of revenge. By the end of the play, Titus' house resembles a slaughterhouse, not a happy abode. The classical precedent for Titus' house, as I have tried to show, is Seneca's *Thyestes*. In both dramatic texts, the word used to signify one's dwelling place becomes a trope for both dynastic and domestic anxiety. As we have seen, whether they are found in Seneca or Shakespeare, unhomely homes are features of domestic tragedies.

Rethinking of *Titus* as a "domestic tragedy," I hope, has revealed the centrality of domestic circle, ritual, and space to the structure of the play, but even more so, I hope that it has demonstrated wider generic import. A play need not focus on an English middle class family to be considered profoundly domestic, and many revenge tragedies – *The Maid's Tragedy, The Changeling, The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Hamlet*, among others – chart the dissolution of families, take place in private residences, and contain horrific scenes of violence conceived in domestic terms, not unlike *Titus*. To be sure, this thesis is not exhaustive – it does not consider gender, for example. But it is not meant to be so;

rather, it resulted from a curiosity about the domestic death scenes in many revenge tragedies, and knowingly leaves many questions unanswered.

NOTES

[1] Henry Hitch Adams, *English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy 1575-1642* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965), 1-2. In addition to dramatizing the domestic woes of the English common folk, Adams maintains that domestic tragedies have a didactic purpose. Adams provides a list of "lost domestic tragedies" as one of his book's appendices. See 193-203. Keith Sturgess, writing a few years after Adams, accepts Adams' generic precepts and, in his definition of the genre, emphasizes the role of divine providence and realistic stage presentation in plays such as *Arden of Faversham*. For Sturgess' description of the genre see *Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies,* ed. Keith Sturgess (New York, Penguin, 1969), 7-54.

[2] Lena Cowen Orlin, Viviana Comensoli, and Catherine Richardson discuss domestic tragedies in terms of private life. See Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994). Orlin demonstrates that the state factors largely into domestic tragedies. She demonstrates that plays like *Arden of Faversham* dramatize the public-private binary and stage the house as "an ideological construct receptive to the superimposition of political models and moral regulation," (9). For Viviana Comensoli's treatment of domestic tragedies see *'Household Business': Domestic Plays of Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999),69-83. Essentially, Comensoli examines gender and disorder in the home, and argues that domestic tragedies, by dramatizing disorder in the home, participate in subversive dialogue. Families disintegrate because female characters do not adhere to codes of proper wifely behavior and renounce their domestic roles. Richardson explores domestic tragedies in relation to household property. Rather than centering on the family dynamic, she concentrates on that which makes domesticity "universal." She explores the "representation of domestic interiors which the genre offers, and the ways in which this affects the movement of the narrative and the pointedness of its homiletic intention." See *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Early Modern England* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2006); 6, 16.

[3] *Adulterous Alliances: Home, State, and History in Early Modern European Drama and Painting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 53.

[4] Ann Christensen. "'Playing the Cook': Nurturing Men in Titus Andronicus," *Shakespeare Yearbook* 6 (1996): 327-354; 328. C. L. Barber and Richard P. Wheeler term *Titus* an "abortive domestic tragedy," but they adhere to the notion that domestic tragedies are "complex social and national action where family ties and motives are seen as crucial" (125), rather than Adams' definition of domestic tragedy. For them, the state and the family are inextricably linked. For their treatment of the play, see *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), esp. 125-157.

[5] Christensen, 329.

[6] *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[7] Miola discusses the family in terms of Roman identity as part of his study of the bard's representations of Rome in *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[8] *Poetics,* trans. Doreen C. Innes, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999), p. 75.

[9] For a survey of political criticism on *Titus* see Andrew Hadfield, "Shakespeare and Republicanism: History and Cultural Materialism," *Textual Practice* 17.3 (2003):461-483. See also Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) and Liz Oakley-Brown *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

[10] All quotes from the play, unless otherwise noted come from *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate, Arden 3 (New York: Thomson, 1995).

[11] *Issues of Death: Morality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997), 265.

[12] "Roman or Revenger?: The Definition and Distortion of Masculine Identity in *Titus Andronicus*," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 10, no. 1(May 2004):7.1-25 http://purl.oclc.org/emls/10-1/hancroma.htm (accessed September 13, 2007), par. 7.

