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THE PLAY: SYNOPSIS AND CHARACTERS

In a framing sequence, or Induction, Christopher Sly, a drunken tinker, falls asleep outside a tavern, and a wealthy Lord conducts a comic experiment in which Sly is carried to the Lord’s house, dressed as a gentleman, and told upon awakening that he has been mad and confused about his identity for 15 years. A traveling acting troupe arrives and performs a play called The Taming of the Shrew as part of the experiment.

In the play, Lucentio and his servant Tranio arrive in Padua from Pisa and eavesdrop as Baptista, a rich gentleman, tells Gremio and Hortensio, suitors to his mild-natured daughter Bianca, that he will not allow Bianca to marry until a husband is found for her shrewish sister Katharina (Kate). Lucentio falls in love with Bianca at first sight and schemes to present himself as a poor Latin tutor to gain access to her. Petruchio arrives from Verona, telling his friend Hortensio that he seeks a wealthy bride. Hortensio describes Kate, not hiding her scolding nature, and Petruchio instantly decides to woo her. Hortensio disguises himself as a music tutor to Bianca and both false tutors are accepted by Baptista. Tranio disguises himself as Lucentio and openly declares himself yet another suitor to Bianca.

The first meeting of Kate and Petruchio is a fiery clash of wits and wills in which he does not respond to her insults but rather praises her gentleness and beauty. Declaring his intention to wed her the following Sunday, he leaves town to buy proper “apparel.” Meanwhile, the disguised Tranio, trying to clinch his master’s claim to Bianca, promises Baptista that Lucentio’s father, Vincentio, would pass on his whole enormous fortune to the young couple. Baptista agrees to the match if Vincentio will confirm those terms, and Tranio engages a passerby to impersonate Vincentio and seal the bargain.

Dressed in ridiculous clothes, Petruchio arrives rudely late for his wedding and insists on leaving with Kate immediately afterwards, deflecting all objections with blustering claims to defend her. They arrive at his home, tired and dirty, and he begins his “taming” regime by systematically depriving her of food, sleep and stylish clothes—all under the pretext of loving care. After some days, Petruchio and Kate return to Padua and on the road meet the real Vincentio, an old man whom Petruchio refers to as a “fair lovely maid.” Playing along with the joke, Kate finally grasps the sort of partnership Petruchio seeks with her.

In Padua, Hortensio has married a wealthy widow after recognizing Bianca’s preference for Lucentio, and Lucentio and Bianca marry in secret. The real Vincentio is briefly taken for a fraud before Lucentio admits everything and begs his father’s forgiveness. At a celebratory banquet, Petruchio proposes a wager over whose wife is most obedient. The widow, Bianca and Kate are sent for in turn but only Kate comes readily. Afterward she delivers an eloquent speech in which she censures the other two women and affirms the virtue of wifely obedience.

Characters

In the Induction:
CHRISTOPHER SLY, a drunken tinker and beggar
HOSTESS
A LORD
A COMPANY OF PLAYERS

In The Taming of the Shrew:
KATHARINA MINOLA, of Padua, the shrew
BIANCA MINOLA, her younger sister
BAPTISTA MINOLA, her father
PETRUCHIO, from Verona, Katharina’s suitor, later her husband
GRUMIO, Petruchio’s servant
CURTIS, Petruchio’s domestic servant
GREMIO, of Padua, a wealthy old man, one of Bianca’s suitors
HORTENSIO, another of Bianca’s suitors, disguises himself as LUISO
LUCENTIO, from Pisa, youngest of Bianca’s suitors, eventually her husband, disguises himself as CAMBIO
TRANIO, Lucentio’s servant; disguises himself as LUCENTIO
BIONDELLO, another of Lucentio’s servants
VINCENTIO, Lucentio’s father
A PEDANT, from Mantua, tricked into impersonating VINCENTIO, sometimes called a schoolmaster or merchant
A WIDOW, becomes Hortensio’s wife

Other Persons:
TAILOR, HABERDASHER, and SERVANTS attending on Baptista and Petruchio
From its perplexing Induction and duel plot lines to its strange doppelgänger with a confusingly similar name, *The Taming of the Shrew* is an interesting play to source. While a good deal of debate still surrounds the play, there is consistent agreement that the three main plots of the play—the courtship of Bianca, the taming of Katharina, and the fooling of Christopher Sly—all have their own distinct sources.

