The Taming of a Shrew (1594): An Electronic Critical Edition

Edited by Alan Edward Galey
B.A., University of Victoria, 1998

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the Department of English

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

[redacted]
Dr. Michael R. Best, Supervisor (Department of English)

[redacted]
Dr. Edward I. Berry, Departmental Member (Department of English)

[redacted]
Dr. Timothy S. Haskett, Outside Member (Department of History)

[redacted]
Dr. Peter G. Liddell, External Examiner (Humanities Computing and Media Centre)

The Taming of a Shrew (1594): An Electronic Critical Edition

Edited by Alan Edward Galey

Supervisor: Dr. Michael R. Best

Abstract

Recent work on *The Taming of the Shrew*'s so-called bad quarto suggests that *The Taming of a Shrew* (1594) is more than a mere piracy of Shakespeare's play, and that its intertextual badness is its best virtue. This electronic edition presents *A Shrew* as a critical response to Shakespeare, and as an incisive parody of Marlowe's plays. The text of *A Shrew* is offered in three forms: a modernized and fully annotated text; a machine-readable transcription containing markup for print entities; and a facsimile. All three texts are linked to each other, and to an automated collation of variants between the 1594, 1596, and 1607 quartos of *A Shrew*. The electronic interface allows users to highlight borrowings from other plays, each of which is accompanied by an extended commentary. A critical introduction discusses the play's print and performance histories, its metadramatic complexities, and its relationship with Shakespeare and Marlowe.

Examiners:

[redacted]

Dr. Michael R. Best, Supervisor (Department of English)

[redacted]

Dr. Edward I. Berry, Departmental Member (Department of English)

[redacted]

Dr. Timothy S. Haskett, Outside Member (Department of History)

[redacted]

Dr. Peter G. Liddell, External Examiner (Humanities Computing and Media Centre)

The Taming of a Shrew (1594): An Electronic Critical Edition

Edited by Alan Edward Galey

To run, open the file "index.html" using Internet Explorer.

Software requirements
Microsoft Internet Explorer
PC version 5.5 or higher
Macintosh version 5.1 or higher

Hardware requirements
Minimum screen size 800 x 600 pixels
96 MB minimum memory is recommended

Files names and sizes
Folder names enclosed in square brackets
Total size: 22 MB

[root folder]
index.html (4 k)
shared.css (3 k)
shared.js (2 k)
readMe.txt (5 k)
[bibliography]
arrow-off.gif (1 k)
bibliography.html (5 k)
bibliography.xsl (2 k)
bibliography-data.html (37 k)
[Chorus]
Chorus.html (28 k)
chorusScripts.js (85 k)
chorusStyles.css (6 k)
compare.html (2 k)
help.html (8 k)
index.html (1 k)
print.html (5 k)
[html]
annotations.html (209 k)
collation.html (197 k)
Mmaster.html (301 k)
Q1master.html (914 k)
Q1master-lite.html (526 k)
relatedTexts.html (93 k)

[images]
arrow-off.gif (1 k)
arrow-on.gif (1k)
longS.gif (1 k)

[xml]
annotations.xml (186 k)
annotations.xsl (4 k)
collation.xml (190 k)
collation.xsl (5 k)
Mmaster.xml (179 k)
Mmaster.xsl (8 k)
Q1master.xml (317 k)
Q1master.xsl (8 k)
Q1master-lite.xml (317 k)
Q1master-lite.xsl (8 k)
relatedTexts.xml (162 k)
relatedTexts.xsl (5 k)

[images]
arrow-off.gif (1 k)
arrow-on.gif (1 k)
casar.gif (2 k)
longS.gif (1 k)
longSr.gif (1 k)
sealed.gif (4 k)
search.gif (2 k)
ye.gif (1 kb)

This folder also contains 52 Q1 facsimile images,
titled "page1.jpg", "page2.jpg", etc., up to "page 52.jpg",
ranging in size from 121 k to 291 k

[images-lite]
arrow-off.gif (1 k)
arrow-on.gif (1 k)
casar.gif (2 k)
longS.gif (1 k)
longSr.gif (1 k)
sealed.gif (4 k)
search.gif (2 k)
ye.gif (1 kb)

This folder also contains 52 Q1 facsimile images,
titled "page1.jpg", "page2.jpg", etc., up to "page 52.jpg",
ranging in size from 28 k to 80 k

[introduction]

- abbreviations.html (6 k)
- appendixA.html (11 k)
- electronicTexts.html (7 k)
- frame.html (16 k)
- general.html (24 k)
- introduction.css (1 k)
- marlowe.html (12 k)
- performance.html (14 k)
- print.html (32 k)
- shakespeare.html (21 k)
- subplot.html (16 k)
- taming.html (15 k)
- textualNote.html (17 k)

Contents

Note: This document contains only the front and back matter of the edition. It does not include the edited texts, since they can be represented only in an electronic medium. For purposes of reading and archiving, this document is provided as a supplement to the edition proper, which consists of the accompanying CD-ROM.

Throughout the Introduction, paragraph numbers corresponding to those in the electronic version are provided in the left margin, enclosed in square brackets.

Abbreviations and Conventions

Abbreviations of Shakespearean play titles follow the conventions set out in The New Cambridge Shakespeare and elsewhere. For example, *1H6* refers to *Henry VI, Part One*.

All quotations from Shakespeare are taken from *The Norton Shakespeare*, except for quotations from *The Shrew*, which are taken from Ann Thompson's New Cambridge edition. All quotations from Marlowe are taken from J.B. Steane's Penguin edition, unless otherwise noted.

ALN	Absolute Line Number
ASCII	American Standard Code for Information Interchange
A Shrew	*A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called The taming of a Shrew* (1594)
Contention	*The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster* (1594)
DOM	Document Object Model
DTD	Document Type Definition
F	The Shakespeare First Folio of 1623
Folio	The Shakespeare First Folio of 1623
HTML	HyperText Markup Language
IE	Microsoft Internet Explorer
ISE	*Internet Shakespeare Editions*
MLN	Modern Line Number
OS	Operating System
PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association*

Praetorius	Praetorius, Charles, ed. *The Taming of a Shrew: The First Quarto, 1594*. London: Praetorius, 1886.
Q	Quarto
Q1	The first quarto of *The Taming of a Shrew* (1594)
Q2	The second quarto of *The Taming of a Shrew* (1596)
Q3	The third quarto of *The Taming of a Shrew* (1607)
Q1-2; Q1-3	Q1 and Q2; Q1, Q2, and Q3
QLN	Quarto Line Number
The Shrew	*The Taming of the Shrew* (1623)
TEI	Text Encoding Initiative
TLN	Through Line Number
True Tragedy	*The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* (1595)
XML	eXtensible Markup Language
XSL-T	eXtensible Stylesheet Language – Transformations

1 General Introduction

[1] "Shakespearish" is a term used by a recent commentator to describe the 1594 quarto *The Taming of a Shrew*, a play whose historical and textual ambiguities almost require the invention of adjectives. As a so-called bad quarto of Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, *A Shrew*[1] has not done well for itself where adjectives are concerned, so the ambivalent value judgements one might infer from "Shakespearish" are not out of place in the play's reception history. Shakespeare scholars have never known quite what to do with this uncanny, Shakespearish quarto. It seems to duplicate parts of the Shakespeare play from the 1623 Folio, yet it also makes frequent and occasionally striking departures from its Shakespearean twin. *A Shrew*'s language is different, its characters are different, and, as critics have recently begun to notice, its depiction of gender and class issues is different. Some of these differences may even be improvements. While *A Shrew* is almost certainly not Shakespeare's writing, it contains a complete frame story for Christopher Sly that has occasionally tempted Shakespeare editors down the thorny path of conflation.[2] *A Shrew*'s Sly remains on stage throughout the play, commenting on the action at two points, directly intervening at a third, and finally waking up from his dream, full of Shrew-taming zeal, in an epilogue. *A Shrew*'s Sly material is Shakespearish indeed – somehow both familiar and strange to audiences coming from the other, Shakespearean play.

[2] This edition is part of a recent critical response to the problem of the two *Shrews*, namely that we should regard *The Taming of a Shrew* as a distinct dramatic work in its own right, and not as merely an appendix or set of footnotes to

Shakespeare. The most recent print edition of *A Shrew*, Stephen Miller's modernized text for the New Cambridge Early Quartos series, is probably the most significant step forward in promoting study of the play among non-specialists. The present edition is intended to complement existing editions[3] by offering an electronic environment for the play, where intertextual relationships are presented in greater depth and breadth than the medium of print allows. One of the advantages of editing *A Shrew* electronically is the ability to accentuate the networks of meaning that extend within and beyond the play – networks that are often disrupted in traditional print transmission. *A Shrew*'s frequent, systematic references to other works make it an ideal text to explore in a medium that thrives on networking. While Miller's edition provides a thorough summary of connections between the two *Shrew* plays, this edition places new emphasis on the frequent allusions to and quotations from the plays of Christopher Marlowe, especially *Doctor Faustus* and the two parts of *Tamburlaine*. Marlovian borrowings are indicated in the marginal notes, and with each substantial borrowing Marlowe's text is included for purposes of comparison. The electronic format allows for a more efficient organization of space than print, so readers are offered a greater amount of parallel-text information than they would normally find in a print edition. Readers are invited to compare borrowings between plays in terms of context, not just language. Parallel-text comparisons are therefore also accompanied by extended commentaries. If *A Shrew*'s use of Marlowe is more subtle and systematic than has previously been thought, the best response to the

two-*Shrews* problem may lie in widening the range of textual comparisons. The electronic medium is eminently suited to such a task.

[3] This introduction is intended to orient the reader in a textual debate that has generally carried a critical bias against *A Shrew*. As such, historical overviews of the play in print and the play in performance (sections 2.1 and 2.2) precede the sections containing critical discussion of the play itself. Revisionist scholarship on the history of Shakespearean editing has shown the value of re-examining the textual theories we have received from the New Bibliographers, who worked in the early- to mid-twentieth century – and who were, in their time, revisionists themselves. The category of the so-called bad quarto has come under particular scrutiny in recent years. The consequence for *A Shrew* is that critical discussion of the play must take into account issues that have been regarded as external to interpretation, namely textual and reception histories.

[4] In approaching *A Shrew* critically, this introduction seeks to reflect the structure of the play by dealing with the three distinct plots – the Sly frame, the subplot, and the taming plot – separately, while also indicating the thematic links between them. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 deal with matters of textual borrowing in *A Shrew*. The full range of borrowed texts, which may include lesser-known plays such as *A Knack to Know a Knave* and *Wily Beguiled*, is dealt with as comprehensively as possible in annotations. Since the writers of *A Shrew* made a point of borrowing extensively from Shakespeare's *The Shrew* and several of Marlowe's plays, this introduction includes separate discussions of each dramatist's

influence on *A Shrew*. Summaries of editing methods and issues pertaining to electronic texts are provided in the final sections of the introduction.

[5] *The Taming of a Shrew* is a deceptively easy play to juxtapose with Shakespeare, but a difficult one to read. A major impediment is the play's anonymity. After 150 years or more of speculation, we have a list of candidates for authorship but no one to name with any confidence.[4] Oddly enough, the Chadwyck-Healey *Literature Online* database gets the authorship exactly right, but only through the kind of serendipity that seems to haunt the Internet. If one runs a search for the title keywords "taming of a shrew," one will be rewarded with a link to an electronic transcription similar in many respects to the one presented in this edition. Like most helpful links, this one says something about where it leads. The link's heading declares *The Taming of a Shrew* to be Anonymous, Elizabethan, and linked to a Biography.[5] Following the Biography link, one learns how it can be perilous to disregard the advice of the search form, which carries the reminder that a proper search would be "Shakespeare, William or *just* Shakespeare." The Biography entry reveals that Anonymous has no specified gender, just a blank space, and that the biographical details by which authors are constructed are, for now, "currently under development" – which is perfectly true. Curiously, Anonymity has also secured for itself British nationality. The real point about reading an Anonymous British Elizabethan play is made, however, by the link to "Texts By Anonymous (Elizabethan)," which conjures up a list of plays that includes a surprising number of titles that have been called, at various times, bad quartos.[6] From a database-eye-

view of literature, there is an authorial link between anonymity and plays that are traditionally held to be unauthorized reproductions.

[6] It is inevitable that most readers will be aware of *A Shrew* only because of Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*. The majority of critics agree they are distinct works, yet their exact relationship is the subject of one of the most convoluted debates in the Shakespearean tradition. Is *A Shrew* the source for Shakespeare's play or a derivation from it? If the latter, does it derive from the Folio version of *The Shrew*, or from another version now lost? The second question, which deals with hypothetical revisions in Shakespeare's play, is a matter for Shakespeare editors.[7] My answer to the first is that *A Shrew* is most likely a creative adaptation of Shakespeare's play, and a critical response to it. The writers[8] of *A Shrew* were probably actors in Pembroke's Men who worked with Shakespeare in 1592-3. They likely performed some version of Shakespeare's play during that period and created their own version – in some ways a subversion – when Shakespeare left the company as its fortunes declined. The actors, perhaps with help, created a new dramatic work that makes specific references to the Shakespeare play, just as it does to Marlowe, and bases many of its dramatic effects on an audience's prior sense of context.

[7] The preceding authorship narrative would have been considered a description of piracy by most *Shrew* scholars until fairly recently. The mainstream tradition of Shakespearean textual studies has never found an adequate place for *A Shrew* among standard bibliographic categories. There is too much original material for it to be strictly a bad quarto, yet there is also too much textual overlap for it to

be just an adaptation, like Garrick's *Catherine and Petruchio* (1754), or a sequel, like Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize* (1611). Add to this uncertainty the old source theory, plus some considerable speculation about a lost *Shrew* play, and the result for *A Shrew* is ambiguity. There are more narratives than facts about how *A Shrew* was written, and the current evidence does not support more than a balance of probabilities, though some narratives weigh more in the balance than others. Ambiguity and anonymity remain paired features in *A Shrew*'s reception history.

[8] While *A Shrew* may be an anomalous special case in the Shakespearean tradition, its dramatic strategies of ironic borrowing – which have often prompted its canonical marginalization – may be a familiar narrative mode for audiences in the early twenty-first century. The best contemporary analogue one could make for *A Shrew* is the Fox Television series *The Simpsons*, a dramatic parody which relies upon, and indeed promotes, a detailed and extensive cultural literacy in its audience. By borrowing rather than merely referencing contexts in other works, parody inevitably reproduces the object of its attention. *The Simpsons* couches surprisingly incisive criticism within the mundane genre of the half-hour family situation comedy. *A Shrew* does something remarkably similar under the guise of dramatic romance, an equally popular genre among 1590s audiences. As aesthetic categories, the bad quarto and the Fox Network drama would certainly invite similar prejudices. Nevertheless, popular audiences in the current *Simpsons*-influenced age are increasingly receptive to the idea that dramatic works can comment upon other works, not to mention the real world, in ways more subtle and nuanced than the term "parody" allows for. If *A Shrew*'s unregenerate borrowing

from Shakespeare and Marlowe – its distinctive mode of critical parody – can be thought of as reproduction with a difference, this difference lies in the badness that earned *A Shrew* the status of bad quarto.

[9] To return to the term "Shakespearish," a debt must be acknowledged to its originator, Leah Marcus, whose work on the two *Shrew* plays prompted not only this edition but also the choice of an electronic format. Marcus regards *A Shrew* as a play that is traditionally denied authority in order to contain its subversive potential for one of the most politically vexed of Shakespeare's comedies. At the close of her chapter on the *Shrew* plays in *Unediting the Renaissance*, she suggests that intertextual readings of the two plays, facilitated by electronic media, would break the critical deadlock that causes *The Shrew* to be perceived as barely acceptable for performance and teaching. Reiterating her general call for better editions, Marcus speculates that computer-based editions would allow for reader-edited texts that can, if the reader-editor so chooses, radically conflate the two *Shrews*. Users of the present edition will notice that there is no such conflation feature here, even though the technology is eminently suited to such a practice. This edition originated in response to Marcus' idea about a reader-edited electronic conflation, but an unavoidable question soon asserted itself: what might be lost in a hybrid of the two plays? What Marcus describes is closer to performance than to critical editing, and would be a misapplication of the fluidity of electronic text. Her proposal would create something resembling new Shakespeare, but the price would be to continue *A Shrew*'s subordinate role as a text that exists only to recuperate the Shakespeare play.