[13] Interestingly, Aaron is referred to as the "chief architect and plotter" of the Andronicus family's woes (5.3.121), a title that accords with the themes that pervade the play.
[14] *Shakespeare and Domestic Loss: Forms of Deprivation, Mourning, and Recuperation* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999), 46.
[15] Such a device scripts Martius and Quintus as guilty, for it constitutes their position in relation to the dead body. Even though the letter is not directly addressed to Saturninus, Aaron writes it with the emperor as his intended audience, and, as such, codes the letter so that the his intended audience will surmise that Martius and Quintus are his brothers killers, foiled by the very pit in which they "decreed to bury Bassanius" (2.2.274). Aaron cleverly manipulates the post, and places "someone else" behind his words in a letter, framed as a private matter but meant for interception. Interestingly, Saturninus does not inquire about the letter's writer.
[16] *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 123. For further discussions of privacy in the Renaissance, see Corinne S. Abate "Neither a Tamer nor a Shrew Be: A Defense of Catherine and Petruchio," in *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England*, ed. Corinne S. Abate (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003): 31-44, John Bold, "Privacy and the Plan," in *English Architecture Public and Private*, eds. John Bold and Edward Chaney (London: The Hambledon Press, 1993): 107-19, and Orlin.
[17] For a discussion of the house as commonwealth in miniature and in relation to one's identity see Linda Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 149-177.
[18] Michael McKeon, *The Secret History of Domesticity* (Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 13. The distinction between public and private has been of some interest to scholars. Henri LeFebvre, in his account of the materiality of space, remarks, "Indeed the relationship between private and public is now fundamental: today the global picture includes both these aspects, along with their relationship, and partial analyses, whether formal, functional, or structural must take this into account." *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 159.
[19] For examples of a household manual that exploits the house-state metaphor, see Robert Cleaver, *A Goodlie Form of Household Government* (London, 1598); R.R., *The House-holders Helpe, for Domesticall Discipline: or A Familiar Conference of House-hould Instruction and Correction, Fit for the Godly Government of Christian Families* (London,George Purslowe for John Budge, 1615); Edward Topsell, *The House-Holder: or, Perfect Man* (London, Henry Rockyt, 1609); Richard Brathwait, *The English Gentleman,* (London: John Haviland for Robert Bostock, 1630); Thomas Carter, *Carters Christian Commonwealth, or Domesticall Dutyes Deciphered* (London: Thomas Purfoot, 1624); and William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties Eight Treatises* (London: John Haviland for William Bladen, 1622).
[20] *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 28.
[21] Hancock, par. 7.
[22] *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 52.
[23] Cleaver, 15. Hereafter, I cite this text parenthetically.
[24] See Orlin 245-247.
[25] Brian Vickers has persuasively argued that Shakespeare co-wrote Titus Andronicus with George Peele in *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Survey of Five Collaborative Plays* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004). Piggy-backing off of Vickers, Brian Boyd argues that the killing of Mutius was written by Peele and to remove it would be to remove the text's largest flaw. "Mutius: An Obstacle Removed in *Titus Andronicus*," *The Review of English Studies,* New Series, 55.219 (2004):196-209.
[26] Christensen, 330. For articles regarding this curious scene, see Christensen; Nicholas Brooke "The Intrusive Fly: A Note on Act 3 Scene 2 of *Titus Andronicus*," *Filološki Pregled* 1-2 (1963-64): 99-102; and Joseph E. Kramer, "*Titus Andronicus*: The 'Fly-killing' Incident," *Shakespeare Studies* 5 (1969): 9-19.
[27] Sturgess, 19.
[28] Christensen, 330.

[29] *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 8.
[30] Bryan, Boyd "Kind and Unkindness in *Titus Andronicus*," *Words that Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson***,** ed. Bryan Boyd (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004): 51-77; 66.
[31] "Properties of Domestic Life: the Table in Heywood's A Woman Killed with Kindness" in *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama,* ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002):129-152; 138.
[32] Lorna Hutson, "Rethinking the 'Spectacle of the Scaffold:' Juridical Epistemologies and English Revenge Tragedies," *Representations* 89 (2005):30-58, 52.
[33] Scholars have discussed the slaughter of Tamora's sons and the cannibalistic feast at the end of the play in a number of ways, from gendered readings, to trauma theory, to medicinal cannibalism, and even to bloodletting. For examples of such readings, see Louise Noble, "'And make two pasties of your shameful heads': Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in *Titus Andronicus,*" *ELH* 70 (2003): 677-708; Deborah Willis "'The gnawing vulture': Revenge, Trauma Theory, and *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 53.1(2002): 21-52; Marion Wynne-Davis "'The Swallowing Womb:' Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*," in *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. Valerie Wayne (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991): 129-51; and Catherine Belling, "Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revienge, Bloodletting and the Health of Rome's Body" in *Disease, Diagnoses, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage,* eds. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Perterson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004): 113-32. Joan Fitzpatrick discusses the final scene in the last chapter of *Food in Shakespeare* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).
[34] *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England. 1550-1700* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 4.
[35] "The Uncanny," in *The Uncanny,* trans. David McLintock (New York: Penguin, 2003),121-162; 123.
[36] Wall, 193.
[37] *A New Book of Cookerie , otherwise called the Good Huswife's Handmaid* (London, 1597), p.4r
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 6r. For more examples of cookbooks of the period see, John Partridge, *The Treasurie of Commodious Conceits Commonly Called the Good Huswife's Closet of Provision* (London: Henry Car, 1584); Anon., *A Good Huswife's Handmaide for the Kitchin Containing Manie Principall Pointes of Cookerie* (London: Richard Jones, 1594); Anon., *A proper new booke of cookery Declaring what maner of meates be best in season for al times of the yeere, and how they ought to be dressed, [and] serued at the table, both for fleshe dayes and fish daies. with a new addition, very necessary for al them that delight in cookery* (London: William How for Abraham Veale, 1575); Thomas Dawson, *The good husvvifes ievvell VVherein is to be found most excellent and rare deuises for conceits in cookerie, found out by the practise of Thomas Dawson. Whereunto is adioyned sundry approued reseits for many soueraine oyles, and the way to distill many precious waters, with diuers approued medicines for many diseases. Also certaine approued points of husbandry, very necessarie for all husbandmen to know* (London: John Wolfe for Edward White, 1587); Thomas Dawson, *The second part of the good hus-wiues iewell Where is to be found most apt and readiest wayes to distill many wholsome and sweet waters. In which likewise is shewed the best maner in preseruing of diuers sorts of fruits, & making of sirrops. With diuers conceits in cookerie with the booke of caruing* (London: E Allde for Edward White, 1597); Thomas Dawson, *A booke of cookerie. And the order of meates to bee serued to the table, both for flesh and fish dayes With many excellent wayes for the dressing of all vsuall sortes of meates* (London: Edward Allde, 1620); John Murrell, *A delightfull daily exercise for ladies and gentlewomen Whereby is set foorth the secrete misteries of the purest preseruings in glasses and other confrictionaries, as making of breads, pastes, preserues, suckets, marmalates, tartstuffes, rough candies, with many other things neuer before in print. Whereto is added a booke of cookery* (London: Augustine Matthewes for Thomas Dew, 1621); John Murrell, *A nevv booke of cookerie VVherein is set forth a most perfect direction to furnish an extraordinary, or ordinary feast, either in Summer or Winter* (London: T. Snodham for John Browne, 1617); and Gervase Markham, *Countrey contentments* (London: John Beale for R. Jackson, 1615), esp. the second book.
[39] Wall, 216.