The main source for Bianca’s story is a play from 1566 called *Supposes*, written and translated by George Gascoigne from an Italian play of 1509 called *I Suppositi*. Ludovico Ariosto, who wrote the original work and *Orlando Furioso*, was a popular Italian poet whose work—and Gascoigne’s—would have been well-known to Shakespeare. *Supposes* involves a series of disguised men, mistaken identities, and speculation surrounding rival suitors and a secret love-affair. In his “Prologue or Argument,” Gascoigne describes the plot of his play:

…understand, this our Suppose is nothing else but a mistaking or imagination of one thing for another. For you shall see the master supposed for the servant, the servant for the master: the freeman for a slave, and the bond slave for a freeman: the stranger for a well-known friend, and the familiar for a stranger.

Just as Shakespeare’s Lucentio falls in love with Bianca at first sight and then arranges to circumvent her father by posing as her tutor (while Tranio woos her father), Gascoigne’s Erostrato is employed in the household of his love-interest, Polynesta, while his servant negotiates with the father. In both, a bidding war for the girl ensues, and the disguised servant wins by employing a traveler to act as his rich father. Matters escalate in *Supposes* however, after Polynesta becomes pregnant, and Erostrato’s servant, disguised as Erostrato, is thrown in jail by her father. Shakespeare, of course, alters this by having the lovers elope before their secret affair becomes public. Once all disguises are revealed in both plays, the lovers are free to resume life as a married couple. Except for the pregnancy, the deletion of one or two minor characters, and the addition of a third suitor to Bianca (Hortensio), Shakespeare borrows directly from the plot of *Supposes*.

While the Katharina/Petruchio plot is much more difficult to source, Shakespeare seems to have combined the plots of several popular, misogynistic ballads with humanist pamphlets, folktales, and the ubiquitous literary tradition of “the nagging wife.” It has also been effectively argued that the society into which Shakespeare was creating *The Taming of the Shrew* was obsessed with the notion of powerful women who upset the patriarchal hierarchy of early modern England. This argument is supported by “new legislation and increased rates of prosecution [in early modern England] targeting women for crimes such as witchcraft, disorderly speech, illegitimate pregnancy, and child murder.” With debates and anxieties raging about the proper role of women in marriage, the household, and society while at the same time—not by coincidence perhaps—Queen Elizabeth I had already...
ruled the country for over thirty years, Shakespeare could have drawn upon any number of arguments and plots to create a taming story. Nevertheless, there is one ballad in particular upon which Shakespeare may have taken his narrative, *A Merry Jest of a Shrewd and Curst Wife Lapped in Morel’s Skin, for her Good Behavior*. The Ballad, printed circa 1550-1560, concerns the eldest of two sisters, the youngest favored by her father because she is like him, and the eldest ill-favored because she is like her shrewish mother. When a man comes along who wishes to marry the eldest, the father—who has been desperate to rid himself of her—warns him of his daughter’s curst tongue, but the man chooses to marry her anyway. He woos her with beautiful vows of love and faithfulness. She reciprocates his love, and though he is happy with her, he is also wary of her father’s warning. Soon after their happy and festive wedding, the couple sours on each other. In order to tame his controlling wife, the new husband strips her, beats her until she faints, and then wraps her in the salted skin of an old workhorse named Morel, which he has killed especially for the purpose of subduing his wife. Later, the couple attends a feast at the house of her father, and the entire household is impressed by the tamed spirit of the wife. Fortunately for Katharina, Shakespeare’s Petruchio tames her “with kindness” rather than a whip.