[10] *The Taming of a Shrew* may be one of the few critical and dramatic comments on Shakespeare that survives from his own time. Since the 1594 quarto precedes both John Fletcher's sequel, *The Woman's Prize* (1611), and the Folio's proto-critical front matter (1623), *A Shrew* is quite possibly the first serious entry in the field of Shakespeare studies. It should not be raided for spare parts, or spare meaning. The current revisionist scrutiny applied to bad quartos is especially important to *A Shrew*, just as *A Shrew* is to it, because the bad quarto category relies upon notions of defective duplication remarkably similar to those articulated by Kate in her final speech about Eve and wifely contrition. Eve, Kate, and the 1594 quarto itself are all second terms in an old mechanism for gendered comparison, in which the copy is threatening to the original because it is paradoxically the same and different. Elizabethan printers and twentieth-century bibliographers explained unauthorized reproduction in terms of corruption and badness, both textual and moral.[9] Yet *A Shrew*'s badness and paradoxical relation to its original are the play's primary virtues, and the best reasons to read or perform it. Critical and bibliographical challenges to the bad quarto category by Marcus, Laurie Maguire, and others raise the possibility that bad quartos may come to signify something other than their old category. But perhaps there is yet a value in retaining, with some irony, the idea that *A Shrew* is better off outside the Shakespearean authorial tradition than within it, that badness in *A Shrew* counts for something, and that it is the baddest of quartos still.

[1] The conventional shorthand for distinguishing the two *Shrew* titles is *A Shrew* and *The Shrew*. Stephen Miller, in an extended footnote on the titles in his Cambridge edition, speculates that the difference in articles may have been introduced to distinguish the plays after the appearance of the 1594 text (1-2 n.1). Whatever the original distinction between the titles, it is worth noting that in the present, the current critical shorthand may have a semantic effect contrary to what Miller suggests. Unlike *The Taming of a Shrew*, a complete title, the truncated *A Shrew* inevitably recalls its differentiated counterpart, *The Shrew*, even when Shakespeare is not the topic of discussion. In terms of bibliographical connotations, the indefinite article may also suggest the supposed multiplicity of irregular and unauthorized quartos of Shakespeare's plays, as opposed to the singular, authorial 1623 Folio which contains the definitive-articled *The Shrew*.

[2] It was not uncommon for eighteenth-century editors to insert *A Shrew*'s Sly epilogue and interludes into their texts of *The Shrew*. The practice began with Alexander Pope's edition of 1747 and was repeated to varying degrees until Edmund Malone labeled *A Shrew* as a non-Shakespearean source play. (Pope had assumed it was Shakespeare's early draft.) Nevertheless, Malone's edition includes substantial amounts of *A Shrew*'s text in George Steevens' footnotes – far more, indeed, than Pope himself had originally inserted. Malone's intention was to indicate Pope's conflations, thus providing a guide for winnowing out non-Shakespearean material, yet the unintended result is a partial parallel-text edition of

the two plays. Malone's approach anticipates modern editors of the Shakespeare play, who often append the Sly epilogue under questionable headings such as "Additional Passages" (the 1997 *Norton Shakespeare*'s term). Alan Dessen has called such appendices a "do-it-yourself kit" for conflation (37).

[3] See section 2.1, ¶11 of this introduction for a full list and discussion of editions of *A Shrew* from the 1990s to the present.

[4] Cases have been made for Marlowe, Greene, Peele, and Rowley, among others. No candidate has met with widespread critical approval, probably because of a lack of external evidence. Recent trends in textual scholarship have also moved away from the need to attribute early quartos to established authorial figures.

[5] <http://lion.chadwyck.com/all/search/> (March 2002); currently, the referenced parts of the site must be accessed from an authorized network or via an authorized proxy server.

[6] There are currently (March 2002) 34 titles on the list, but the number will probably grow with the database. Of these, 12 have at various times been called bad quartos, judging by Laurie Maguire's list in *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* (12-13).

[7] The present edition does not attempt to use *A Shrew* to answer questions about the Shakespeare text, but it follows Ann Thompson's theory that the Folio represents a revised version of *The Shrew*; see the textual analysis her Cambridge edition of *The Shrew*, especially pages 160-4. *A Shrew* may well be based on an unrevised version of *The Shrew* that is now lost, but with an absent text this is impossible to prove.

[8] I assume that *A Shrew*, like most Elizabethan plays, is not the product of a single author. Jeffery Masten plausibly suggests that modern criticism is only beginning to reckon adequately with collaborative authorship in early modern drama (4).

[9] The classic Elizabethan lament for unauthorized textual reproduction is John Day's preface, "The P[rinter]. To the Reader," in his 1570 edition of *Gorboduc*. Day describes the publisher of the 1565 version of the play as violating the text as if it were woman: "even as if [...] he should have enticed into his house a fair maid and done her villainy, [...] and then thrust her out of doors dishonested" (53). For recent discussions of similar rhetoric in Shakespearean traditions, see Marcus's *Unediting the Renaissance* and Werstine's "Narratives About Printed Texts". Gary Taylor addresses the topic in a more generalized discussion of textual scholarship, especially with reference to the idea of textual purity; see "The Rhetoric of Textual Criticism" (48-51).

2.1 The Play in Print

[1] This section provides an overview of the serpentine course of the production and transmission of *A Shrew* as a printed text. *A Shrew* has no corresponding performance tradition of its own. Its status as primarily a print entity has resulted in particularly close links between its textual and critical histories. As with many of Shakespeare's plays, the textual history of *A Shrew* is the history of a debate. Since the debate's inception in 1850 with Samuel Hickson's first few comments in *Notes and Queries*, critical understanding of *A Shrew* as a printed text has been conditioned by the back-and-forth of competing theories. With such little evidence to guide the debate, it is difficult to imagine *A Shrew* as a settled issue in which authorship questions are solved and challenges to critical categories are safely contained. Though it is rarely recognized as such, the chief value of *A Shrew* as a textual object is its present ambiguity. There is simply not enough textual evidence, or stylistic evidence that can convincingly answer textual questions, for the debate to be settled. A common response to this problem is to invoke textual categories and make an argument by analogy. Accordingly, *A Shrew* has been labeled a draft, a source, a bad quarto, an echo of an ur-play, and, following Miller, a Pembroke's Men quarto. The only textual category that *A Shrew* sits comfortably within, however paradoxically, is that of the special case.

[2] *A Shrew*'s first mention as a print entity is an entry in the Stationers' Register for 2 May 1594. The entry gives the full title of the play as it would appear in all three quartos, "A pleasant Conceyted historie called the Tayminge of a Shrowe" (qtd. in Miller's facsimile, v), and names the publisher as Peter Short. The

1594 quarto (Q1) followed, with Cuthbert Burby named as printer and wholesaler on the title page. A practically identical reprint followed in 1596 (Q2) under the same arrangement. A third quarto followed in 1607, but events transpired in the meantime for which we have indirect evidence: an unspecified dispute is recorded between Short and Burby in 1600; Short dies three years later; and the Register's entry for Q3 in 1607 indicates that Burby had come to possess the rights by this time since he gave publication permission to Nicholas Ling. Later that year, *A Shrew*'s publication rights were transferred from Ling to John Smethwick along with 15 other plays. The crucial issue is the link between John Smethwick's rights to *A Shrew* and the appearance of *The Shrew* in the 1623 Folio. We have only two pieces of hard evidence to work with: Smethwick's name is included in the consortium of Folio publishers, and no *Shrew* play is included in the 1623 Stationers' Register entry that lists plays not previously entered. The 1631 quarto, based on the Folio text, appears to be printed under Smethwick's permission.[1]

[3] It has become almost traditional in *Shrew* criticism to turn these facts into the conclusion that *The Shrew* was printed under *A Shrew*'s copyright, and that early modern publishers and, by extension, audiences and readers did not distinguish between the two plays.[2] There are several misconceptions at work in this conclusion. Copyright as a term and a concept are both products of the eighteenth century, and imply a kind of unique intellectual property. Smethwick's right – really more of a privilege conferred by a professional association than a civil enfranchisement – was not to a given play as a piece of intellectual property but as the basis of a financial venture. Right to copy, as Peter Blayney terms it in "The

Publication of Playbooks," had little to do with authorship or the creative content of a play, and more to do with the protection of an investment. The Stationers' Company allowed members to block the publication of similar plays that might cut into their sales, thus diminishing the original publishers' ability to recoup their investment in printing. This is not to suggest that the threat of a blocking entry is necessarily the reason for *The Shrew*'s absence until 1623. There is no evidence that Smethwick ever formally exercised any right to block *The Shrew*'s publication, assuming he inherited this right from Ling in 1607. That Smethwick reserved the right to block could have been enough if the parties involved played by the rules. The reservation of a right would paradoxically show up as an absence of evidence, which is not enough to support a textual argument about the relationship between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew*.[3] The purpose here, however, is merely to disprove the notion that Smethwick's interest in *A Shrew*, combined with *The Shrew*'s absence from print until the 1623 Folio, necessarily add up to the two plays being considered a single creative work. A clarification of the difference between copyright and right to copy is enough to cast doubt on the critical commonplace that early modern publishers treated the two *Shrew* plays as the same dramatic entity.

[4] Samuel Hickson in 1844 published successive pieces in *Notes and Queries* that attempted to build the argument that *A Shrew* is not an Old Play but a derivation from the Folio text, and that Marlowe wrote it.[4] Hickson met with little success in his second proposition, but his evidence in support of the first continues to be a challenge to critics and editors. To show that *A Shrew* derived from *The Shrew*, and not the other way around as was thought, Hickson gives a seven-point

list of readings that are remarkably close in both plays, but different enough to indicate imperfect copying. Hickson's basic criterion would be invoked by many later critics: in each comparison, "the purpose, and sometimes even the meaning, is intelligible only in the form in which we find it in Shakespeare" (30 March, 347).

[5] After Hickson, the next major turning-point in the debate is an article by Peter Alexander in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 16 September 1926. With Alexander enters the bad quarto theory,[5] which remains the strongest contender up to the present, though the last decade has seen the effective dismantlement of the bad quarto as a catch-all textual category. Alexander followed an hypothesis developed by A.W. Pollard in which a group of quartos – among them *Romeo and Juliet* (1597), *Henry V* (1600), *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1602), *Hamlet* (1603), and *Pericles* (1609) – is defined in terms of Heminges and Condell's cryptic comment about "diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos'd them."[6] These quartos became the bad quartos, as distinct from the good quartos whose texts reappear in the Folio. New Bibliographically-minded scholars would swell their ranks with other quarto plays that seemed uncomfortably different from their Folio counterparts. W.W. Greg's memorial reconstruction hypothesis explained the badness of the bad quartos: their shortness, irregularity of metre, misassigned speeches, faulty logic, and fragmentary reproduction of Shakespeare's language.[7] The bad quarto rapidly became a viral category because it was vague enough to account for almost any irregular quarto, yet specific enough in imposing an authorship narrative. It appealed to the Folio-centered view of Shakespeare as

author first, playwright second, with actor and shareholder tying for third. With authorship comes the author's intellectual property, and thus the possibility of its infringement. Alexander had already added *Contention* and *True Tragedy* to this list, so his argument for *A Shrew* was, within the work of the New Bibliography, part of a larger project of category-building. Alexander's argument succeeded at least in re-opening debate to the possibility of *A Shrew* as a derived play, but his labeling of *A Shrew* as "no more than a pirate's version" (614) unnecessarily tied a particular mode of authorship to the apparent composition order of the plays.

[6] Alexander's article is a fascinating example of the cultural and literary complexities in which the New Bibliography operated,[8] but space permits only a brief summary of the essential points of Alexander's evidence. His view of the change in settings is that it makes perfect sense to move from Ferrara to Padua to Athens,[9] especially since Athens is near enough to Sestos for a Marlovian *Hero and Leander* connection. Alexander also sees Aurelius' disguise as unnecessary since the suitors are not denied access to the sisters as they are to Bianca in *The Shrew*; this plot thread is therefore an untidy remnant of the original play. Likewise, the need for Valeria to disguise himself and for Aurelius, not his servant, to arrange for a stand-in father (Phylotus) are loose ends from *The Shrew*. These points are explained adequately in *A Shrew*, especially since the entire subplot turns on the inequality of rank in Aurelius' and Phylema's marriage. It is curious that Alexander should miss such obvious plot points; perhaps this bad quarto did not merit careful reading, even to prove its status as a bad quarto.

[7] Alexander's theory was half-endorsed by the 1928 Cambridge edition of *The Shrew*, co-edited by John Dover Wilson and Arthur Quiller-Couch. Wilson's cautious support of Alexander was not shared by Quiller-Couch, who preferred the older source theory. B.A.P. van Dam also developed Alexander's hypothesis in the same year, noting a further inconsistency where Aurelius escorts the Duke to a nonexistent ship at 13.126, and suggesting that *A Shrew* was constructed for a smaller company than *The Shrew*, rather than shortened for touring. The bad quarto theory was rejected by the Cambridge *Shrew*'s reviewer, T.W. Baldwin, and by two influential studies, E.K. Chambers' *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems* and Leo Kirschbaum's "A Census of Bad Quartos." Of these dissenting views, Baldwin's is the most provocative. On the differences in plot and character between the two plays, he suggests that

> whether these are additions to *A Shrew* or subtractions from *The Shrew*, in neither case can the one play be considered as merely a degraded version of the other. The plays are on different plots, and for quite different casts. These changes are fundamental, and are the result of a reasoned purpose; they cannot possibly be the result of mere blundering accident. (154)

Baldwin concludes that *A Shrew* was Shakespeare's source, but in the process of weighing the evidence makes an important point about the inadequacy of the bad quarto category to *A Shrew* – despite Alexander, it must be more than a pirate's version.

[8] The debate reached another turning point in the 1940s with closer investigation into the possibility that the relationship between the two *Shrew*s is somehow connected to inconsistencies within *The Shrew* – a problem long faced by

critics but not addressed in the bad quarto hypothesis. The solution presented itself in the form of an ur-*Shrew*, a lost common source from which both *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* derive in parallel. The theory was presented, appropriately enough, in parallel articles by Raymond Houk and G.I. Duthie.[10] Houk's argument depends upon the assumption that *A Shrew* should follow a strict chronology but does not, thus allowing Houk to postulate a rearrangement of scenes that approximates the source play in which the time scheme makes sense. Houk's approach is at best inventive, but Duthie's more lucid and reasoned argument bears closer attention. Duthie revisits Hickson's points of comparison and traces the migration of particular words into *A Shrew* through a mode of composition associated with memorial reconstruction. Duthie takes Ferando's soliloquy at 6.27 as an example of the type of composition

> in which a memorial reconstructor, remembering the thought but forgetting most of the phrasing of the original, produces blank verse of his own, arranging in new combinations the words which he does recollect from the original, and eking out these recollections with his invention and sometimes with reminiscences of passages in other plays. (338-9)

Duthie's application of this thesis to various parallels is mostly convincing, and the first section of his essay states the derivation case in careful detail. His discussion of overlapping plot inconsistencies in the two plays, which leads to his conclusion that an ur-*Shrew* explains them, is closely tied to long-running debates about the nature of the Folio text. The present brief history does not afford the space that Duthie's argument deserves, but suffice it to say that Duthie does not satisfy the second of Alexander's requirements for an ur-*Shrew* hypothesis: "that *A Shrew*

contains passages which can be accounted for only by postulating X" (Alexander 614).

[9] The debate in the postwar period oscillated between the three established theories: source, bad quarto, and ur-*Shrew*. W.W. Greg weighed in with *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* in 1951 and *The Shakespeare First Folio* in 1955. Greg's position, though stated only briefly in each case, presents a significant modification of the bad quarto theory:

> *A Shrew* is not a 'bad' quarto of the usual type. Its points of verbal contact with *The Shrew* are comparatively rare [...]. In fact, although here and there it shows unmistakable signs of memorization, it would need to be regarded, not so much as a reconstruction of an original on the lines of *The Shrew*, as an imitation based on a recollection of it. (*Folio* 210-11)

Unfortunately, Greg does not develop the implications of this statement, namely that *A Shrew* is more outside the bad quarto category than in it, and that there is no other suitable label for this kind of text. A bad quarto of this unusual a type – one that seems to have been written for a purpose inadequately described by "reconstruction" or "imitation" – is perhaps not a bad quarto at all in the sense the term had come to mean by 1955. Richard Hosley echoes this sense of *A Shrew* as a special case in his 1964 article, "Sources and Analogues of *The Taming of the Shrew*," arguably one of the methodological high points of the whole debate.