[40] *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 19.
[41] See *The Gift*, trans. W. D. Halls (New York: Norton, 1990).
[42] Dubrow, 116.
[43] For a full explication of the reciprocity entailed in revenge, see Harry Keyishian, *The Shapes of Revenge: Victimization, Vengeance, and Vindictiveness in Shakespeare* (Amherst: Humanity Books, 2003).
[44] Giovanne de Rosselli, *Epulario, or The Italian Banquet,* (London, 1598), B4r.
[45] *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and other Gastronomic Introjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 19.
[46] Chris Meads discusses the two banquet scene in *Banquets Set Forth: Banqueting in English Renaissance Drama* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001). He argues, "The public banquet should have been the occasion when…elements of society were consolidated, but Titus' act of vengeance rends the social fabric, turning decorum to destruction" (77).
[47] Richardson, "Properties of Domestic Life," 143.
[48] Richardson, *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy*,193.
[49] Freud, 124.
[50] The notion of tomb as domestic space appears in several plays throughout the period. In *The Atheist's Tragedy*, too, while sitting in a churchyard Charlemont remarks,

> How fit a place for contemplation
> Is this dead of night, among the dwellings
> Of the dead. This grave – perhaps th'inhabitant
> Was in his lifetime the possessor of
> His own desires. (4.3.3-7).

Indeed, in period revenge tragedies, houses become indistinguishable from tombs (see, for instance, *The Changeling, The Duchess of Malfi,* and *The Revenger's Tragedy*), which seems remarkably odd given that during this time people wished to separate themselves from the dead. While people still died at home, there is a sense that, with the increasing partitioning of the house, there were specific places to die. In revenge tragedies, people die unnaturally in inappropriate parts of the home, and, typically, by the end of the plays, there are more dead people in the domestic space than living. Interestingly, the language adopted to talk about domestic spaces and rituals greatly coincided with the language deployed to talk about death. In early modern England As mentioned above, tombs were often described as domestic spaces for the dead and were considered property, which could be "visited." People died at home in their beds and were wrapped in winding "sheets." For discussions of death in the period, see Philippe Ariés, *Western Attitudes Towards Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, trans. Patricia M. Ranum (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974); Philippe Ariés, *The Hour of Our Death*, trans. Helen Weaver (New York: Knopf, 1981); Lucinda M. Becker, *Death and the Early Modern English Woman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003); Clare Gittings, *Death, Burial, and the Individual in Early Modern England* (London: Croom Helm, 1984); Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings, eds. *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 2000), esp. chapters 5-7; Ralph Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion, and the Family in England 1480-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Ralph Houlbrooke (ed.), *Death, Ritual, and Bereavement* (New York: Routledge, 1989); Neill; and Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977). *The Atheist's Tragedy* quoted from Katharine Eisaman Maus, ed. *Four Revenge Tragedies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
[51] Margreta de Grazia, Hamlet *without Hamlet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 148.
[52] Neill, 291.
[53] Preface, in *Seneca: The Tragedies Volume I*, trans. and ed. David R. Slavitt (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992): vii-xvi; vii.
[54] T.S. Eliot writes, "So far as Shakespeare was influenced by Seneca, it was by his memories of school conning and through the influence of Senecan tragedy of the day, through Kyd and Peele, but chiefly