The third plot line is the Christopher Sly material. Like the Katharina/Petruchio taming plot, the Sly plot in which a beggar is tricked into believing himself wealthy and powerful may well have been taken from old folktales. Tales of deluded beggars exist in many cultures, one of the most famous being a tale from *Arabian Nights*. Although it is improbable that Shakespeare would have known about *Arabian Nights* in particular, its stories, which were also told within a framing device, are known to have been collected and disseminated as early as the fourteenth century.

Finally, it is important to discuss a play—which may or may not be a source for the entire story—published in 1594 under the title *A Pleasant Conceited History, Called the Taming of a Shrew*, known hereafter as *A Shrew*. Both plays share the same basic plot elements of courtship, taming, and fooling, and similar passages of dialogue. While most of the differences between the two are superficial—*A Shrew* is set in Athens rather than Padua and all of the character names are different save Kate’s—more substantial differences can be found in two areas. First, there are three sisters instead of two. The addition of a sister does little to alter the courtship plot, and, as in Shakespeare’s play, three husbands wager on their respective wives’ obedience in the final scene. The second, and perhaps more interesting difference lies in Kate’s final speech concerning a wife’s duty to her husband. Whereas much anxiety has been spent over the meaning of Katharina’s speech in Shakespeare’s play, there can be no confusing the meaning of Kate’s speech from *A Shrew*. Her argument is distinctly religious, following the Judeo-Christian creation story. She opens with the creation of the world in six days from “a form without a form, / A heap confused, a mixture all deformed...Where all the elements were orderless.” Then God creates Adam “in his image,” and from Adam,

A rib was taken, of which the Lord did make
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.10
Since women, A Shrew’s Kate claims, are created from men and bring about the fall from grace (tempting Adam to eat the fruit from a forbidden tree), they are inferior, both physically and morally. Therefore, husbands are masters to be obeyed and followed. Further, she says, “If they by any means do want our helps; / Laying our hands under their feet to tread, / If that by that we might procure their ease.” She then ends the speech where Shakespeare’s Katharina does, with her hand under the foot of her husband. Her sentiments express the prevailing theological philosophy on gender and marital relations that dominated both religious and secular society in Elizabethan England.

Four distinct theories have formed around the relationship between A Shrew, published in 1594, and Shakespeare’s play, written sometime in the early 1590s but not published until the First Folio of 1623. The first theory sees A Shrew and Shakespeare’s play as “parallel or alternate versions, by two different authors, of an older lost play.” The text and themes of both plays are similar enough to be related, but the setting, character names, and even particular misogyny of both plays are distinct enough that it is possible, and even likely, that they were written by two separate individuals. The second theory stems from the first, designating A Shrew as the source upon which Shakespeare bases his text. It is certainly possible that Shakespeare could have revised the inferior text and dramatic weaknesses of A Shrew without an earlier source; he worked within a small community of actors and playwrights that frequently borrowed from one another. And since published plays of unknown playwrights rarely, if ever, announced the author on their title pages (Shakespeare’s name did not appear on any of his plays until the Love’s Labour’s Lost quarto of 1598), many scholars suggest that authorship and indeed, the printed text, mattered less than the company and its patron and that the surviving theatrical texts of the period were probably collaborations anyway. The third theory holds that A Shrew is simply an early version of Shakespeare’s play. The final theory argues that “A Shrew is derived from a now-lost earlier version [perhaps even a reconstruction from an actor or playgoer’s memory] of Shakespeare’s play, to which the compiler added original material and borrowed or even plagiarized from other literary sources as well.” Whatever the dizzying academic relationship, A Shrew has remained relevant to producers of theatre and thus, playgoers, only inasmuch as it contains an expanded version of the Sly material and as it offers an alternate view of shrew-taming that is contemporary to Shakespeare’s. The text for Theatre for a New Audience’s production of The Taming of the Shrew is based on the text printed in the 1623 Folio, but some lines from A Shrew have been incorporated into the production script.