[10] The early 1980s saw new editions of *The Shrew* from Arden (Brian Morris), Oxford (H.J. Oliver), and New Cambridge (Ann Thompson), all of which devote substantial space to the increasingly complex debate. Morris, in the longest introduction of the Arden series, takes up the burden of critical house-cleaning in

the matter of the plays' relationships, applying a combination of rigor and thoroughness that is not often seen in the debate to this point. Morris disposes of the source and ur-*Shrew* theories after re-examining their evidence, and comes down in favour of Hosley's inflection of the bad quarto theory, with support from Harold Brooks' unpublished study of both plays' language. Oliver also supports the bad-quarto-with-a-difference theory and links it to a modified ur-*Shrew* theory in which F is revised by Shakespeare out of an earlier version, also by Shakespeare, that inspired *A Shrew* – the two theories tend to work well together. Oliver's authorship narrative for *A Shrew* is worth pausing to examine. He suggests that *A Shrew* was authored by an editor hired by reporters of *The Shrew* to reconstruct the text. This editor deliberately introduced substantial changes of his own design such as the third sister, "perhaps [...] because not enough 'recollected' material had been given to him to work on, and perhaps because he thought he could go one better than Shakespeare" (21). The notion of a creative reviser, like Hosley's (293), is hinted at here, though there is little reason for a Shakespeare editor to place much importance on the idea. Ann Thompson's edition, the most recent, sets the stage for most contemporary views of the situation: an early Shakespearean version of *The Shrew* was revised into F, though not drastically enough to call the pre-revision play a lost ur-play, and this pre-revision Shakespeare play was the basis for *A Shrew*. To my knowledge, Thompson is the first to make the significant point that *A Shrew* has the status of an adaptation, which locates it at the beginning of what might be called *The Shrew*'s dramatic critical tradition:

> If played straight, with a minimum of interpretative direction, Shakespeare's play contains no [...] indication of a comfortable, egalitarian compromise [...]. Perhaps this is one reason why, despite a long and vigorous stage tradition, it has probably been played straight less often than any other play in the canon. From *The Taming of a Shrew* in 1594 up to the 'free adaptation' of Charles Marowitz in 1975 it has been constantly altered and adapted. (18)

Thompson's placement of *A Shrew* in the category of adaptations brings critical and textual views of the play into closer proximity, but without using critical opinion as textual evidence. Wells and Taylor take a similar view of the *Shrews* in their rationale for the Oxford edition,[11] which leans toward Duthie but rejects the need for a lost source play.

[11] The *Oxford Shakespeare* was a crucial part of the broad re-evaluation of received textual models that began in the 1980s and developed into truly interesting times in the following decade. *A Shrew* finally came into its own in the 1990s both as an edited work and as a subject for critics that requires more than speculation about pirates. Recent writers on the *Shrews* seem to have taken Morris' points about "current orthodoxy" and the vacuum of evidence to heart (Morris 45), but in a productive manner that engages with larger discussions about intertextuality, canonicity, and editorial theory. After a century of accumulating answers, critics finally turned to better questions. This process has been facilitated by better editions of *A Shrew*: Graham Holderness' and Bryan Loughrey's old-spelling edition for the Shakespearean Originals series (1992); Francis Dolan's intertextual collection, *The Taming of the Shrew: Texts and Contexts* (1996), which reprints *A Shrew*'s wager scene and epilogue;[12] Stephen Miller's 1998 Malone Society facsimile of the 1594 quarto, which is the first accurate facsimile in over 100 years;

and, probably the most influential, Miller's modern edition for the New Cambridge Early Quartos series (1998). Holderness, Loughrey, Miller, and to an extent Dolan (see note), proceed from the pragmatic assumption that they cannot settle the *Shrew* debate, but can improve it by examining *A Shrew* as a freestanding work in its own right, rather than as a second term in constant comparison to Shakespeare. These editorial projects are supported by the past decade's debate over the continued viability of the memorially-reconstructed (pirated) bad quarto as a bibliographic category. As literary and textual scholars take a renewed interest in each other's work, new possibilities for *A Shrew*'s editors and critics emerge that, like the play itself, point to the value of the current heterodoxy.

---

[1] For a more exhaustive account of *A Shrew*'s early printing and publishing history, see the introduction to Miller's Malone Society facsimile of *A Shrew*.

[2] K.B. Danks offers evidence for this conclusion in a 1955 *Notes and Queries* article (331). This conclusion is apparantly taken for granted by Leah Marcus (*Unediting* 105) as well as Holderness and Loughrey (13). Stephen Miller, ever judicious, acknowledges room for doubt: "state of text and copyright were separate issues. We cannot assume that, having Smethwick's rights to *A Shrew*, the consortium [that published the Folio] would have paid another entry fee for *The*

Shrew even though they knew it to be a completely different play" (New Cambridge 33).

[3] Another obstacle to the blocking hypothesis is that one would need to prove that an entry from 1607 would be enough to forestall a rival publication for a 16-year period afterward. Blayney's examples indicate much shorter periods in which publications are blocked.

[4] 13 (26 January 1850): 194; 15 (9 February 1850): 226-7; 22 (30 March 1850): 345-7. The last article, also the longest, contains his argument relating to Shakespeare.

[5] The definitive work on the subject of bad quartos is Laurie Maguire's *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts*; but also see the Bibliography for a brief list of criticism on the subject. It is customary to enclose some or all of the term "bad quarto" inside quotation marks. The present edition departs from that convention, following the rationale that any punctuation added to elicit skepticism is surely redundant in a bibliographic term that contains the word "bad."

[6] From John Heminge and Henry Condell's note "To the great Variety of Readers" in the front matter to the Folio. See the *Internet Shakespeare Editions*, <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Annex/DraftTxt/Pref/PrefPages/PrefA3.html> [A3r]. Pollard's theory was first advanced in *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos* in 1909.

[7] Laurie Maguire cites the first appearance of Greg's memorial reconstruction theory as his 1910 edition of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (4).

[8] As with many twentieth-century critics, Alexander frequently reads textual evidence through cultural lenses. For example, Alexander himself decries outdated categorical thinking: "when two texts were compared, the cruder has been, almost inevitably, regarded as the earlier," to which he attributes the uncritical application of evolutionary ideas to texts. One cannot help but notice that an advertisement next to this part of Alexander's article promotes "Scientific Humanism. By Lothrop Stoddard[,] Author of 'The Revolt Against Civilization' [and] 'Racial Realities in Europe'" (614).

[9] Ferrara is the setting of the English source for the subplot, George Gascoigne's *Supposes* (1566).

[10] A further irony is that both theories echo a lost source theory by Bernhard Ten Brink, the first to postulate a lost *Shrew* play. Ten Brink's theory is available only as a reported text in a study by his student, Albert Tolman ("Shakespeare's Part in *The Taming of the Shrew*" 227-9).

[11] Outlined in the *Textual Companion* and explained more fully in "No Shrew, A Shrew, and The Shrew: Internal Revision and *The Taming of the Shrew*" (351-70).

[12] A major disadvantage of Dolan's text is that it prints *A Shrew* only as a fragment, from the removal of Sly at the beginning of the wager scene to the end of the play. Dolan's introduction notes that rather than constantly reading the plays in

comparison, "some scholars [Marcus and Holderness, whom she cites] are urging that we start to think instead about the two as different plays with their own strengths, as 'alternate versions'" (145). Yet, to do exactly this, a reader would need to find a full edition of *A Shrew* since Dolan's text invites comparison between isolated parts of the two plays. To be fair, this limitation probably has more to do with the requirements of space in an anthology than with any intended contradiction on Dolan's part, but the limitation is there.

2.2 The Play in Performance

[1] There is no firm evidence that *A Shrew* ever saw an Elizabethan stage, though evidence to the contrary is just as lacking. Somewhere within that ambiguity is the true story of Pembroke's Men, the short-lived anomaly whose name appears on the title pages of *A Shrew*'s quartos as having "sundry times acted" the play. Unless new evidence is found to clarify the activities of Pembroke's Men and Shakespeare in the period 1591-4, our knowledge of *A Shrew*'s original performances will remain more conjecture than history. No performance record of *A Shrew* exists after the breakdown of Pembroke's Men in 1594,[1] but it is reasonable to assume that Shakespeare's *Shrew* would have had better chances for performance since it had a stable home and company after Shakespeare joined the Chamberlain's Men in the same year. *A Shrew* has no continuous performance tradition as a distinct dramatic work, though it has an intriguing history as an indistinct work, as we shall see below.

[2] When might *A Shrew* have been acted, and under what circumstances? That question cannot be answered without first considering whether or not Shakespeare was a member of Pembroke's Men. This enigmatic company appears to have burned brightly but briefly on London and provincial stages between 1591 and 1594. Several theories have been advanced to account for their creation: they could be an offshoot of the declining Queen's Men, or an amalgamation of the Strange's and Admiral's companies, or a creation of James Burbage to fill a vacancy at his Theatre. The Burbage theory was recently advanced by Andrew Gurr in *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (266-73), and is the most likely

explanation if one assumes that Shakespeare was one of Pembroke's Men. According to Gurr, Burbage needed a company to play the Theatre after a falling-out in May 1591 between him and Edward Alleyn drove Alleyn and Strange's Men to the Rose. Burbage found a patron in Henry Herbert, the Earl of Pembroke and Philip Sidney's brother-in-law, and a leader for the new company in his son Richard, who had remained after the defection of Alleyn. Did Shakespeare, possibly with Strange's at this time, remain with Burbage as well? No one can say with any surety what Shakespeare was doing until his name appears as one of the Chamberlain's Men in 1594, but Gurr makes a persuasive argument that Shakespeare was not far from his own plays in 1592-3, and several of these were with Pembroke's Men.

[3] We can gather something of Pembroke's repertory from title-page attributions. It included Marlowe's *Edward II*, Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, *A Shrew*, *True Tragedy*, and probably *Contention*. After regular touring and London performances at the Theatre, success came quickly to Pembroke's with an invitation to perform at court in the Christmas season of 1592-3. Their fortunes declined just as rapidly the following year when a combination of plague and unsuccessful touring forced them to pawn their costumes and playbooks. With the London theatres still closed through 1593 and into the next year, it is plausible that the remains of the company looked to publication as a means of raising funds. Shakespeare may well have ended his tenure with the company when greener pastures appeared, but until that point we can assume that if Pembroke's were acting a *Shrew* play, it was Shakespeare's. The opportunity for *A Shrew*'s

development by the remaining Pembroke's Men would occur in this period, though the seeds of revision no doubt grew out of regular exposure to the Shakespeare play that departed with him. If *A Shrew* was ever acted by Pembroke's Men, it could have happened only in late 1593 or 1594, when the company was spending much of its time touring. Miller notes that there is some evidence for a company of the same name playing in the Welsh Marches in 1593-4, suggesting a tempting narrative in which a post-Shakespeare Pembroke's toured with their own derivation of Shakespeare's play. But Miller is right in resisting this temptation, acknowledging that it is "perhaps stretching the thinnest of evidence to the breaking point" (36).[2] If an original production of *A Shrew* ever saw a stage in its totality, here is its window of opportunity – fleeting and unglamorous though it may be.

[4] *A Shrew*'s subsequent performance history is one of fragments caught up in the history of Shakespeare's play. *The Shrew* itself follows a circuitous route from the Renaissance to the modern stage, with adaptations displacing it from the Restoration up to 1844, when the Folio text was revived by Benjamin Webster. Most stage histories of *A Shrew* in this period are essentially influence studies that trace the uses, adaptations, and omissions of the Sly framework – a difficult task since not all appearances of Sly represent borrowing from *A Shrew*.[3] Among the eighteenth-century adaptations of *The Shrew*, only John Lacy's *Sauny the Scott* (1698) shows a clear example of influence. *A Shrew*'s Sander appears to replace *The Shrew*'s Grumio in name, temperament, and prominence. The role of Sauny becomes a Scottish caricature with a name that derives from "Sander" and "Alexander." It is possible that Lacy's substitution of *A Shrew*'s more interesting

servant is part of an unrecorded stage tradition, but as yet we have no evidence of this. It is more likely that Lacy knew of *A Shrew* as a quarto, though he does not use any direct quotations that would verify this hypothesis.

[5] Whatever else Lacy's recruitment of Sander means, it is the only case where *A Shrew* material other than the frame is used in production. William Poel in 1913 began the modern tradition of using *A Shrew*'s Sly interludes to pad out Shakespeare's play in a successful production at London's Prince of Wales Theatre, to which Poel was an advisor. Miller notes that the 1913 production made two surprising choices with regard to conflation: Poel and the director, Martin Harvey, used Sly's intervention in the arrest of Phylotus and Valeria instead of Gremio's intervention in Vincentio's arrest, requiring the replacement of Shakespeare's lines; also, the 1913 production strangely chose not to use *A Shrew*'s epilogue (Miller, New Cambridge 47). Productions up to the 1950s made frequent use of *A Shrew*'s Sly, often with the epilogue, and sometimes with open acknowledgment. A 1931 production at Sadler's Wells, directed by Harcourt Williams, included a dubious credit to the source of the borrowing, with implicit warnings of a bad quarto: "The addition of three short scenes and an Epilogue from *The Taming of a Shrew* is a gambling assumption that the play is but a garbled version of Shakespeare's and possibly fell out of the hard used Prompt-book during a performance" (qtd. in Miller 49). Miller concludes that the effect of *A Shrew*'s Sly frame in prewar productions was to "[render] the shrew-taming plot less offensive because any roughness towards Katherina could be excused as appropriate entertainment for a drunken tinker" (49). The metadrama thus operated in ways contrary to what we

usually associate with such Brechtian techniques, containing and insulating the play's potential for political and ethical trouble-making. *The Shrew* began to move away from mere entertainment, however, after World War Two with productions that used the Sly frame as a space for experimentation. John Barton's 1960 Stratford production, starring Peter O'Toole as Petruchio and Peggy Ashcroft as Kate, included the usual insertions but also shared *A Shrew*'s emphasis on the travelling players by showing actors out of character – or at least acting out of character. Trevor Nunn's 1967 production, with W. Morgan Sheppard as Sly, also emphasized the actors, particularly their poverty.

[6] Productions of *The Shrew* in the last three decades have tended to see the absence of a complete Shakespearean frame as more of an opportunity than a problem, especially given the growing influence of feminist challenges to the Shakespearean canon. Gale Edwards' 1995 production at Stratford used Sly material which, oddly like Lacy's farce, seems to faintly echo *A Shrew*. A dispute between the drunken Sly and his wife framed the play, but it is difficult to know whether this should be credited to *A Shrew*'s influence or to Edwards' creativity, though one suspects the latter.

---

[1] Henslowe's Diary records a performance on 11 June 1594 of "the tamyng of A shrowe" (qtd. in Thompson, Cambridge 1) at the Newington Butts theatre. Shakespeare's new company, the Chamberlain's Men, are thought to have

performed at Newington Butts in 1594, and to have included *Titus Andronicus* and some form of *Hamlet* in their production run. There is disagreement as to whether Henslowe's "A shrowe" was *A Shrew* or some Shakespearean form of *The Shrew*. For a list of differing views on the subject, see Marcus's *Unediting the Renaissance* (244 n.9).

[2] The question still remains as to whether the quarto text bears signs of having been performed. Miller sees no clear evidence that it was. Yet we should remember that whether or not *A Shrew* was designed for performance is a different question entirely. Miller tends to treat them as the same question. Pembroke's Men may have constructed their own remake of the Shakespeare play with the intention of staging it, then sold it for publication instead; or perhaps wrote with the intention of doing both. Without evidence we are still in the dark on both questions, but the distinction points to a need for further research into the possibility of dramatic reading quartos.

[3] This discussion is confined to relatively unambiguous uses of *A Shrew* in performance. More detailed and speculative discussion can be found in Tori Haring-Smith's *From Farce to Metadrama: A Stage History of "The Taming of the Shrew," 1594-1983*, now the standard reference on the subject. Readers are also referred to Ann Thompson's discussion in her edition of *The Shrew*, as well as Miller's summary of the points relevant to *A Shrew* in his New Cambridge edition, which treats the influence possibilities more exhaustively.