Kyd." See "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca," in *T. S. Eliot: Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1932): 107-20; 110.
[55] *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 103.
[56] *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992); 23. For Miola's full study on Seneca and *Titus*, see pages 13-32.
[57] Douglas A. Brooks provides a similar insight, and one to which I am indebted, to *The Faerie Queene*. See "'Made all of yron, ranckling sore': The Imprint of Paternity in *The Faerie Queene*," in *Textual Conversations in the Renaissance: Ethics, Authors, Technologies*, ed. Zachary Lesser and Benedict S. Robinson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006): 173-98.
[58] "Rape and the Appropriation of Progne's Revenge in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, or 'Who Cooks the Thyestean Banquet?'" in *Representing Rape in Medieval and Early Modern Literature,* ed. Christine M. Rose and Elizabeth Robertson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001): 213-37; 214.
[59] For an enlightening study of Seneca's use of Ovid, see Alessandro Schiesaro, *The Passions in Play:* Thyestes *and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), esp. 70-138.
[60]"Madness in Jasper Heywood's 1560 Version of Seneca's *Thyestes*," *Classical and Modern Literature* 16.2 (1996): 119-129; 122. Many recent studies have excluded Seneca and instead focused on Ovid as Shakespeare's major source. A dated, but still useful, study by Howard Baker denies that Titus Andronicus is Senecan at all. See *Induction to Tragedy: A Study of a Development of Form in* Gorboduc, The Spanish Tragedy, *and* Titus Andronicus (Russell and Russell, 1965). Jessica Lugo suggests that "Titus Andronicus takes parodic delight in its roots in Ovid's version of the Philomela myth, transforming it into stage drama that both delights and sickens audiences," but she neither acknowledges that Seneca had already done so nor entertains the narrative overlap between Seneca and Ovid. "Blood, Barbarism, and Belly Laughs: Shakespeare's *Titus* and Ovid's Philomela," *English Studies* 88.4 (2007): 401-17; 401. Similarly, A. B. Taylor attends to the play's Ovidianism and neglects the dramaturgical similarities between Shakespeare and Seneca. "Animals in 'manly shape as too the outward showe': Moralizing and Metamorphosis in *Titus Andronicus*, in *Shakespeare's Ovid: The* Metamorphoses *in the Plays and Poems*, ed. A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006): 66-80.
[61] All citations from *Thyestes* are taken from *Seneca: Oedipus, Agamemnon, Thyestes, Hercules on Oeta, Octavia*, trans. John G. Fitch, Loeb Classical Library 78 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004). "vidit infandas domus Odrysia mensas – fateor, immane est scelus, sed occupatum…animum Daulis inspira parens sororque: causa est similis" (272-76). All quotes from Jasper Heywood are taken from *Seneca: His Tenne Tragedies* (London, 1581); E1r. Hereafter, all citations will be noted parenthetically in my text.
[62] 81.
[63] "pars nulla nostri tuta ab insidiis vacat" (238, my translation).
[64] *The Resources of Kind: Genre Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 8. Though Colie speaks of genres and the rape of Philomel is not a genre unto itself, her critical apparatus is a useful heuristic, because it provides method to explain the characters' beahavior. According to Colie, genre functions as a "mode of thought," and it presents a way for one to connect "literary kinds with kinds of knowledge and experience" (29).
[65] *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, trans. Arthur Golding, ed. John Frederick Nims (Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000).
[66] Miola offers a variety of Senecan influences on the play
[67] During the early part of Elizabeth's reign, many of Seneca's tragedies were performed at the Inns of Court. For a list of Seneca's plays performed at Cambridge see, G. C. Moore Smith, *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923). For a printing history, see J. W. Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1965), 8. Bruce Smith provides a history of the performance of Seneca's plays in a university setting in *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500-1700* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

[68] *Thyestes* was not the only play of Seneca's to be altered by Elizabethan translators. For a study of alterations made to Seneca's Latin see, Howard B. Norland, "Adapting to the Times: Expansion and Interpolation in the Elizabethan Translations of Seneca," *Classical and Modern Literature* 16.3 (1996): 241-63.
[69] Ibid., 241. Milton quotes *Hercules Furens* in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*. See *The Riverside Milton*, ed. Roy Flannagan (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998):1057-1075, 1063.
[70] *An Apology for Poetry*, in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937): 148-207; 196-97.
[71] "Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*," in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937): 307-320; 312.
[72] "Seneca in Early Elizabethan England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 29-58; 31. According to Winston, translating Seneca's tragedies became a means to "[facilitate] the translators' Latin learning, personal interactions, and their political thinking and involvement" (32).
[73] Seneca, of course, did not only influence tragedies of blood. Scholars have traced his influence in Shakespeare's other plays. See, for example, Laura Alexander, "Senecan Stoicism and Shakespeare's *Richard III*," *Interactions: Aegean Journal of English and American Studies* 14.1 (2005): 27-48; Yves Peyré, "'Confusion Now Hath Made His Masterpiece: Senecan Resonances in *Macbeth*," in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, ed. Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004): 141-55; M. L. Stapleton, "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne:" Margaret of Anjou and English Seneca," *Comparative Literature Studies* 43.1-2 (2006): 100-33. John M. Wallace, "The Senecan Context of *Coriolanus*," *Modern Philology* 90.4 (1993): 465-78.
[74] *The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy* (Manchester, University of Manchester Press, 1974), 144. A. J. Boyle makes a similar remark in *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical Tradition* (New York: Routledge, 1996). "After the opening of the public theatres in 1576," he writes, "the dramaturgical response [to Senecan drama], although extensive, was more indirect, complex and creative," than it was earlier in the period (143).
[75] 312.
[76] *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 2. Braden's fascinating study traces the Senecan self from Seneca, through France, Italy, and England. A. J. Boyle also focuses on the Senecan tradition, paying extensive attention to Seneca's plays in their context as well as the Elizabethan modification of Seneca's plays. Charlton's study draws a distinction between the French, Italian, and English receptions of Seneca. According to A. L. and M. K. Kistner, Elizabethan drama takes from Senecan tragedy the following characteristics, characteristics that form an the chief Senecan pattern in drama of the period. Typically, the protagonist "falls into despair, which produces one or more reactions (a) madness, (b) desire for suicide, (c) desire for revenge, or (d) any combination of these responses" (1). See "The Senecan Background of Despair in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Studies* 7 (1974): 1-9. For an excellent history of twentieth-century studies of Senecan influences in Elizabethan England, see Miola, *Classical Tragedy*, esp. 1-10.
[77] Miola, *Classical Tragedy*, 32.
[78] Ibid., 23.
[79] "Expedi amplexis, pater: / venere. natos equid agnoscis tuos?" (1004-05, my translation).
[80] "*Titus Andronicus*: The Classical Presence," *Shakespeare Survey* 55 (2002): 199-208; 204. See also, Boyle, 148.
[81] "Classical and Contemporary Sources of the 'Gloomy Woods' of *Titus Andronicus*: Ovid, Seneca, Spenser," in *Shakespearean Continuities: Essays in Honour of E. A. J. Honigmann*, ed. E. A. J. Honigmann, John Batchelor, Thomas Grant Steven Cain, and Clare Lamont (New York: St. Martins, 1997): 40-55, 41.
[82] The correspondence between the two texts can be found in the messenger's speech in *Thyestes,* where he describes the scene of Atreus' perfidy. Pincombe suggests that Spenser also plays a role in the "gloomy woods."
[83] "The Need for Lavinia's Voice: Titus Andronicus and the Telling of Rape," *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001) 75-92; 86.

[84] 4.
[85] James, 70.
[86] "Private Life and Domestic Architecture in Roman Africa," in *A History of Private Life*, vol. 1, ed. Paul Veyne, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge [Mass]: Belknap, 1992): 313-410; 407.
[87]de Certeau contends that a space "occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, and temporalize it." *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 117.
[88] "Ante perturba domum, / inferque tecum proelia et ferri malum / regibus amorem" (83-85, my translation).
[89] "domus aegra, dubius sanguis; est certi nihil" (240, my translation).
[90] "liberos nasci mihi / nunc credo" (1098-99, my translation).
[91] "Iam nostra subit / e stripe turba quae suum vincat genus / ac me innocentem faciat et inausa audeat" (18-20, my translation).
[92] "numquam stante Pelopeea domo / Minos vacabit" (22-23, Fitch's translation).
[93] "Liberi pereant male, / peius tamen nascantur; immineat viro / infesta coniunx: impia stuprum in domo / levissimum sit facinus" (41-44, my translation).
[94] Fitch note 3, 233. Fitch's introduction to the Loeb edition provides a concise summary of the long-standing familial woes of the Tantalid line.
[95] *Tragic Drama and the Family* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 2.
[96] Interestingly, the soliloquy that Heywood added to Thyestes also articulates dynastic anxieties on a larger scale, for it foretells of the vengeance that will ultimately visit upon Atreus (F6v).
[97] "Dissonant Sympathy: Song, Orpheus, and the Golden Age in Seneca's Tragedies," in *Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama*, ed. A. J. Boyle (Berwick: Aureal Publications, 1983): 229-251; 242.
[98] 124.
[99] "The Tragic World of Seneca's Agamemnon and Thyestes," in *Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama*, ed. A. J. Boyle (Berwick: Aureal Publications, 1983): 199-228; 213. Boyle develops the ideas presented in this essay in his book *Tragic Seneca*.
[100] Kristina Milnor discusses the Roman house as a unit of civic life. See *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), esp. 245.
[101] "The Materiality of Shakespearean Form," in *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*, ed. Stephen Cohen (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007): 31-48; 36. Colie's analysis of genre also provides a way in which to analyze the house in terms of material form.
[102] For an overview of private life and household conduct in Rome, see *A History of Private Life*, vol. 1.
[103] It is worth noting *en passant* that "house" in the early modern period crops up in a variety of discourses and places. Parliament, for instance, was comprised of the "House of Lords" and the "House of Commons," many books advertise themselves as "storehouses," and, as noted above, "house" refers to dynastic line and domicile. "Domestic" too resonates with public and private meanings, as does "state," for it is employed as a measure of one's personal well-being – as in sonnet 29, for instance, "When in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes / I all alone beweep my outcast state" (1-2) – and in governmental terms. Sonnet 29 is quoted from *Shake-Speare's Sonnets,* ed. Stephen Booth (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).
[104] "Hunc, hunc fuorem divide in totam domum." (101, Fitch's translation)
[105] "sentit introitus tuos / domus et nefando tota contactu horruit" (103-04, my translation).
[106] For a discussion of houses and male subjectivity, see Dubrow, esp. 55.
[107] This is not to say that Seneca's play does not voice concerns about public and private, but that the public/private dichotomy that Shakespeare explores is particular to early modern England.
[108] For an analysis of an house as a character in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, see Orlin 152.
[109] 5r.
[110] "Response, Private Lives, Public Performance, and Rites of Passage," in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, eds. Betty Travitsky and Adele S. Seefe (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994): 187-97; 187.