3.1 The Frame

[1] *A Shrew* owes much of its popularity – if that is the right word – to Sly and his frame story. Unlike its counterpart in *The Shrew*, the frame is sustained throughout *A Shrew* and brought to a conclusion in the epilogue. Like *The Shrew*, *A Shrew* has two induction scenes in which the Lord and his men gull Sly with the help of a company of players. Sly and his companions remain on stage throughout, providing ironic commentary over two scene transitions, directly intervening when the Athens plot comes to a head, and finally concluding the Sly story with an epilogue that has Sly confidently setting off to tame his wife. The Folio text of *The Shrew* seems to lose track of Sly after his first interlude (end of 1.1), which ends on the stage direction, "They sit and marke" (TLN 564).[1]

[2] It is not uncommon for critics to assert that *A Shrew* offers a more complete version of the Sly frame than *The Shrew*, with the implication that the seeming disappearance of Sly in the Folio text is due to incompleteness rather than to Shakespeare's design. Following this rationale, eighteenth-century editors beginning with Pope took up the task of reconstructing the Folio text by silently patching it out with frame material from *A Shrew*. Malone's revisionist edition of 1790 put a stop to this practice by establishing *A Shrew* as a source text rather than an echo of lost Shakespearean material. As the question of *A Shrew*'s derivative status unfolded in the twentieth century, modern editors developed a tradition of Sly conflation by way of appendices. Most modern editions, including the most recent from Arden, Oxford, and New Cambridge, append the Sly epilogue. The conclusion to Sly's dream thereby occurs where a reader would expect it, at the end

of the play, but is also separated from the proper Shakespeare material by a few pages, the designation Appendix, and perhaps a caveat from the editor. Alan Dessen calls this approach a "do-it-yourself kit" for conflation (37) which enables readers and directors of *The Shrew* to piece out its imperfections with spare parts from *A Shrew*. As Dessen argues, the Sly frame in *A Shrew* is not as modular as do-it-yourself conflation might suggest. Even if the frame material in *A Shrew* preserves traces of lost Shakespeare, it is above all original content from a distinct play, designed to signify within the context of a dramatic work that has important differences from *The Shrew*.

[3] *A Shrew*'s induction develops contrasts and connections that echo throughout the play. The persistence of the metadramatic frame puts the traveling players in a position that does not occur in *The Shrew*: *A Shrew*'s players remain players until the Athens play is done; they do not gradually disappear into the characters they play, as seems to be the case in *The Shrew* after Sly leaves the text, if not also the stage. The first appearance of the players, represented by Sander, Tom, and a Boy, sets up a context that will continue to be important – we will see these faces again and be expected to remember them. Whatever Shakespeare may have planned in his version, the writers of *A Shrew* saw dramatic value in keeping the players visible and occasionally conspicuous, along with their lordly audience.

[4] This pattern is begun as soon as the players enter at 1.58, with "packs at their backs." As Leah Marcus points out, these are not the urbane and educated players from *The Shrew*, but rather bumpkinish vagabonds still muddy from the road,[2] not unlike Sly himself (113). What they lack in professionalism, however,

they make up for in personality, especially their spokesman who seems to play the same character in the frame as in the Athens play. Sander is a distinctive presence from the start. He is sententious and scheming in equal measure, first moralizing to the disguised Lord that their play is "a good lesson for us my Lord, for us that are married men" (1.63) and then promptly arranging for a free dinner under the guise of requesting stage properties. Sander even shares Sly's comic habit of saying the wrong thing at the right time, as when he offers the Lord a performance of a "tragical or a commodity or what you will" (60) – a malapropism for the word "comedy" that has been transferred from Shakespeare's Sly.[3] In a play that is often preoccupied with symmetry and doubling, it is not difficult to see Sander as Sly's mirror image, a reflection that repeatedly draws Sly's interest.[4] Most significantly, the two share complementary positions in relation to the Lord's prank: Sly is led to believe he is a Lord and is directed to become an audience; Sander is also led to believe Sly is a Lord and plays to Sly's audience; ultimately, neither knows who the real director is – the Lord disguises himself to both of them. This devious symmetry is reflected in Sly's question, "Is there not a fool in the play?", to which the Lord deadpans, "Yes, my Lord" (43-4), ironically conflating two fools and two meanings in one.

[5] Sly plays his part as fool perhaps better than Sander. He certainly gets some of the play's best lines as part of his duties as licensed heckler. His first interlude and significant commentary at the end of the first Athens scene (scene 3) coincides with the entrance of Kate and Valeria, to which Sly says, "Oh brave, here's two fine gentlewomen" (301). Sly, blinking through a drunken haze – he

calls for the Tapster just before –, may mistake Valeria for a woman in his disguise as a music teacher.[5] Possibly Sly is making a sarcastic comment about both, to the effect that Kate is no more a gentlewoman than Valeria is a music teacher. Sly takes the wind out of the Athens play's pretensions again at the end of scene 11, in which he has presumably attempted to follow the contest of high astounding terms between Emelia and Phylema. Polidor and Aurelius each declare in equally high-flying language that the time has finally come for Hymen, Helen's brothers, and Juno to knit in sight of heaven their Gordian knot (paraphrasing 67-71, 75). Sly cuts through this Gordian knot of rhetoric with perfectly timed frankness: "Sim, must they be married now?" (80). His ignorance of what was said may echo and comically exaggerate an audience's reaction to the fast-and-furious allusions of the preceding scene.

[6] "Interlude" is the wrong word for Sly's biggest scene during the Athens play; it is more of an intervention. Sly steps directly into the action midway through scene 13, when the Duke of Sestos discovers his son's plans and threatens Valeria and Phylotus with prison. Sly may not catch the Ovidian rapture of previous scenes but he knows injustice when he sees it, such that it causes him to forget that he is watching a play. The humour of the scene depends on a clever inconsistency in metadramatic layering. Sly forgets that he is just watching fictional characters, prompting the Lord, whose prank has just succeeded brilliantly, to remind him, "My Lord, this is but the play, they're but in jest" (49). Yet Sly has presence of mind enough to remember that he is a Lord with the power of pardon. He even invents a title for himself when he feels his authority is questioned: "Why, Sim, am

I not Don Christo Vary? Therefore I say they shall not go to prison" (50). Sly is prompted to this reaction by the mere suggestion of prison, and he mentions "sending to prison" twice as the thing he will not tolerate. Sly's reaction suggests that he has seen the inside of a prison or two in his time, and that he sees himself in the threatened characters. Sly's interest in the play is keen and sustained, unlike his shadow in *The Shrew* who has never seen a play and expresses boredom in his one interlude. One can almost imagine a bored Sly dropping out of the Folio text and coming to visit *A Shrew*, a play more to his liking.[6]

[7] Intoxication gets the better of Sly and he passes out for the rest of the scene. Seeing that the butt of their joke is no longer available, the Lord has Sly taken offstage by his men to be returned to the alehouse (129-35).[7] The practical joke is over, yet the Athens play continues with the wager scene even though its ostensible audience has just been carried offstage. We are faced with a performance crux: what happens to the Lord? If he leaves the stage with the others, the wager scene becomes a fascinating anomaly since it is the one scene in the Athens play that is outside the frame. An equally intriguing possibility is that the stage directions are correct and the Lord remains on stage as the frame's principal audience,[7] which would prompt us to consider thematic connections between this particular scene and the Lord as its auditor. There is a strong connection between the wager scene's dubious restoration of order in the other plots and the Sly frame's simultaneous putting of things in their place. Perhaps, here at the end, it should strike us as odd that the term "Sly frame" seems so natural when discussing this layer of *A Shrew*. The Lord – who, we recall, enters this play as a mock-Faustus –

conceives the prank and does the framing. He appears on stage as much as Sly, he even has the play performed in his own house, yet critics and characters alike have their attention directed elsewhere – perhaps the sign of a master magician after all.

---

[1] An online transcription of this part of the Folio is available from the ISE: <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Annex/DraftTxt/Shr/Shr_FPages/Shr_FS4v.html#TLN564>.

[2] Sander tells his companion, Tom, to "Go get a dishcloth to make clean your shoes" (1.83).

[3] Shakespeare's Sly, inquiring about the play he is about to see, asks, "Is not a comonty a Christmas gambold or a tumbling trick?" (Induction 2.132-3). *OED* gives two especially relevant definitions of commonty: "The body of the common people" (1); and "Land held in common" (5), as in a village commons.

[4] Sly makes an initial inquiry at 2.43; another at 3.295 ("Sim, when will the fool come again?"), and notes with satisfaction that "the fool is come again now" as scene 2 begins.

[5] Leah Marcus offers a plausible support for this reading: "Valeria in disguise, if the singing master was imagined as being in minor orders, might have worn a soutane or similarly skirted garment, in which case Christopher Sly's telltale gaffe might point toward the singing master's effeminacy: he waxes eloquent on the subject of music's power but finds it inefficacious against Katherine" (120).

[6] Dessen's argument is worth returning to here, since he makes the salient point that Sly's intervention cannot be inserted into *The Shrew* like a missing puzzle piece. Not only would conflation require replacement of Shakespearean lines, it would also interfere with the character who acts as intercessor in *The Shrew*, Gremio (37-8).

[7] See section 3.2 for discussion of the Sly epilogue and the taming theme.

[8] There are other possibilities as well. The Lord's men, if any were onstage with the three main frame characters, could stay behind. Or, more likely, if all the frame characters leave, the chair, table, and remnants of Sly's banquet would serve to remind us of his absence. Perhaps these props are taken over by the entering Athens characters?

3.2 Taming

[1] "Taming plot" is generally used to describe the stories involving Kate and Ferando as well as Kate and Petruchio, but the subplot and frame drama are equally taming plots, and Kate is not the only object of taming. The ubiquity of the taming theme may be implied in the title, *The Taming of a Shrew*, which differs from Shakespeare's in the use of an indefinite article, implying an indefinite object of taming. Another difference from Shakespeare's version is that the title of *The Taming of a Shrew* is stated openly (1.63, 64) as the name of the play-within-the play. *Hamlet* interpolates *The Murder of Gonzago* (which Hamlet adapts into *The Mousetrap*); *The Taming of a Shrew* interpolates a play by the same title, *The Taming of a Shrew*. The proliferation of shrews and tamers echoes between the three plots, but all refer back to the most recognizable form of the taming story contained in the Kate-Ferando plot.

[2] Elizabethan audiences would likely be familiar with the shape of this story from a network of sources that are now collected under the heading "folktale tradition." Popular versions of the tamer-versus-intransigent-wife tale abounded in Renaissance culture, and valuable research has been done on the matter, but the metamorphosis of folktale material into textual evidence is fraught with difficulty. Aside from a few incarnations of the story that made the transition from orality to print, the popular sources of the Kate/Ferando plot are as textually elusive as any other products of oral culture. Detailed comparisons with folktale material can rarely go beyond conjecture, so I will not dwell on them here.[1] There is, however, at least one generalization that can be made about the *Shrew* plays' relation to their

taming sources: both *Shrews* are comparatively progressive in their treatment of women, at least in terms of mitigating the violence of the taming process. Audiences who knew the tale from the ballad *A Merry Jest of a Shrewd and Curst Wife Lapped in Morel's Skin, for her Good Behavior* (c. 1550, with subsequent derivatives) might be surprised at the lack of animal-killing, wife-beating, and other brutal forms of physical violence in the *Shrew* plays. *A Merry Jest* ends with the challenge, "He that can charm a shrewd wife / Better than thus, / Let him come to me [the ballad's tamer], and fetch ten pound, / And a golden purse" (Dolan 288, lines 1115-9). Shakespeare appears to take up the challenge, followed by the writers of *A Shrew*.

[3] Whether or not Shakespeare implicitly endorses the misogyny he depicts in *The Shrew* is a hotly debated question. Despite the efforts of critics such as Leah Marcus and Robert Ornstein, *A Shrew* cannot be made to answer the Shakespeare question. There is a long-standing critical prejudice, now a fading one, that *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* are essentially the same taming play, with the former simply lacking Shakespeare's richness of language, character, and thought. Shakespeare's taming play uses the context of high Renaissance humanism (Latin and music lessons), courtly rites of masculinity (hunting and hawking), and language that embodies a psychological subtlety not usually associated with comedy. *A Shrew* is closer to the ground. The project of taming is likewise dressed in the trappings of classical education and masculine bravado, but Shakespeare's psychological barbs are blunted in *A Shrew* by romantic farce. If the subplot contains the romance, the taming plot provides the farce. The bombast of language and shallowness of

character generally associated with farce has the effect of softening the taming theme, though softening should not be confused with diminishing. Kate is still subjected to abuse and manipulation, but *A Shrew*'s Kate – she is never Katherina – does not invite sympathy by displaying the psychological interiority of complex characterization. Kate is less a complex victim than a forthright shrew.

[4] Kate's shrewishness is more functional than psychological, as we see in her first scene with Ferando (beginning at 3.148). Shakespeare usually excels at character illustration by way of intellectual and erotic confrontation, but the talents of *A Shrew*'s playwrights clearly lie elsewhere. The rather banal exchange is punctuated, however, by an aside found exclusively in *A Shrew*. The play's only marked aside, flagged prominently in the stage direction, consists of Kate taking three lines to explain herself to the audience:

> *She turns aside and speaks.*
> But yet I will consent and marry him,
> For I methinks have lived too long a maid,
> And match him too, or else his manhood's good.
> (173-6)

That the writers felt the need for Kate to declare her will, to put all of Ferando's subsequent taming efforts in an ironic context, is a revealing response to the problem of psychological depth; their Kate has none, or very little, so *A Shrew*'s writers turn from detailed character drawing to bombastic broad strokes. We are invited not to explore the subtleties of Kate as victim, but to laugh at the cartoonish humours of both combatants. Our cue for this response comes from Sander, who enters shortly afterward and takes Ferando down a few pegs:

> You spoke like an ass to her. I'll tell you what, and I had been there to have wooed her, and had this cloak on that you have, chud have had her before she had gone a foot further. And you talk of woodcocks with her, and I cannot tell you what. (196)

Like Kate's aside, this bawdy lampooning of Ferando's taming pretensions serves to frame the rest of the relationship ironically, even satirically. Kate is not much of a shrew, Ferando is not much of a tamer, and both speak like asses to each other.

[5] But does this farcical deflation of shrew-taming mean that, for the sake of a few laughs, *A Shrew* sidesteps the gender issues that modern audiences consider important? Critics occasionally regard the patriarchal taming of Kate in *A Shrew* as the center of a circular argument involving dramatic pirates and Elizabethan audiences: if Elizabethan culture relished misogynistic depictions of women, and if it was good economics for *A Shrew* simply to confirm the attitudes of a popular audience, then we know *A Shrew* is simply misogynistic because it tells us what contemporary audiences wanted, and therefore we know what audiences wanted because *A Shrew* is a misogynistic depiction – a bad quarto, after all, deserves a bad audience. Kate's final speech in *A Shrew* is generally recruited to support this type of argument. It is probably familiar to most students and general readers, but as an extract and as the second term in comparison to a Shakespearean opposite number. Thus editors and critics can frame comparisons in terms of less versus more misogyny, eloquent language versus wooden recitation, secular humanism versus theological rigidity in Kate's final speech, and above all, originality versus copying.[2] No wonder Kate chooses to tell the story of Eve.

[6] The final speech does not invite sympathy for Kate, nor does it bring her any closer to the audience, but it does challenge the audience to make sense of this

odd sermon on Genesis. Kate retells the origin story of man and women in deceptively straightforward terms. Drawing on Du Bartas' version of the chaos that preceded creation, Kate contrasts disorder and formlessness, "A heap confused, a mixture all deformed," with God's taming of this unruly mass into the ordered world. Man and woman are created within this order, but Kate follows the preferred version of Saint Paul, the Jahwist account (2:18) in which Eve is Adam's second self but also a derivation and copy, rather than the earlier Elohist account of woman's and man's simultaneous creation (1:26). The Jahwist version was, along with Saint Paul's teachings on marriage, the popular rationale for many who promoted the subjugation of women in the Renaissance. But is Kate merely repeating the sanctioned version of creation or does she flag the parts of it that provoke anxiety? She appears to make a curious theological error when she describes the creation of Eve, who according to Kate was *created* sinful and defective, "The woe of man, so termed by Adam then, / Woman, for that by her came sin to us, / And for her sin was Adam doomed to die" (136-8). Consciously or not, the writers of *A Shrew* make Kate depart in this important point from the standard doctrine in which Eve brings about the Fall through her own free will; Kate's version of Eve is fallen from the moment the copy is made.