[111] (London, 1592), A3r. Hereafter I will cite this text parenthetically.
[112] Julie Sievers provides a concise look at so-called literatures of wonder in "Literatures of Wonder in Early Modern England and America," *Literature Compass* 3.4 (2007): 766-83. For a later example of this type of pamphlet, see *Strange and fearfull newes from Plaisto* (London, 1645).
[113] Trans. Ævesham (London: 1586). Unfortunately, this pamphlet has no extent signatures or page numbers, so I cannot offer them parenthetically. Other examples of this pamphlet genre include *A bloudy New-yeares Gift, or A True Declaration of the Most Cruell and Bloudy Murther, of Maister Robert Heath, in His Owne House at high Holbourne* (London, 1609) and *A true report of the horrible murther, which was committed in the house of Sir Ierome Bowes, Knight* (London, 1607), both by Anonymous.
[114] Orlin notes that, among other things, a house is an "ideological construct receptive to the superimposition of political models and moral regulations" (9). Matthew Johnson stresses that houses have "social meaning," which cohere with "cultural values." See *Housing Culture: Traditional Architecture in an English Landscape* (Washington D. C., Smithsonian, 1993), 28.
[115] *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy*, 41. Richardson's discussion centers on depositions, but it applies to my argument. She remarks, "These tropes of the penetration of the household boundaries are at the heart of the creation of a moral distance between the deponent and the accused" (41).
[116] For an intriguing take on the clown's execution, see Francis Barker, "A Wilderness of Tigers: *Titus Andronicus, Anthropology*, and the Occlusion of Violence." in *The Culture of Violence: Essays on Tragedy and History* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1993): 143-206.
[117] Johnson, 107.

REFERENCES

Abate, Corinne S. "Neither a Tamer nor a Shrew Be: A Defense of Catherine and Petruchio." *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England.* Ed. Corinne S. Abate. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. 31-44.

Adams, Henry Hitch. *English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy 1575-1642.* New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

Alexander, Laura. "Senecan Stoicism and Shakespeare's *Richard III*." *Interactions: Aegean Journal of English and American Studies* 14.1 (2005): 27-48.

Anon. *A Bloudy New-yeares Gift, or A True Declaration of the Most Cruell and Bloudy Murther, of Maister Robert Heath, in His Owne House at High Holbourne.* London, 1609.

---. *A Good Huswife's Handmaide for the Kitchin Containing Manie Principall Pointes of Cookerie.* London, 1594.

---. *A Most Straunge, Rare, and Horrible Murther Committed by a Frenchman.* Trans. Ævesham. London, 1586.

---. *A New Book of Cookerie , Otherwise Called the Good Huswife's Handmaid.* London, 1597.

---. *A Proper New Booke of Cookery Declaring what Maner of Meates Be Best in Season for Al Times of the Yeere, and How They Ought to Be Dressed, [and] Serued atthe Table, Both for Fleshe Dayes and Fish Daies.* London, 1575.

---. *A True Discourse of Such Straunge and Woonderfull Accidents, as Hapned in the House of M. George Lee*. London, 1592.

---. *A True Report of the Horrible Murther, which was Committed in the House of Sir Ierome Bowes, Knight.* London, 1607.

---. *Strange and Fearfull Newes from Plaisto.* London, 1645.

Applebaum, Robert. *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and other Gastronomic Introjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Ariés, Philippe. *The Hour of Our Death.* Trans. Helen Weaver. New York: Knopf, 1981.

---. *Western Attitudes Towards Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*. Trans. Patricia M. Ranum. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Aristotle. *Poetics.* Trans. Doreen C. Innes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Baker, Howard. *Induction to Tragedy: A Study of a Development of Form in* Gorboduc*,* The Spanish Tragedy*, and* Titus Andronicus. New York: Russell and Russell, 1965.

Barber, C. L. and Richard P. Wheeler. *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Barker, Francis. *The Culture of Violence: Essays on Tragedy and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1993.

Becker, Lucinda M. *Death and the Early Modern English Woman.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.

Belling, Catherine. "Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revenge, Bloodletting and the Health

of Rome's Body." *Disease, Diagnoses, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage.* Ed. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Perterson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004. 113-32.

Bold, John. "Privacy and the Plan." *English Architecture Public and Private.* Ed. John Bold and Edward Chaney. London: The Hambledon Press, 1993. 107-19.

Boyd, Brian. "Kind and Unkindness in *Titus Andronicus.*" *Words that Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson*. Ed. Bryan Boyd. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004. 51-77.

---. "Mutius: An Obstacle Removed in *Titus Andronicus*." *The Review of English Studies* ns 55.219 (2004): 196-209.

Boyle, A. J. *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical Tradition.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

---. "The Tragic World of Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*." *Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama*. Ed. A. J. Boyle. Berwick: Aureal Publications, 1983. 199-228.

Braden, Gordon. *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

Brathwait, Richard. *The English Gentleman.* London, 1630.