[7] The speech that begins with chaos and proceeds to a dubious creation story ends on a typological comparison, an exemplar like the ones from classical mythology bandied about in scene 11, but this time Biblical rather than Ovidian. The wife should be to the husband as Sarah was to Abraham: obedient, faithful, more concerned for her husband's posterity than for herself, unable to reproduce

without God's consent, and sexually available to other men when it suits her husband's purposes...? The model becomes more unsettling and ridiculous the further we press the comparison to the Biblical Sarah. This dissonance creates considerable interpretive leeway in Kate's physical gesture of submission: "*She lays her hand under her husband's feet*" (146). Is she making an implicit joke of the comparison between herself and Sarah, and by extension Ferando and Abraham? Phylema and Emelia in scene 11 make exactly this kind of ironic comparison between themselves and their men. Or, does Kate really mean to put forward "for a precedent" (144) a domestic model following Saint Paul and his inheritors?

[8] What we make of Kate's possibly deliberate inconsistencies depends on how we might expect an Elizabethan audience to react, which again brings us in danger of circular reasoning where historical reactions and intentions are concerned. Should we look instead for a definitive reaction from Sly, who wakes from one illusion into another as he sets off, with a cloud of failure hanging over him, to tame his own wife? Several critics have done so, and while the idea of shrew-taming is plausibly lampooned at the end, it is worth remembering that we have information Sly does not – he passed out and was carried offstage before the wager scene began. A joke is made of taming, certainly, but the questions raised in Sly's absence suggest that the taming is not just a joke. Whatever the answers may be, perhaps it is more important for readers coming from the Shakespearean tradition to notice that the questions are being asked at all, and that at some point in 1593-4, Shakespeare's colleagues decided to invite us to the debate.

[1] See Miller's introduction for a particularly detailed analysis of sources and analogues.

[2] On the strategic uses of comparison in critical approaches to the *Shrew*s, see Leah Marcus' chapter on the plays in *Unediting the Renaissance* (especially 114-5). Marcus asserts that *A Shrew* represents an older mode of patriarchy than *The Shrew*, but also that *A Shrew* is less sincere in its articulation of patriarchal values (117). The tradition of comparative language in *Shrew* criticism becomes prominent after the introduction of the bad quarto theory by Peter Alexander in 1926. As a classic bad quarto, *A Shrew*'s aesthetic flaws take on new importance as evidence of copying, and incompetent copying at that. Alexander also casts the plays' authors in terms of comparative characterizations: the original Shakespeare versus *Henry IV*'s Marlowe-quoting Pistol (1926, 614); in other words, invention versus imitation.

3.3 The Subplot

[1] Many of the most striking differences between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* lie in *A Shrew*'s subplot, and it is here we see *A Shrew*'s writers at their most inventive. Alfonso has three daughters, not two, and the pantaloon character, Gremio, is dispensed with entirely. Thus there is no competition between Polidor and Aurelius, making room for the play to examine their friendship and their developing relationships with Emelia and Phylema. Intrigue and disguise are still present, but modified to suit the requirements of a romance plot in which a prince falls in love with a woman beneath his rank. Many critics have regarded the changes in *A Shrew* as mere simplification of *The Shrew*'s subplot, but *A Shrew*'s subplot is clearly not an attempt to reproduce Shakespeare or their common source, George Gascoigne's *Supposes*.[1] What *A Shrew*'s writers attempted was revision and innovation, not simplification, and their success can be measured by the subtle connections between their romance material and the more recognizably Shakespearean taming and frame stories.

[2] The change in setting from Shakespeare's Padua to Athens has long been a source of critical confusion, though there are several good reasons for the relocation. It may be that Athens represents not so much a transplantation as a return to the setting of one of *A Shrew*'s sources, Plautus' *Mostellaria* (*The Ghost*). William Harrold suggests that *A Shrew*'s writers may have revisited *Mostellaria* independently of Shakespeare,[2] who takes from it the names Tranio and Grumio as well as the scenario of a father locked out of his crafty son's house. Plautus may have supplied *A Shrew* with a name and the basis for the Aurelius-Phylema-Duke

story. Phylema's name, Greek for "kiss," recalls Plautus' character Philematium, an Athenian courtesan who is showered with expensive gifts by a protagonist bent on squandering his absent father's money. However, the significance of Athens in *A Shrew* is more generally classical than specifically Plautine. The fast-and-furious allusions common in subplot scenes are oddly at home in this Athens, not because of any correspondence between Greek myths and Greek setting, but because the allusive comparisons are as incongruous in the characters' mouths as the Athens setting is in Sly's home theatre. This is not so much Athens as "Athens" – a send-up of romantic classicism that earns its dubious quotation marks just as much as Bottom's "lion" in *Pyramus and Thisbe*.

[3] The most convincing reasons for the play's Athens setting are found in the first lines of the Athens plot, and they introduce symmetries that appear throughout the subplot's romances. Polidor's welcome to Aurelius sets the scene for the audience as well:

> Welcome to Athens my beloved friend,
> To Plato's schools and Aristotle's walks.
> Welcome from Sestos, famous for the love
> Of good Leander and his tragedy,
> For whom the Hellespont weeps brinish tears.
> (3.2-6)

The Athens subplot declares its reference points openly, situating itself in an imagined classical landscape. Athens is a center of classical learning, a place for education and formation of the humanistic self, but it also borders on the world of classical romance familiar to readers of Ovid. The prince replies to the scholar with "Thanks, noble Polidor, my *second self*" (9; emphasis added), using a

commonplace phrase that could be familiar to students in early modern England and anachronistic "Athens" alike. Members of *A Shrew*'s audience who had attended grammar school might recognize the phrase from Cicero, whose works were standard subject matter for lessons in rhetoric. Cicero's essay "On Friendship" describes the second self or *alter ego* as a way of imagining friendship: "In the face of a true friend a man sees as it were a second self. So that where his friend is he is; if his friend be rich, he is not poor; though he be weak, his friend's strength is his" (16; section 7). Cicero's description in turn recalls Polidor's allusion to Aristotle, who in the *Nicomachean Ethics* gives the function of a second self as twofold: first, "to supply things we cannot procure for ourselves" (557), thus extending our own powers; and second, to bring us back to ourselves again by way of empathy, for "if the virtuous man feels toward his friend in the same way as he feels towards himself (for his friend is a second self) – then, just as a man's own existence is desirable for him, so, or nearly so, is his friend's existence also desirable" (563-5). This nearly paradoxical balance – a sameness that reflects the self and a difference that supplements it – informs the many second selves we find in the subplot.

[4] The doubling that begins with the friendship of Polidor and Aurelius soon proliferates into romantic love as they couple up with Emelia and Phylema. The competition that complicates Shakespeare's subplot is perhaps hinted at when Aurelius declares his love for Alfonso's "second daughter" (3.64), to which Polidor replies, "I like your choice, and glad you chose not mine" (68). There is a sister for every suitor, so the two wooing scenes that follow are romantic set-pieces rather than farcical attempts to evade pantaloons and fathers. The more elaborate of these

is scene 11, in which an exchange of ornate compliments between the lovers conceals a test. Aurelius, disguised as a merchant, teasingly asks Phylema if she would not be tempted away by the Prince of Sestos, a part currently played by Valeria in order to give the real Prince cover to woo a merchant's daughter. The scene then becomes a competition between the two women, each attempting to out-Marlowe the other with bombastic comparisons drawn from Ovid and other classical sources. The mild and tractable Phylema, and the slightly less mild and tractable Emelia, use vivid allusions to superimpose images of borrowed selves: Orpheus; a Hero who swims the Hellespont with Leander; and Penthiseleia, the Amazon warrior who fought with Achilles. This is one of the few moments in the play when the women own the stage. Within this barrage of full-frontal Ovidity (to borrow Edward Pechter's term [319]) are subtle challenges to the men. The women take up the excessive language of the suitors and turn it back at them, forcing comparisons in which the suitors come out the worse: "And should my love [Polidor], as erst did Hercules, / Attempt to pass the burning vaults of hell" (11.29-30); a rather personal one for the prince of Sestos, "And should my love [Aurelius] as erst Leander did, / Attempt to swim the boiling Hellespont" (36-7); and, to the mild-mannered scholar, "Should Polidor, as great Achilles did, / Only employ himself to follow arms" (50-1). Presumably the men, an errant student and a vacationing prince, are prepared to do none of these things; the women know it, and indicate to the men that they know the value of blustering, and can speak the language. Yet the message goes over the men's heads just as much as Sly's. We can see the outcome of the wager scene from here.

[5] Doubling can emphasize disproportion just as much as symmetry, and only recently have critics noticed that an important disproportion is introduced by making Aurelius and his father, the Duke of Sestos, of a different rank than the others.[3] Early critics of the play tend to regard Valeria's disguise as a loose end resulting from haphazard adapting. But the change in rank is a way of reintroducing the need for disguise into a subplot that has no competing suitors. A network of disguises almost as complicated as *The Shrew*'s develops: Aurelius pretends to Alfonso and Phylema to be a merchant friend of Polidor's; Valeria pretends to be Aurelius so that his role as princely visitor to Athens is not neglected; the ever-dutiful Valeria temporarily takes on the second disguise of a music teacher to distract Kate; Phylotus impersonates the father of Aurelius-the-merchant to Alfonso; even the Duke of Sestos enters Athens disguised as an old man to avoid the ostentation of a state visit. The need for all this disguise can be traced to the fundamental inequality between prince and scholar, and, even more so, between prince and merchant's daughter. The difference is both a source of comedy, as when Aurelius unconsciously lapses into ridiculous courtly language at 5.93-90, and a source of trouble when the Duke of Sestos is enraged to discover his son marrying without consent and beneath his station (13.22). The Duke threatens Phylotus and Valeria with imprisonment but finds his orders countermanded by, of all people, the lowest-ranking character on the stage. The sympathetic audience member Sly – possibly having more than a passing familiarity with the insides of prisons – steps confidently as "Don Christo Vary" into his borrowed rank and

intercedes for Phylotus and Valeria: "we'll have no sending to prison, that's flat" (50).

[6] After Sly's probably unnecessary interventions in the subplot, amends are made and the weddings proceed, finally bringing us to the wager scene. The end of a romantic comedy traditionally belongs to the couples. The matches are finally made and the wedded couples head off to consummate second selves into one, in the Pauline sense. *A Shrew* does not subvert this convention as radically as *Love's Labours Lost* or *Measure for Measure*, but we are given an ending where at least two untamed shrews remain. An interesting difference between *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* is that the former has the idea of the wager originate in the subplot. The particularly cocky Aurelius makes the suggestion, not Ferando, and after losing face and 100 pounds has no words of reconciliation with his wife. Her last words are almost 60 lines before the end, and his are the rather bitter "Believe me, father, I rejoice to see / *Ferando* and *his* wife so lovingly agree" (14.160-1, my emphasis). Polidor and Emelia at least show a sense of humour about the matter:

> EMELIA
> How now, Polidor, in a dump? What say'st thou, man?
>
> POLIDOR
> I say thou art a shrew.
>
> EMELIA
> That's better than a sheep.
>
> POLIDOR
> Well, since 'tis done, let it go. Come, let's in.
> (163-6)

The Athens play ends as it began, on paired characters, but with shrews and sheep instead of the humanistic harmony of second selves.

---

[1] Gascoigne's 1566 academic comedy is a prose adaptation of Ariosto's *Gli Suppositi*, which was performed in Ferarra in 1509. Ariosto's play is itself a reworking of Latin comic material to suit Renaissance Italian tastes. Shakespeare makes a deliberate nod to his source when Lucentio finally declares his true identity:

> Here's Lucentio
> Right son to the right Vincentio,
> That have by marriage made thy [Baptista's] daughter mine
> While counterfeit supposes bleared thine eyne.
> (5.1.89-92)

A Shrew makes no such overt references to *Supposes*. A lucid explanation of *The Shrew*'s sources can be found in Richard Hosley's "Sources and Analogues of *The Taming of the Shrew*," which also provides one of the best discussions of the theories about the two *Shrew* plays. A useful recent discussion of *The Shrew* and its sources in terms of intertextuality is found in Fernando Cioni's "Shakespeare's Italian Intertexts: The Taming of a/the Shrew."

[2] Harrold follows Raymond Houk's version of the ur-*Shrew* theory and thinks the common source play was set in Athens. In his view, the setting of *A Shrew* does not represent a departure from Shakespeare; rather the opposite since *A Shrew* stays

faithful to its lost source and *The Shrew* reintroduces the Italian setting from *Supposes* (194).

[3] Miller's 1998 Cambridge edition pays particular attention to the issue of rank; see his introduction, especially pages 7 and 28-9.

4.1 *A Shrew* and Shakespeare

[1] Among *A Shrew*'s many intertextual relationships, none is more contentious than the connection with Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*. The central question of the Shakespearean material in *A Shrew* – perhaps also the central question of the play's history – is whether or not *A Shrew* derives from a Shakespearean *Shrew* play.[1] For much of *A Shrew*'s critical history, this question was framed too rigidly as a choice between regarding *A Shrew* as a source, as an early draft of Shakespeare's play, or as a flawed reproduction of a prior *Shrew* play. Ready-made textual categories can be tempting solutions, especially when there is a lack of external evidence, as is the case with *A Shrew*. Bibliographers and critics have therefore turned to the content of both *Shrew* plays for answers, and internal evidence is often made to bear the weight of various theories. The present edition does not pretend to escape this pattern, though it does attempt to be transparent in its adoption of the hypothesis that *A Shrew* derives from a version of Shakespeare's play, and that the differences between them are explained by *A Shrew*'s status as a critical dramatic response to Shakespeare. This section will examine some of the moments in *A Shrew* that will seem oddly, even uncannily familiar to readers coming from *The Shrew* – an effect that is perhaps part of the design of the anonymous writers. This section will also revisit items of internal evidence for *A Shrew*'s derivation that are regularly debated by *Shrew* critics, from Samuel Hickson in 1850 to Leah Marcus in recent years.[2]

[2] The migration of language and ideas into *A Shrew* sometimes takes the form of echoed phrases, such as "I'll feeze you," Sly's opening line in both plays,

and sometimes whole speeches that bear a shadowy resemblance to their counterparts in *The Shrew*. A notable example of this latter phenomenon is Ferando's soliloquy on taming at 6.27-37 in *A Shrew*, which corresponds to Petruchio's soliloquy at 4.1.159-82 in *The Shrew*. When placed side-by-side, Shakespeare's speech is, in simple terms, clearly the better speech. It is longer, more precise in its use of hawking terminology, and fuller in its illustration of Petruchio's program of taming than *A Shrew*'s corresponding speech. However, the critical effect of such comparisons has often been to cast *A Shrew*'s text into sharper relief than is warranted, reducing its speeches to garbled versions of Shakespeare's that have no meaning of their own. Between the two texts, the original and the derivation thus become merely good and bad, meaningful and meaningless. However, to read Ferando's soliloquy without its overshadowing original is to read a sufficiently coherent speech; it makes a sense of its own, if not Shakespeare's. Relatively smaller units of meaning, such as "I'll feeze you" and other shared phrases, are less subject to invalidation through comparison in this manner. It can, however, be a challenge to read *A Shrew*'s longer shared passages without falling into the assumption that Shakespeare's text has meaning, while *A Shrew* does not.

[3] Internal evidence of imperfect textual reproduction suggests that *A Shrew* derives from *The Shrew*. Yet, as Leah Marcus argues, such evidence need not be read as proof against *A Shrew*'s internal coherency. We can explore this distinction in two passages that are traditionally taken by critics since Hickson to exemplify a

pattern of flawed reproduction in *A Shrew*. At 10.28, a dispute between Sander and the Tailor degenerates into an exchange of threats:

> SANDER
> I say the note lies in his throat, and thou too, and thou say'st it.
>
> TAILOR
> Nay, nay, ne'er be so hot sirrah, for I fear you not.
>
> SANDER
> Do'st thou hear, Tailor? Thou hast braved many men: brave not me. Thou'st faced many men.
>
> TAILOR
> Well, sir.
>
> SANDER
> Face not me; I'll neither be faced nor braved at thy hands, I can tell thee.
> (28-32)

The dual meanings of "brave," to defy and to decorate ostentatiously, allow Sander to draw the Tailor into a fight – or, more precisely, to pretend that the Tailor is picking a fight with him. Sander also puns on the verb "to face," which means both to stand up to someone and to decorate clothing. The Shakespearean counterpart to this scene reads:

> GRUMIO
> Thou hast faced many things.
>
> TAILOR
> I have.
>
> GRUMIO
> Face not me. Thou hast braved many men; brave not me. I will neither be faced nor braved. I say unto thee, I bid thy master cut out the gown, but I did not bid him cut it to pieces. *Ergo*, thou liest.
> (4.3.121-6)

The two passages are clearly related, and *A Shrew*'s version of the faced-braved joke does not have the clarity and timing of Shakespeare's. Critics since Hickson have taken the differences between the above passages as reasonable proof that *A Shrew* is attempting to reproduce a joke from *The Shrew* without a clear understanding of how the joke works. Following this scheme, derivation could only be argued at *A Shrew*'s expense.

[4] An alternative kind of reading is offered by Leah Marcus: "All that would be required for *A Shrew* to make as much 'sense' as *The Shrew* would be for the actor to indicate through gesture that the braving and facing he has in mind are punningly linked to the tailor's trade. *A Shrew*'s version of the passage is less explicit, but would hardly be regarded as corrupt if it were allowed to stand on its own" (*Unediting* 118). Marcus' argument is a convincing refutation of Hickson's criterion for derivation, that "the purpose, and sometimes even the meaning [of the compared passages], is intelligible only in the form in which we find it in Shakespeare" (Hickson, 30 March, 347). *A Shrew* preserves the pun and embodies an awareness of comic slippage between two meanings of "faced," but its dialogue does not preserve the timing that makes the most effective use of the pun. It is possible that Shakespeare's version improves upon a rough joke he found in *A Shrew*, as a prior play. However, one need not be as absolute as Hickson to read the evidence in terms of probability rather than proof. For Shakespeare to borrow his source's language on such a large scale would be improbable, especially given his judicious handling of source material throughout the rest of the canon. *A Shrew*'s

version of the joke may derive imperfectly from *The Shrew*'s, yet both versions still make sense; one does not have to be bad for the other to be better.

[5] Another of Hickson's examples follows similar lines. Hickson was particularly convinced that the following parallel proved his case: "I am almost tempted to ask if passages such as this be not evidence sufficient" (Hickson, 30 March, 346). Earlier in the same scene as the previous example, the Tailor reads out the order and Sander mishears him:

> TAILOR
> Item: a loose-bodied gown.
>
> SANDER
> Master, if ever I said 'loose-body's gown,' sew me in a seam and beat me to death with a bottom of brown thread!
> (10.25-6)

Sander thinks the Tailor is accusing him of calling his new mistress a prostitute, or loose-body. Shakespeare's version is almost identical:

> TAILOR
> [*Reads*] '*Imprimis*, a loose-bodied gown – '
>
> GRUMIO
> Master, if ever I said 'loose-bodied gown', sew me in the skirts of it and beat me to death with a bottom of brown thread. I said 'a gown'.
> (4.3.130-33)

Hickson's confidence rests on the assumption that "sew me in the skirts of it" has meaning but "sew me in a seam" has none.

[6] Marcus offers two plausible and reasonably compatible readings for the latter passage. Her first brings us back to the terms used in tailoring: "The talk during the scene [earlier in *A Shrew*, but later in *The Shrew*] has been of facings,

and facings quite commonly require the type of seam (though admittedly not quite the amplitude) in which a person could be sewn" (117). Her second point is probably closer to the mark: "The speech in *A Shrew* is more ludicrous than its counterpart in *The Shrew*, and also more deviously ribald if one takes the idea of being sewn in a lady's seam as relating to her person, not her clothes." Add to this ribaldry Sander's comic mishearing of "loose-bodied" for "loose-body's" – Grumio misinterprets rather than mishears – and we have a version of the joke which may be more comically effective than Shakespeare's, and certainly more bawdy.

[7] One of the supposed misquotations of *The Shrew* suggests a deliberate strategy of quotation on the part of *A Shrew*'s writers. The phrase "morning washed with dew," which appears in *A Shrew* at 12.36, is taken by Hickson as a garbled version of the more poetic "morning roses newly washed with dew" from *The Shrew* (2.1.69). It may be more illuminating to compare broader contexts of these lines. In *A Shrew*, Kate and Ferando meet the Duke of Sestos on the road to Athens; at Ferando's behest, she addresses the Duke as a woman:

> KATE
> Fair, lovely lady, bright and crystalline,
> Beautious and stately as the eye-trainèd bird,
> As glorious as the morning washed with dew,
> Within whose eyes she takes her dawning beams,
> And golden summer sleeps upon thy cheeks,
> Wrap up thy radiations in some cloud,
> Lest that thy beauty make this stately town,
> Inhabitable like the burning zone,
> With sweet reflections of thy lovely face.
> (12.37-45)

This kind of vividly extravagant language is heard throughout *A Shrew*, but always from characters other than Kate, and usually from men speaking to women.[3] Kate is

suddenly speaking in an uncharacteristic mode, and borrows or co-opts a manner of speech from the male characters. It may therefore not surprise attentive audience members who catch the quotation from Shakespeare in Kate's poetic performance. "Washed with dew" and morning are parts of a different whole in Shakespeare's version:

> PETRUCHIO
> I'll attend her here –
> [...]
> And woo her with some spirit when she comes!
> Say that she rail, why then I'll tell her plain
> She sings as sweetly as a nightingale.
> Say that she frown, I'll say she looks as clear
> As morning roses newly washed with dew.
> Say she be mute and will not speak a word,
> Then I'll commend her volubility
> And say she uttereth piercing eloquence.
> (2.1.164-72)

Petruchio continues on in the same contradictory vein and attempts to apply his tactic when Katherina enters. Petruchio's stated strategy of overwhelming his opponent with contradictory compliments is taken up by both Kates when they meet the travelling father, the Duke of Sestos in *A Shrew* and Vincentio in *The Shrew*. *A Shrew*, however, makes the reversal more explicit and presents an unrelenting Kate, one who chases the Duke offstage with her bewildering poetry.[4]

[8] It is surely no coincidence that *A Shrew*'s Kate should quote from Petruchio's speech on how to subdue her counterpart in *The Shrew*, and that she should do so at the very moment she employs the same tactics herself. *A Shrew*'s Kate takes the "washed with dew" conceit and does with it exactly what Petruchio proposes to do. *A Shrew*'s Kate is thus oddly closer than Ferando to Petruchio,

using Petruchio's own words to join in Ferando's game, and aggressively persuading the Duke from his shape. Close reading alone will not prove which passage was written first, but comparing the contexts suggests *A Shrew* contains a reply that is part of the play's ironic pattern. Like many of the Marlowe borrowings, this passage is intertextual because its full effect requires the auditor to know both plays. The traditional critical practice of isolating common phrases tends to obscure important details, in this case the names of the characters specified in the speech prefixes.

[9] Kate's final speech on wifely duty, the rhetorical centrepiece of both plays, is remarkably different in each, especially in terms of rationales for obedience. *A Shrew*'s version tends toward metaphysical and Biblical reasoning, while *The Shrew* gives a secular model of order that is analogous to visions of the early modern state. The content of Kate's speech in *A Shrew* is discussed elsewhere (see section 3.2), but it is worth noting that the final speech in many ways encapsulates *A Shrew*'s attitude toward its Shakespearean predecessor. The scenario in scene 14 of *A Shrew* is particularly familiar to audiences with a knowledge of *The Shrew* since the wager theme is identical in both. A lecture on the wife's role is not unexpected by the time it arrives in *A Shrew*, but as with the first quarto of *Hamlet*, *A Shrew* presents us with verbal dissonance similar to Hamlet's following of "to be, or not to be" with "ay, there's the point." Kate's chance to stand up and speak is also *A Shrew*'s moment to declare itself, to announce its relation to a privileged opposite number. Despite the spotlight, *A Shrew* curiously makes no attempt at all to mimic the specific language of Shakespeare, even when such

mimicry might be most expected. This is not to say that *A Shrew* finally speaks in its own original voice. The speech's patchwork of Du Bartas and Genesis suggest that original poetry is not what the *Shrew* writers have in mind. Instead, a speech about the ambivalence of copies is itself ambivalent about copying Shakespeare.

---

[1] The exact nature of Shakespeare's *Shrew* play in 1594 is a matter of some debate among Shakespeare editors. The text of Shakespeare's play in the 1623 folio may not represent the version that was familiar to the creators of *A Shrew*. Ann Thompson's edition of *The Shrew* presents the case for the 1623 text as a revised version (see her textual analysis, esp. 160-4). I do not take a position in that debate, since it is primarily a matter for Shakespeare editors, though I find Thompson's theory persuasive. All quotations from the *The Shrew* are offered with the caveat that Shakespeare's play, as we have received it, may not be a stable point of comparison for the 1594 quarto.

[2] A discussion of external evidence is available in section 2.1, "The Play in Print," and section 2.2, "The Play in Performance."

[3] A notable reversal of the gender pattern occurs in the preceding scene, where the women co-opt the male suitors' high astounding terms and out-Marlowe the men. See section 3.3, "The Subplot," for a discussion of this scene.

[4] In *The Shrew*, Katherina obeys Petruchio and quickly changes back to addressing the travelling father, Vincentio, as a man – even offering an apology for her mistake. After normal relations are resumed, all three continue onward together in a friendly manner. Kate makes no such retraction and apology to the Duke in *A Shrew*, though Ferando says at the end of the scene that they will "after him, / And now persuade him to his shape again" (12.54-5). If *A Shrew*'s Kate ever softens her attack on the Duke, she does so offstage. *A Shrew*'s version of the scene therefore presents the encounter more decisively as a victory for Kate, though it may be the victory of a hawk that has been cast at her prey by Ferando.

4.2 *A Shrew* and Marlowe

[1] Echoes of Marlowe's characters and especially his words are profuse throughout *A Shrew*, and are often put to surprising uses. There are frequent moments of recognition for members of the audience who know plays like *Doctor Faustus* and the two parts of *Tamburlaine*. This would describe a large segment of an Elizabethan audience, especially in the years 1592-4 when Marlowe's much-admired plays were regularly performed. Popular with audiences and portable to dramatists, Marlowe's style was instantly recognizable and just formulaic enough for lesser writers to imitate. Peter Berek's survey of *Tamburlaine* imitations provides a summary of essential Marlowisms: "classical allusions; polysyllabic 'high astounding terms,' especially in the form of place names, personal names and classical references; emphasis on precious exotic objects and vivid physical sensations; and hyperbolical comparisons and assertions" ("Weak Sons" 59). *A Shrew* exhibits these features in abundance, and frequently seems more Marlowe than Marlowe.

[2] Critics have recognized the presence of Marlovian content in *A Shrew* for over 150 years. The first to deem it worth discussion was Samuel Hickson, who lists several borrowings and argues for Marlowe's authorship in a series of three *Notes and Queries* pieces in 1850. Hickson expresses surprise that no one had noted the Marlovian material before, and takes it as an indication that "the internal evidence, relating to our old dramatic literature, cannot have been very much studied" (26 January, 194). By the time Frederick Boas published his edition of *A Shrew* in 1908, he was able to flag 16 specific instances of borrowing from

Marlowe. Most clearly identifiable examples are either direct quotations or paraphrases, but there are several passages in *A Shrew* that deploy a generalized Marlovian style and vocabulary (scene 11, for example). Of portable Marlovian phrases, the well-worn "crystal heavens" and its variants undoubtedly top the list. Until recently, detailed discussion of borrowed material has generally been overshadowed by dominant approaches to authorship issues: the borrowings argue either for or against Marlowe as author, or they prove *A Shrew* is merely a pirated quarto, padded out with *Faustus* or *Tamburlaine* where memory and creativity failed the pirates. The New Bibliographers probably did the most to discredit borrowing as a legitimate mode of authorship – except, of course, when Shakespeare does it – by reducing its practitioners to dramatic magpies, for whom stolen verses are little more than bright, shiny objects. The bad quarto label and the abiding preoccupation with stylistic attribution had the same effect, to direct attention away from the questions implicit in the text itself. Why does Marlowe appear where it does in *A Shrew*? What kinds of patterns are evident in the borrowing? Perhaps most significantly, what effect does the Marlovian content have on *A Shrew* as a whole? These questions cannot be exhaustively answered here, but we can examine some of the ways *A Shrew* uses Marlowe not as bombastic filler but as the means to a deliberate and crafted intertextuality.

[3] Characters like Faustus and Tamburlaine, both larger than life on Marlowe's stage, require little retooling to be effective in a comic context. The writers of *A Shrew* superimpose Faustus and Tamburlaine over the Lord and Ferando, respectively, to produce mock-heroic swaggerers much as Shakespeare

does in the *Henry IV* plays with Pistol. *A Shrew* is hardly subtle about declaring itself as pastiche in its opening lines. We are not twenty lines into the play before encountering recontextualized lines from one of *Doctor Faustus*' most recognizable scenes, the first devil-summoning (1.3). Instead of the overreaching philosopher, *A Shrew* presents a practical-joking Lord complemented by a snoring drunk for a Mephistopheles. Yet Faustus and the Lord both share the power to remake the world with language, only the Lord's magic is that of Faustus' creator, not Faustus himself: dramatic illusion legitimated by an audience's desire to be tempted from itself.

[4] Ferando's project of forcibly remaking Kate's world is suggestive of conquest, so Ferando is often made to exhibit shades of Tamburlaine. After Ferando arrives "basely attired" (4.117) for his wedding and makes his excuses, he bowls over the stubborn Kate with a speech that out-Marlowes Marlowe, topping it off with adapted *Tamburlaine*:

> And care not thou, sweet Kate, how I be clad.
> Thou shalt have garments wrought of Median silk,
> Enchased with precious jewels fetched from far,
> By Italian merchants that with Russian stems,
> Ploughs up huge furrows in the Terrene main,
> (166-70)

As with the Lord's *Faustus* quotation, context here is everything. Ferando takes lines from two speeches early in *1 Tamburlaine*. The first is Tamburlaine's long speech to woo his future wife, Zenocrate (1.2.82-105; specifically lines 95-6). The second, which follows soon after in the same scene, is Tamburlaine's wooing of his future lieutenant, Theridimas (165-210; specifically lines 193-4). The effectiveness

of these borrowings depends on how much Marlovian context an auditor brings to Ferando's speech, but the dizzying imagery of Ferando's whole speech achieves an unmistakable purpose: it shuts down anyone who would challenge Ferando, especially Kate.

[5] The Tamburlaine effect is at its most blatant during the taming of Kate, at the climax of the starvation scene. After Sander has baited Kate with a sequence of promptly retracted offers of food, Ferando makes an entrance "with a piece of meat upon his dagger's point" (8.19). This is a visual citation and parody of Tamburlaine's gesture to Bajazeth in 4.4 of *1 Tamburlaine* when Tamburlaine extends food to his caged and humiliated enemy on his sword point (the action is indicated by dialogue in lines 42-3). Again, the effect is to make Ferando's taming seem comically exaggerated by reducing him to a parody of the Scythian conqueror. But the comedy evokes an uncomfortable laughter at best since the Marlovian reference points lead to an unsettling subtext in which Kate changes from Tamburlaine's queen and right hand into his prisoner.

[6] Not all of the Marlowe borrowings rely on correspondence between characters and situations. *A Shrew* occasionally relies more on contrast than on comparison between those quoting and those quoted. Contrast and incongruity become particularly effective tools in situations where conventional gender positions are reversed for comic effect. Sly's introduction to his so-called wife provides an example of one such borrowing, when the disguised boy imports lines from *Tamburlaine, Part 2*:

> Oh that my lovely Lord would once vouchsafe
> To look on me, and leave these frantic fits,
> Or were I now but half so eloquent,
> To paint in words what I'll perform in deeds,
> I know your honor then would pity me.
> (2.34-8)

The final lines recall another promise to "perform in deeds" what has just been painted in high Marlovian language like that used by the Lord, Tom, and Will to tempt Sly. Lines 36-7 are lifted from the persuasive, almost wooing, speech of Tamburlaine's prisoner Callapine to his keeper, Almeda, which results in Almeda freeing Callapine and following him through the rest of the play like a consort. Whether homoeroticism is implied in the original is an open question, but *A Shrew*'s writers evidently regarded the Almeda-Callapine relationship as material to embellish Sly's misplaced desire – assuming Sly's desire is, indeed, for the portrayed role rather than the actor.