Brooke, Nicholas. "The Intrusive Fly: A Note on Act 3 Scene 2 of *Titus Andronicus.*" *Filološki Pregled* 1-2 (1963-64): 99-102.

Brooks, Douglas A. "'Made all of yron, ranckling sore': The Imprint of Paternity in *The Faerie Queene*." *Textual Conversations in the Renaissance: Ethics, Authors,*

Technologies. Ed. Zachary Lesser and Benedict S. Robinson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. 173-98.

Bruster, Douglas. "The Materiality of Shakespearean Form." *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*. Ed. Stephen Cohen. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. 31-48.

Carter, Thomas. *Carters Christian Commonwealth, or Domesticall Dutyes Deciphered.* London, 1624.

Charleton, H. B. *The Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy*. Manchester, UK: University of Manchester Press, 1974.

Christensen, Ann. "'Playing the Cook': Nurturing Men in Titus Andronicus." *Shakespeare Yearbook* 6 (1996): 327-354.

Cleaver, Robert. *A Godlie Form of Household Government*. London, 1598.

Colie, Rosalie L. *The Resources of Kind: Genre Theory in the Renaissance.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Comensoli, Viviana. *Household Business: Domestic Plays of Early Modern England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Cressy, David. "Response, Private Lives, Public Performance, and Rites of Passage." *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*. Ed. Betty Travitsky and Adele S. Seefe. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994. 187-97.

Cunliffe, J. W. *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy.* Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1965.

Daalder, Joost. "Madness in Jasper Heywood's 1560 Version of Seneca's *Thyestes*."

Classical and Modern Literature 16.2 (1996): 119-129.

Dawson, Thomas. *A Booke of Cookerie.* London, 1620.

---. *The Good Huswifes Jewell.* London, 1587.

---. *The Second Part of the Good Hus-wiues Jewell.* London, 1597.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

de Grazia, Margreta. Hamlet *without Hamlet*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

de Rosselli, Giovanne. *Epulario, or The Italian Banquet.* London, 1598.

Dolan, Frances. *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England. 1550-1700.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Dollimore, Jonathan. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Dubrow, Heather. *Shakespeare and Domestic Loss: Forms of Deprivation, Mourning, and Recuperation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Eliot, T.S. "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca." *T. S. Eliot: Selected Essays*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1932. 107-20.

Fitzpatrick, Joan. *Food in Shakespeare.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." In *The Uncanny.* Trans. and Ed. David McLintock. New York: Penguin, 2003. 121-62.

Fumerton, Patricia. *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of*

Social Ornament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Gittings, Claire. *Death, Burial, and the Individual in Early Modern England.* London: Croom Helm, 1984.

Gouge, William. *Of Domesticall Duties Eight Treatises*. London, 1622.

Hadfield, Andrew. "Shakespeare and Republicanism: History and Cultural Materialism." *Textual Practice* 17.3 (2003): 461-483.

Hancock, Brecken Rose. "Roman or Revenger?: The Definition and Distortion of Masculine Identity in *Titus Andronicus*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 10.1 (2004): 7.1-25. 13 September 2007 <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/10-1/hancroma.htm>.

Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Helgerson, Richard. *Adulterous Alliances: Home, State, and History in Early Modern European Drama and Painting.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Houlbrooke, Ralph. *Death, Religion, and the Family in England 1480-1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

---. *Death, Ritual, and Bereavement*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Hutson, Lorna. "Rethinking the 'Spectacle of the Scaffold:' Juridical Epistemologies and English Revenge Tragedies." *Representations* 89 (2005): 30-58.

James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Johnson, Matthew. *Housing Culture: Traditional Architecture in an English Landscape.*

Washington DC: Smithsonian, 1993.

Jupp, Peter C. and Clare Gittings, eds. *Death in England: An Illustrated History.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2000.

Kahn, Coppelia. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

Keyishian, Harry. *The Shapes of Revenge: Victimization, Vengeance, and Vindictiveness in Shakespeare.* Amherst, MA: Humanity Books, 2003.

Kistner, M. L. and A. K. Kistner. "The Senecan Background of Despair in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Titus Andronicus.*" *Shakespeare Studies* 7 (1974): 1-9.

Korda, Natasha. *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Kramer, Joseph E. "*Titus Andronicus*: The 'Fly-killing' Incident." *Shakespeare Studies* 5 (1969): 9-19.

LeFebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson Smith. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1991.

Lugo, Jessica. "Blood, Barbarism, and Belly Laughs: Shakespeare's *Titus* and Ovid's Philomela." *English Studies* 88.4 (2007): 401-17.

Markham, Gervase. *Countrey Contentments.* London, 1615.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift.* Trans. W. D. Halls. New York: Norton, 1990.

McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Meads, Chris. *Banquets Set Forth: Banqueting in English Renaissance Drama.*

Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Milnor, Kristina. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Milton, John. *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates. The Riverside Milton*. Ed. Roy Flannagan. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998. 1057-75.

Miola, Robert. *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1992.

---. *Shakespeare's Rome.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Murrell, John. *A Delightfull Daily Exercise for Ladies and Gentlewomen.* London, 1621.