[7] While the Callapine-Almeda borrowing serves to complicate gender roles, an incisive quotation delivered by Emelia to Polidor in scene 4 furthers the complication to the point of reversal. After listening to Polidor protest in rather ludicrous terms that he will die without her love, Emelia answers with a Rosalind-like deflation,[1] quoting *1 Tamburlaine*:

> Fie man, I know you will not die for love.
> Ah Polidor, thou need'st not to complain.
> Eternal heaven sooner be dissolved,
> And all that pierceth Phoebus' silver eye,
> Before such hap befall to Polidor.
> (72-6)

Take the last three lines, substitute "Zenocrate" for "Polidor,"[2] and we have the answer given by Agydas to Zenocrate (3.2.18-20) when she pines – also threatening

death, like Polidor – for Tamburlaine, at that point her suitor. If high astounding terms is the language used by anxious suitors to talk to women in *A Shrew*, Emelia reminds us turnabout is fair play.

---

[1] [Speaking to Orlando] "Men have died from time, and worms have eaten them, but not for love" (*As You Like It*, 4.1.91-2).

[2] Marlowe refers to Phoebe rather than Phoebus.

5.1 Textual Note

[1] This edition offers more textual material than is generally found in a traditional critical edition. The text of *A Shrew* is offered in three forms: a facsimile of Q1, a transcription of Q1, and an annotated text that has been modernized in spelling and punctuation. This section will outline the editorial practices behind each version of the text.

[2] The facsimile was originally produced in 1886 by Charles Praetorius under the supervision of F.J. Furnivall. It is a photolithograhic[1] reproduction of the original copy of Q1 owned at the time by the Duke of Devonshire and now by the Huntington Library. It is offered here as a window on the original state of the quarto, but with the caveat that this window is not perfectly transparent. Although the essential typographic features of Q1 appear as they would in the original, the reproduction is far from perfect and should not be taken as equivalent to the original.[2] One of the strangest features of the Praetorius facsimile is that it contains what appear to be silent emendations – changes made to the 1886 facsimile that differ from what appears in the 1595 quarto itself. QLN 187 ($B1^{r}$) contains the word *Cæsar* in the original, but Praetorius displays "*Casar.*" This anomaly could be explained by a partial imprint, but another case is strongly suggestive of doctoring. QLN 1181 ($E3^{v}$) has the phrase "siluer scaled *Dolphyns*" which appears as "siluer sealed *Dolphyns*" in Praetorius.[3]

[3] This edition's transcription of Q1 presents the quarto in a machine-readable format. The transcription provides an intermediate stage between the modernized text and the facsmile. In addition to enabling the electronic collation of

variants between the quartos, the transcription is included so that readers will have a form of original-spelling text that embodies the strengths of electronic text markup. The transcription enables ligatures, swash letters, and most other print entities to be flagged using various kinds of visual markup.[4] Colour (foreground and background), boldface, and underlining are available as visual flags since they do not occur in the quarto text. Spacing is regularized throughout the transcription, and there are minor typographic changes from the original.[5] Italic type is preserved, as are i/j, u/v, and vv/w as they appear in the original. Electronic transcriptions normally regularize long s since it is not yet represented in ASCII or Unicode; however, the Chorus interface, in which this edition is presented, uses an inline graphic to preserve the distinction between the two s letter-forms. The interface also allows users to regularize ſ/s if they so choose. Developments in the Unicode standard should, in the not-too-distant future, enable a proper encoding scheme for early print and manuscript transcriptions.

[4] Clicking the text in any version will either produce either an electronic collation directly (as in the transcription and facsimile), or a menu offering different kinds of collation (as in the modernized text). In the collation of variants and emendations, the interface offers readers two levels of detail: marginal textual notes, and speech-by-speech reconstructions of variants. The first level takes the form of gold-coloured notes that signal emendations as well as significant variations between the three quartos. These notes will sometimes contain a brief explanation of a textual issue if one is required. The second level of collation is reached via the contextual menu for each speech. The Compare submenu allows

users to open small windows containg the speech as it appears in Q1 or Q2. The theory behind the traditional apparatus is that a reader is able to reconstruct lines in collated texts by making substitutions themselves. This edition's interface does the work of reassembling the collated lines so that a reconstructed speech from Q2 or Q3 can be viewed in its totality. Future versions of Chorus may allow this form of display for whole scenes or even the entire transcription. Second-level collation display also provides more detail than traditional print tables of variants, since accidentals are also included. Variants between the given text and Q1 are flagged in colour. Italics and swash letters, beyond the scope of most collations, are not included; therefore, to simplify comparison, italics are removed from Q1 collation displays.

[5] Modernization is always a vexed issue, not least because what we call modern is always in motion. Conversely, the illusion of rigorous unmodernity is no longer convincing, as perhaps it once was in the old-spelling editions preferred by W.W. Greg. Following the rationale offered by Stanley Wells,[6] this edition offers a modernized version of *A Shrew*, but assumes that readers who prefer old-spelling can have it by switching to the Q1 transcription. Accidentals are silently added, replaced, and moved whenever their appearance in the original conflicts with modern usage. The same rule applies to spacing, as in "to morrow" (QLN 445) which becomes "tomorrow". Where a modernization could alter the original meaning, an annotation is provided. Many changes in accidentals coincide with choices made by the Q3 compositor(s) since Q3 represents an early- modernization of Q1-2 up to 1607 conventions for punctuation.

[6] Typography – if the term can serve both print and electronic media – is normalized so that long s becomes sigma s, vv becomes w, and u/v and i/j follow current usage. Graphical compressions such as ye and & are expanded. Elisions made for metrical reasons ("th'antarticke" QLN 19) are kept to preserve the metre, but none are introduced as emendations when the metre would seem to call for it. Words in the source that are contracted, elided, or slurred as characteristic speech remain unexpanded but punctuated with apostrophes to indicate elided letters. For example, Sly's "Gis some more drinke" (QLN 513) becomes "Gi's some more drink" since the expanded "Give us" would impose a misplaced sobriety upon Sly's language.

[7] Where Q1's orthography differs from modern use, the modern spelling is followed as long as it preserves the sense of the word. Original spelling is retained in cases where a word has no modern counterpart or exists now in a substantially different form. For example, "renowmed" (QLN 183) becomes "renowned," but the aphetic form "gratulate" (QLN 141) does not become "congratulate." In the many cases where Renaissance and modern spellings coincide but meanings do not (for example, "ancient" QLN 233), the word is glossed. The modernized spellings of many small words in Q1, especially those ending in "l" or "ll," often agree with variant spellings in Q2 and Q3, but, as with accidentals, these cases do not represent the adoption of variant readings.

[8] Certain words appear in contexts in *A Shrew* that present particular problems for modernization. The arguments made by Stanley Wells against G. Blakemore Evans' policy of selective modernization might tempt an editor to avoid

words like "opes" since the "variety and colour" (Evans qtd. in Wells 5) of selected original Elizabethan spellings and word-forms is a deceptively modern artifact. The preservation of old spellings for reasons of quaintness or supposed fidelity to pronunciation amounts to modernization in absentia. However, even if "opens" did not introduce metrical irregularities to its context in *A Shrew*, it is equally inappropriate since it appears when characters use a recognizable type of poetic language, namely Marlowe's high astounding terms. On the theory that modernization should mediate between reader and text, but not between dramatic styles within the text, "opes" and idiomatic expressions (such as "souns" for "God's wounds" QLN 66) are left as they are found. Accents are added to characters where the metre of the line strongly suggests a certain pronunciation

[9] The wording of stage directions is preserved as closely as possible, though spelling and punctuation are subject to the same rules as dialogue. *A Shrew* contains several stage directions that are more descriptive than prescriptive, suggesting the influence of someone who is remembering the play in performance. Perhaps the best example is Q1's first entry for Polidor, his Boy, Aurelius, and Valeria, which reads, "Enter two yoong Gentlemen, and a man and a boie" (QLN 171-2). While the ambiguity of the direction is certainly of bibliographical interest, most readers will expect a stage direction that gives proper names. Character names are substituted for generic titles whenever dialog indicates who has just entered. Other substitutions are more subjective, but all significant emendations are flagged in annotations.

[10] In the matters of asides and dialogue addressed exclusively to a given character, the modernized text prefers to leave these performance cues to the reader's discretion. Except for Kate's well-marked, "She turnes aside and speakes" (QLN 347), Q1-3 contain no directions to indicate asides or specifically directed lines. Readers should be free to interpret the manner of a speech's delivery for themselves according to dialogue. Editorial suggestions are occasionally provided in annotations.

[11] For similar reasons, settings are suggested rather than specified in annotations. To define a scene as occurring in Ferando's country house would be to run roughshod over *A Shrew*'s intricate metadramatic structure since Ferando's house is also the Lord's house. Readers are encouraged to recognize that *A Shrew* deliberately employs spatial ambiguities of this kind. *Staging* is a better way of thinking about dramatic space than *setting*, so commentary tends to focus on the former.[7]

[12] Line numbers are provided in all three texts. Quarto Line Numbers (QLNs) are keyed to Q1 and coincide with the numbering scheme in Miller's Malone Society facsimile. Modern line numbers present an interesting set of issues for electronic texts, mainly because the dimensions of prose passages on computer screens can vary according to window, font, and margin sizes. This edition departs from standard print practice in the matter of prose speeches, which are traditionally numbered line by line as they appear on the page. As far as an electronic text is concerned, a prose speech is one long line that wraps according to the constraints of the given window. Prose passages are treated as logical nodes rather than

collections of lines, so a single line number serves for each passage. Stage directions that wrap lines are numbered in the same manner.

---

[1] The history and method of photolithography are detailed by Philip Gaskell in *A New Introduction to Bibliogrpahy* (270). In discussing the first photolitho facsimiles of printed books, Q1 and Q2 *Hamlet* (1858-9), Gaskell notes that facsimiles of this kind were sometimes subject to retouching.

[2] For a better-quality photographic facsimile, readers are referred to Stephen Miller's Malone Society Reprint. Miller's introduction contains a compositor analysis and thorough printing history.

[3] Without having seen the original document of Q1 in the Huntington Library, I am hesitant to speculate on the reasons for the divergence between Praetorius and Q1. Miller's 1998 Malone Society facsimile of Q1 notes that some patching has been peformed on Q1 (xvii n. 16), though he does not discuss the specific variants mentioned above. Further research is needed into the history of the Q1 document itself.

[4] Chorus, the user interface software used by this edition, follows the *Internet Shakespeare Editions*' approach to print entities by treating them as conceptual objects, though there are semantic differences.

[5] The transcription could be considered a diplomatic transcript according to D.C. Greetham's definition of the term in *Textual Scholarship* (350). The transcription also embodies some of the features of what Greetham terms a type facsimile by preserving Q1's original lineation, hung words, differences in type size, and horizontal text alignment.

[6] For a detailed discussion of modernization issues in Shakespearean editing, see Wells' *Re-Editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader.*

[7] The "Go to" menu of the Chorus interface provides titles for scenes beside the numbers. Sometimes these titles take the form of locations, but this menu should not be taken as specifying setting, and is rather offered as a convenient shorthand.

5.2 The Electronic Texts

[1] As a supplement to the Textual Note, this section will outline important features of the electronic text. A thorough explanation of how the edition works is not feasible in this space, nor is an exploration of the critical questions involved in electronic critical editing, so this section will restrict itself to issues which may be of bibliographic relevance. Current theoretical concerns are nevertheless at work in the background of the discussion. This project is partly a response to current developments in the field of humanities computing, and attempts to rethink traditional distinctions between marked-up texts versus databases, server- versus client-based delivery software, and modeled versus unmodeled data.

[2] The present edition was facilitated by two webware applications:[1] Compositor, a flat-file database used to create and modify the texts, and Chorus, an interface that displays the edition's content to the user. Both Compositor and Chorus are proprietary applications created specifically for this edition, and Chorus is included with the editorial content that constitutes the Master's thesis. The raw data of the edition consists of 52 graphic files, each a scanned image from the out-of-copyright Praetorius facsimile, as well as five text files, the names of which give an indication as to the division of content: "annotations.xml," "collation.xml," "Mmaster.xml" (the modern text), "Q1master.xml" (the Q1 transcription), and "relatedTexts.xml" (the related text transcriptions and commentaries).

[3] The encoding, or character set, used by these files is 128-bit ASCII. A preferable approach would have been to use Unicode (UTF-8), but Macintosh OS 9 does not adequately support Unicode.[2] The markup language for the data files is

XML (eXtensible Markup Language), transformed by XSL-T (eXtensible Stylesheet Language – Transformations) into verbose HTML. Chorus can either load XML files directly, which uses CPU resources to perform the XSL transformations on the fly, or it can load pre-transformed HTML files. Ideally, one would dispense with HTML and transformations altogether and use the XML DOM (Document Object Model) directly. However, the Macintosh version of Internet Explorer (as of 5.1) does not allow for direct access to the XML DOM, thus necessitating HTML. This encumbrance will be dropped in time, as browsers improve.

[4] This edition – at least in its present state – does not use a standardized tagset such as TEI (Text Encoding Initiative), and does not provide metadata in the form of a DTD (Document Type Definition). The chief function of a DTD, to enforce self-consistency in a marked-up text, is performed by the Chorus interface itself. The adoption or rejection of a third-party model for a text is a fundamental editorial decision, and the history of Shakespearean editorial theory – especially where *A Shrew* is concerned – is full of object lessons on the dangers of excessively categorical thinking. Since my editorial method involved looking at *The Taming of a Shrew* as a special case, it seemed inappropriate to proceed from an a priori model of any sort. Any future version of the edition will likely offer TEI-compliant versions of the texts, including a DTD.

[5] The tagset used for the Q1 transcription is based upon the tagset and editorial principles of the ISE, which are in turn based upon work by Ian Lancashire for his Renaissance Electronic Texts.[3] A partial list of tags is available in the

Appendix. The modernized text contains relatively little XML markup, and the tagset is mainly confined to <SCENE>, <DIRECTION>, <SPEECH>, <LINE>, <PROSE>, and <NOTE>. I have placed higher priority on machine-readability than human-readability in the data so that Chorus and Compositor can make the most efficient use of the DOM. Users wishing to inspect the XML source code are therefore advised to use either XML software or an XML stylesheet, such as the default stylesheet in Internet Explorer.

---

[1] Webware applications, generally written in Javascript or Java, are designed to run inside a web browser, as opposed to directly in the computer's operating system. Chorus was made to run with Microsoft's Internet Explorer, Windows versions 5.5 and above as well as Macintosh versions 5.1 and above.

[2] OS X now supports Unicode, but it will take considerable time for the majority of Mac users to upgrade. Any future versions of Chorus will certainly use Unicode.

[3] A discussion of ISE tagging principles is available at <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Foyer/Tagging.html>.

Appendix: Transcription Tagset

The Q1 transcription contains a great deal of markup for the purpose of flagging print entities. The Chorus interface exposes most of these entities to the user through the Elements menu. The list below describes most of the tags used in the transcription, along with their attributes, where applicable. The list follows the syntax of the XML data file "Q1master.xml" rather than the considerably more verbose syntax of the HTML data file. This list is intended as an introductory overview of the tagset rather than an exhaustive definition of the markup scheme. As such, not all containment relationships are specified, not all tags and attributes are listed, and no XML processing instructions are listed.

The transcription tagset is adapted from that of the ISE, with some semantic and structural differences. See the ISE website for the tagset upon which the present list is based: <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Foyer/TagSum.html>.

*Elements marked with an asterisk are included in the full version of Chorus, but are omitted from the faster version.

Element	Attributes		Total
<PAGE> Encloses a single page of Q1	PRAETORIUS="[1886 page number]"	SIG_REAL="[actual signature]"	52
<BL/> **Blank line**; blank vertical space of any height	ALN="[Absolute Line Number]"		151
<ORN/> **Ornament**	ALN="[Absolute Line Number]"		2

<TITLE> Any title font	ALN="[Absolute Line Number]"		6
<SIG_TRANS> **Signature transcribed**; the page's signature as printed			50
<CATCHWORD> The page's catchword (usually the first word of the first <LINE> element of the following page)			50
<RT> **Running title**	ALN="[Absolute Line Number]"		49
<LINE> Encloses a single line of play text as it appears on the Q1 page; a <LINE> can include dialogue, speech prefix, and stage directions	ALN="[Absolute Line Number]"	QLN="[Quarto Line Number]"	1628
<SP> **Speech prefix**	align="[horizontal alignment, where applicable]"		478
<SD> **Stage direction**	align="[horizontal alignment, where applicable]"		131
<I> **Italic text**			1038
***<L>** **Long S**			1834
***<LIG>** **Ligature**; usually contains an **<L>** element			834
***<SWASH>** **Swash capital**			198
<ABBREV> **Abbreviation**, usually yt			2
<HW> **Hung word**; the <HW> element is the child of the <LINE> element whose dialogue it completes, as opposed to the <LINE> to which the <HW> is turned	turned="[up or down]"		9
<DROPPED> **Dropped capital**; not implemented in this version	lines="[number of lines spanned vertically]"		1

Bibliography

A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called The taming of a Shrew. London: Peter Short, 1594. STC 23667. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1953. Reel 551.

A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called The taming of a Shrew. London: P[eter] S[hort], 1596. STC 23668. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1953. Reel 551.

A Pleasaunt Conceited Historie, called The Taming of a Shrew. London: V[alentine] S[immes], 1607. STC 23669. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, n.d. Reel 1118.

Alexander, Peter. "A Case of Three Sisters." *Times Literary Supplement* (8 July 1965): 588.

Alexander, Peter. "The Taming of a Shrew." *Times Literary Supplement* (16 September 1926): 614.

Alexander, Peter. "The Original Ending of *The Taming of the Shrew.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20 (1969): 111-6.

Alexander, Peter. [Reply to anonymous reviewer from 17 May.] *Times Literary Supplement* (7 June 1928): 430.

Amyot, Thomas, ed. "The Taming of a Shrew." *Shakespeare's Library.* Ed. W.C. Hazlitt. 2nd ed. Vol. 6. New York: AMS Press, 1965. 485-542.

Anon. *Wily Beguiled.* W.W. Greg, ed. Oxford: Malone Society, 1912.

Anon. "The Taming of the Shrew." *Times Literary Supplement* (17 May 1928): 374.

Anon. *A Knack to Know a Knave.* Ed. G.R. Proudfoot. Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1964.

Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics.* Trans. Harris Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1945.

Baldwin, T.W. [Review of Cambridge edition of *The Shrew* by Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson.] *Journal of English and Germanic Philology.* 31 (1932): 152-6.

Bartlett, Henrietta C. *Mr. William Shakespeare: Original and Early Editions of His Quartos and Folios, His Source Books and Those Containing Contemporary Notices.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1923.

Bartlett, Henrietta C. and Alfred W. Pollard. *A Census of Shakespeare's Plays In Quarto: 1594-1709*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1916.

Berek, Peter. "*Tamburlaine* 's Weak Sons: Imitation as Interpretation Before 1593." *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982): 55-82.

Berek, Peter. "Text, Gender, and Genre in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *"Bad" Shakespeare*. Ed. Maurice Charney. Toronto: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1988. 91-104.

Blayney, Peter. "The Publication of Playbooks." *A New History of Early English Drama*. Eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

Boas, F.S., ed. *"The Taming of a Shrew" Being the Original of Shakespeare's "Taming of the Shrew."* New York: Duffield, 1908.

Bond, R. Warwick, ed. *The Taming of the Shrew* by William Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1905. [Arden 1.]

Boswell, James and Edmond Malone, eds. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. 2nd ed. 21 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1966. [London, 1826]

Bullen, A.H., ed. *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Vol 1. London: John C. Nimmo, 1885.

Bullough, Geoffery, ed. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*. Vol. 1. New York: Columbia UP, 1966.

Chambers, E.K. *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*. vol. 1. 1930. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Cicero. "On Friendship." *Letters of Marcus Tullius Cicero*. Trans. E.S. Shucksburgh. The Harvard Classics 9. New York: Collier, 1909.

Cioni, Fernando. "*A Shrew* and *The Shrew*: Shakespeare, Plautus and the 'Bad' Quarto." *Textus* 11 (1998): 235-60.

Cioni, Fernando. "Shakespeare's Italian Intertexts: The Taming of the/a Shrew." *Shakespeare and Intertextuality: the Transition of Cultures Between Italy and England in the Early Modern Period*. Ed. Michele Marrapodi. Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 2000. 149-61.

Cloud, Random. "The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33 (1982): 421-31.

Craig, Hardin. "*The Shrew* and *A Shrew*: Possible Settlement of an Old Debate." *Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds*. Boulder: U of Colorado P, 1945. 155-65.

Crundell, H.W. "Notes on 'The Taming of a Shrew.'" *Notes and Queries* 163.17 (1932): 309-10.

Danks, K.B. "'A Shrew' & 'The Shrew.'" *Notes and Queries* 200 (1955): 331-2.

de Grazia, Margreta. *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authority and the 1790 Apparatus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Dessen, Alan C. "The Tamings of the Shrews." *Shakespeare's Sweet Thunder: Essays on the Early Comedies*. Ed. Michael J. Collins. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997. 35-49.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Ed. William Smith. 3 vols. London: Walton and Maberly, 1858.

Dolan, Frances E., ed. *The Taming of the Shrew: Texts and Contexts*. New York: Bedford, 1996.

Donaldson, Peter. "Digital Archive as Expanded Text: Shakespeare and Electronic Textuality." *Electronic Text: Investigations in Method and Theory*. Ed. Kathryn Sutherland. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997. 173-97.

Duthie, G.I. "*The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Review of English Studies* 19.76 (1943): 337-56.

Fletcher, John. *The Woman's Prize or The Tamer Tamed*. Ed. George B. Ferguson. London: Mouton, 1966.

Freedman, Barbara. "Errors in Comedy: A Psychoanalytic Theory of Farce." *Shakespearean Comedy*. Ed. Maurice Charney. New York: New York Literary Forum, 1980.

Furnivall, Frederick J. Forward. *The Taming of a Shrew: The First Quarto, 1594*. Ed. Charles Praetorius. London: Praetorius, 1886.

Gascoigne, George. "Supposes." *Five Pre-Shakespearean Comedies*. Ed. Frederick S. Boas. London: Oxford UP, 1934. 273-341.

Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 1995.

Gondris, Joanna. "'All This Farrago': The Eighteenth-Century Shakespeare Variorum Page as a Critical Structure." *Reading Readings: Essays on Shakespeare Editing in*

the Eighteenth Century. Ed. Joanna Gondris. Madison, WI: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1998. 123-39.

Graves, Robert. *The Greek Myths*. 2 vols. 1955. Baltimore: Penguin, 1973.

Gray, Henry David. "*The Taming of a Shrew*." *Philological Quarterly* 20.3 (1941): 325-33.

Greetham, D.C. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York: Garland, 1994.

Greenfield, Thelma Nelson. "The Transformation of Christopher Sly." *Philological Quarterly* 33.1 (1954): 35-42.

Greg, W.W. "The Taming of the Shrew." *The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Greg, W.W. *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare: A Survey of the Foundations of the Text*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Griffin, Alice, ed. "The Taming of a Shrew." *The Sources of Ten Shakespearean Plays*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966. 44-82.

Grosart, Alexander B., ed. *Life and Works of Robert Greene, M.A.* Vol 6. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.

Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearean Playing Companies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Hackel, Heidi Brayman. "'Rowme' of Its Own: Printed Drama in Early Libraries." *A New History of Early English Drama*. Eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

Haring-Smith, Tori. *From Farce to Metadrama: A Stage History of "The Taming of the Shrew," 1594-1983*. London: Greenwood, 1985.

Haring-Smith, Tori. *The Taming of the Shrew: A Stage History 1594-1978*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1980.

Harrold, William E. "Shakespeare's Use of *Mostellaria* in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Deutche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West* (1970): 188-94.

Hickson, Samuel. "Marlowe and the Old 'Taming of a Shrew.'" *Notes and Queries* 13 (26 January 1850): 194.

Hickson, Samuel. "Marlowe and the Old 'Taming of a Shrew.'" *Notes and Queries* 15 (9 February 1850): 226-7.

Hickson, Samuel. "The Taming of the Shrew." *Notes and Queries* 22 (30 March 1850): 345-7.

Hockey, Susan. *Electronic Texts in the Humanities: Principles and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare in Performance: The Taming of the Shrew*. New York: Manchester UP, 1989.

Holderness, Graham, and Bryan Loughrey, eds. *A Pleasant Conceited Historie, Called The Taming of a Shrew*. Shakespearean Originals: First Editions. Toronto: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

Honigmann, E.A.J. "Shakespeare's 'Lost Source-Plays.'" *Modern Language Review*. 49 (1954): 293-307.

Hosley, Richard. "The Formal Influence of Plautus and Terence." *Elizabethan Theatre*. Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 9. Eds. John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris. London: Edward Arnold, 1966. 131-45.

Hosley, Richard. "Sources and Analogues of *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 27 (1963-4): 289-308.

Houk, Raymond A. "Shakespeare's *Shrew* and Greene's *Orlando*." *PMLA* 62 (1947): 657-71.

Houk, Raymond A. "The Evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew*." *PMLA* 57 (1942): 1009-38.

Hull, Suzanne W. *Chaste, Silent, & Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640*. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982.

Kirschbaum, Leo. "A Census of Bad Quartos." *Review of English Studies* 14 (1938): 20-43.

Lamont, Claire. "Annotating a Text: Literary Theory and Electronic Hypertext." *Electronic Text: Investigations in Method and Theory*. Ed. Kathryn Sutherland. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997. 47-66.

Literature Online. Chadwyck-Healy. 12 January 2002 <http://lion.chadwyck.com/>.

Maguire, Laurie. *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Marcus, Leah S. *Unediting the Renaissance*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Marcus, Leah S. "Levelling Shakespeare: Local Customs and Local Texts." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.2 (1991): 168-78.

Marcus, Leah. "The Shakespearean Editor as Shrew-Tamer." *English Literary Renaissance* 22.2 (1992): 177-200.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*. Ed. J.B. Steane. Toronto: Penguin, 1969.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus*. Ed. W.W. Greg. Oxford: Clarendon, 1950.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine the Great*. Ed. U.M. Ellis-Fermor. *The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe*. Gen. ed. R.H. Case. Vol. 2. New York: Gordian Press, 1966.

Masten, Jeffery. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Maxwell, J.C. "'The Shrew' and 'A Shrew': The Suitors and the Sisters." *Notes and Queries* 15.1 [213] (1968): 130-1.

McKerrow, Ronald B. *Prologomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.

McMillin, Scott. "Casting for Pembroke's Men: The *Henry VI* Quartos and *The Taming of A Shrew*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 23.2 (1972): 141-59.

Middleton, Thomas. "The Family of Love." *The Works of Thomas Middleton*. Ed. A.H. Bullen. Vol. 3. New York: AMS Press, 1964. 7-120.

Miller, Stephen Roy, ed. *The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Miller, Stephen Roy, ed. *The Taming of a Shrew: 1594*. Malone Society Reprints 160. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Miller, Stephen. "The Taming of a Shrew and the Theories; or, 'Though this be badness, yet there is method in't.'" *Textual Formations and Reformations*. Eds. Thomas L. Berger and Laurie Maguire. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1999. 251-63.

Morris, Brian, ed. *The Taming of the Shrew*. By William Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1981. [Arden 2.]

Nichols, J. ed. "The Taming of a Shrew." *Six Old Plays*.

Oliver, H.J., ed. *The Taming of the Shrew*. By William Shakespeare. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.

Ornstein, Robert. "*The Taming of the Shrew.*" *Shakespeare's Comedies: From Roman Farce to Romantic Mystery.* Toronto: U of Delaware P, 1986.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses.* Trans. Mary M. Innes. Toronto: Penguin, 1955.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. Oxford UP. 2 March 2002. <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.

Oxford Classical Dictionary. Eds. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

Parrott, T.M. "*The Taming of a Shrew* -- A New Study of an Old Play." *Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds.* Boulder: U of Colorado P, 1945. 155-65.

Partridge, Eric. *Shakespeare's Bawdy.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Pechter, Edward. "Critical Studies." *Shakepeare Survey* 54 (2001): 297-329.

Pettie, George. *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure Containing Many Pretie Histories By Him Set Forth In Comely Colours and Most Delightfully Discoursed.* Vol. 1. 2 vols. New York: AMS, 1970. [London: Chatto and Windus, 1908.]

Pollard, A.W. *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos: A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays 1594-1685.* New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1970.

Pope, Alexander and William Warburton, eds. *The Works of Shakespear.* 8 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1968. [London: Tonson, 1747.]

Powell, Thomas. "Loues Leprosie." *Literature Online.* Chadwyk-Healey. 2 March 2002. <http://lion.chadwyck.com/>.

Praetorius, Charles, ed. *The Taming of a Shrew: The First Quarto, 1594.* London: Praetorius, 1886.

Preston, Thomas. "Cambyses, King of Persia." *Minor Elizabethan Drama.* Ed. Ashley Thorndike. Vol. 1. New York: Dutton, 1949.

Prescott, Anne Lake. "The Reception of Du Bartas in England." *Studies in the Renaissance* 15 (1968): 144-73.

Quiller-Couch, Arthur, and John Dover Wilson, eds. *The Taming of the Shrew* by William Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1928.

Ringler, William A., Jr., ed. *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Thompson, Ann, ed. *The Taming of the Shrew*. By William Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Thompson, Ann. "Dating Evidence for *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Notes and Queries* 29.1 [227] (1982): 108-9.

Tilley, Morris Palmer. *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1950.

Tolman, Albert H. "Shakespeare's Part in the *Taming of the Shrew*." *PMLA* 5 (1890): 201-77.

Tydeman, William, ed. *Two Tudor Tragedies*. Toronto: Penguin, 1992.

Urkowitz, Stephen. "Good News about 'Bad' Quartos." *"Bad" Shakespeare*. Ed. Maurice Charney. Toronto: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1988. 189-206.

van Dam, B.A.P. "The Taming of a Shrew." *English Studies* 10 (1928): 97-106.

Vergil. *The Aeneid*. Trans. Frank O. Copley. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor, et al. *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Wells Stanley. *Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Wells, Stanley. *Re-Editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Wells, Stanley and Gary Taylor. "No Shrew, A Shrew, and The Shrew: Internal Revision and *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Shakespeare: Text, Language, Criticism. Essays in Honour of Marvin Spevack*. Eds. Bernhard Fabian and Kurt Tetzeli von Rosador. New York: Olms-Weidmann, 1987. 351-70.

Werstine, Paul. "Narratives About Printed Shakespeare Texts: 'Foul Papers' and 'Bad' Quartos." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41 (1990): 65-86.

Westfall Suzanne. "'A Commonty a Christmas gambold or a tumbling trick': Household Theatre." *A New History of Early English Drama* . Eds. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

White, D. Jerry, ed. *Richard Edwards'* Damon and Pithias*: A Critical Old-Spelling Edition*. New York: Garland, 1980.

Vita

Surname: Galey **Given Names:** Alan Edward

Place of Birth: Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada

Educational Institutions Attended:

University of Victoria	1995-2002
Malaspina University-College	1993-5

Degrees Awarded:

B.A.	University of Victoria	1998

Publications:

"Death and Mortality." *Shakespeare's Life and Times*. Ed. Michael Best. *Internet Shakespeare Editions*. University of Victoria. 25 November 2001 <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/SLT/ideas/death1.html>.

"Death: The Undiscovered Country." *Shakespeare's Life and Times*. Ed. Michael Best. *Internet Shakespeare Editions*. University of Victoria. 25 November 2001. <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/SLT/ideas/death2.html>.

"Suicide: An Act of Dignity or Despair?" *Shakespeare's Life and Times*. Ed. Michael Best. *Internet Shakespeare Editions*. University of Victoria. 25 November 2001. <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/SLT/ideas/suicide1.html>.

"Suicide on Stage." *Shakespeare's Life and Times*. Ed. Michael Best. *Internet Shakespeare Editions*. University of Victoria. 25 November 2001. <http://web.uvic.ca/shakespeare/Library/SLT/ideas/suicide2.html>.

University of Victoria Partial Copyright License

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain by the University of Victoria shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of thesis: The Taming of a Shrew (1594): An Electronic Critical Edition

Author: [redacted]
Alan Edward Galey
29 April 2002