---. *A New Booke of Cookerie*. London, 1617.

Nash, Thomas. "Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*." *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Ed. G. Gregory Smith. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937. 307-20.

Neill, Michael. *Issues of Death: Morality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Noble, Louise. "'And make two pasties of your shameful heads': Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in *Titus Andronicus.*" *ELH* 70 (2003): 677-708.

Norland, Howard B. "Adapting to the Times: Expansion and Interpolation in the Elizabethan Translations of Seneca." *Classical and Modern Literature* 16.3 (1996): 241-63.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.

Orlin, Lena Cowen. *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England.*

Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Ovid. *Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Trans. Arthur Golding. Ed. John Frederick Nims. Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000.

Partridge, John. *The Treasurie of Commodious Conceits Commonly Called the Good Huswife's Closet of Provision.* London, 1584.

Peyré, Yves. "'Confusion Now Hath Made His Masterpiece': Senecan Resonances in *Macbeth.*" *Shakespeare and the Classics.* Ed. Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 141-55.

Pincombe, Michael. "Classical and Contemporary Sources of the 'Gloomy Woods' of *Titus Andronicus*: Ovid, Seneca, Spenser." *Shakespearean Continuities: Essays in Honour of E. A. J. Honigmann.* Ed. E. A. J. Honigmann, Tom Cain, and Claire Lamont. New York: St. Martins, 1997. 40-55.

Richardson, Catherine. *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Early Modern England.* Manchester, UK: University of Manchester Press, 2006.

---. "Properties of Domestic Life: the Table in Heywood's A Woman Killed with Kindness." *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*. Ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 129-52.

Robertson, Karen. "Rape and the Appropriation of Progne's Revenge in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, or 'Who Cooks the Thyestean Banquet?'" *Representing Rape in Medieval and Early Modern Literature.* Ed. Christine M. Rose and Elizabeth Robertson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. 213-37.

R.R., *The House-holders Helpe, for Domesticall Discipline: or A Familiar Conference of Household Instruction and Correction, Fit for the Godly Government of Christian Families.* London, 1615.

Rudd, Niall. "*Titus Andronicus*: The Classical Presence." *Shakespeare Survey* 55 (2002): 199-208.

Schiesaro, Alessandro. *The Passions in Play: "Thyestes" and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Segal, Charles. "Dissonant Sympathy: Song, Orpheus, and the Golden Age in Seneca's Tragedies." *Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama*. Ed. A. J. Boyle. Berwick: Aureal Publications, 1983. 229-51.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Seneca: His Tenne Tragedies.* Comp. Thomas Newton. London, 1581.

---. *Seneca: Oedipus, Agamemnon, Thyestes, Hercules on Oeta, Octavia.* Trans. and Ed. John G. Fitch. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Shakespeare, William. *Shake-Speare's Sonnets.* Ed. Stephen Booth. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977.

---. *Titus Andronicus*. Ed. Jonathan Bate. New York: Thomson, 1995.

Sievers, Julie. "Literatures of Wonder in Early Modern England and America." *Literature Compass* 3.4 (2007): 766-83.

Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Ed. G. Gregory Smith. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937. 148-207.

Simon, Bennett. *Tragic Drama and the Family.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press,

1988.

Slavitt, David. Preface. *Seneca: The Tragedies Volume I*. Trans. and Ed. David R. Slavitt. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992. vii-xvi.

Smith, Bruce. *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500-1700.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Smith, G. C. Moore. *College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1923.

Stapleton, M. L. "'I of Old Contemptes Complayne:" Margaret of Anjou and English Seneca." *Comparative Literature Studies* 43.1-2 (2006): 100-33.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800.* New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Sturgess, Keith, ed. *Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies.* New York: Penguin, 1969.

Taylor, A. B. "Animals in 'manly shape as too the outward showe': Moralizing and Metamorphosis in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare's Ovid: The* Metamorphoses *in the Plays and Poems*. Ed. A. B. Taylor. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 66-80.

Thébert, Yvon. "Private Life and Domestic Architecture in Roman Africa." *From Pagan Rome to Byzantium.* Ed. Paul Veyne. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge: Belknap, 1992. 313-410. Vol. 1 of *A History of Private Life.*

Topsell, Edward. *The House-Holder: or, Perfect Man*. London, 1609.

Tourneur, Cyril. *The Atheist's Tragedy*. Ed. Katharine Eisaman Maus. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Vickers, Brian. *Shakespeare, Co-Author: A Historical Survey of Five Collaborative Plays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Wallace, John M. "The Senecan Context of *Coriolanus.*" *Modern Philology* 90.4 (1993): 465-78.

Willis, Deborah. "'The gnawing vulture': Revenge, Trauma Theory, and *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 53.1 (2002): 21-52.

Winston, Jessica. "Seneca in Early Elizabethan England." *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (2006): 29-58.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Wynne-Davis, Marion. "'The Swallowing Womb:' Consumed and Consuming Women in Titus Andronicus." *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Ed. Valerie Wayne. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991. 129-51.

VITA

Name: Ashley Marie Brinkman

Address: English Department
Texas A&M University
MS 4227 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-4227

Email: ambrinkman@gmail.com

Education: B. A., The University of Texas at Austin, English, 2005