11 Bevington, “Shakespeare’s Sources,” 214.
12 Dolan, Texts and Contexts, 144.
13 Bevington, “Shakespeare’s Sources,” 214.
THE PLAY: THE INDUCTION

Given the many productions, movies, and adaptations available to the modern playgoer, it is not surprising that viewers and readers enter the story expecting to see Kate and Petruchio’s battle of wits. The text of The Taming of the Shrew, however, actually begins with material that acts as a framing device for the main story, which modern editors call the Induction. It consists of two scenes with less than 150 lines each. It has fallen in and out of favor for the last 400 or so years.

The Induction opens with a drunk being thrown out of a bar by its angry Hostess and then passing out in the gutter. A lord enters proudly discussing the prowess of his hunting dogs. He is immediately disgusted at Sly’s excesses—“O monstrous beast, how like a swine he lies!”—and then shrewdly inventive—“Sirs, I will practice on this man1.” The Lord and his men will trick the unsuspecting Sly into thinking he is a great lord who dreamed he was a drunken tinker. And so the tinker becomes a lord, the serving boy his long-suffering wife, and the Lord, his grieving—if poetic—kinsman. So too the players, arriving soon thereafter, become who and what the play dictates, in order to entertain Sly. The players will perform a comedy called The Taming of the Shrew, to “frame [his] mind to mirth and merriment2.”

While neither the conventions of an Induction nor a play-within-a-play were especially new when Shakespeare wrote Shrew, he used them in a remarkably imaginative way. Shakespeare’s Induction invites the playgoer to enter the world of The taming of the Shrew, where the transformation of a person happens not with magic potions or tragic events, but on a whim, with a word, a change of clothing, and, especially, a different name. Scholar Frances E. Dolan discusses the Induction in the following terms:

First, the Induction teaches viewers that characters form their identities by playing roles and that they can switch roles and thus identities; and that characters also form their identities in relation to other characters…In the process the Induction instructs readers/viewers that class and gender identities are not natural or fixed, but instead are roles—a matter of how one dresses, acts, and is treated—and, as such, can be changed3.

Since Shrew is actually a play being performed for Sly as a ruse by the Lord and his household, the playgoer is constantly reminded of the artificiality of theatre, and, perhaps, of the artificiality of the structures and conventions that make up society. Arin Arbus, director of Theatre for a New Audience’s production, writes, “If the only difference between a lord and beggar is their clothing, then the privileges awarded to the lords are without merit. And suddenly it all comes tumbling down.” The Taming of the Shrew thus raises questions about the sources of legitimate authority, and about the means of achieving and maintaining power. Shrew can be construed as an early modern mirror, subtly reflecting and subverting the society into which it was born.

If the play’s opening is startling, then it is even more surprising when the characters of the Induction simply fall away over the course of the play. Although Christopher Sly speaks two lines at the end of Act 1, he never appears again in the text. Because of this inconsistency, some editors,

---

1 Induction 1.31 and 33
2 Induction 2.132
3 The Taming of the Shrew: Texts and Contexts, edited by Frances E. Dolan, 6
producers, and directors of the play have chosen to eliminate the Induction altogether. Since there were no editions of the play printed in quarto—small single editions—during Shakespeare’s lifetime, the play of his *First Folio* is the text upon which most modern editions are based. There was, however, a play entitled *A Pleasant Conceited History, Called The Taming of a Shrew* first printed in quarto in 1594, just after the period in which most scholars believe Shakespeare wrote his play. Both plays have framing devices featuring Christopher Sly, but only *A Shrew* opens and closes the play with him. (See the “Sources” section of this Viewfinder for a more detailed discussion about the relationship between the two plays.) At end of *A Shrew*, the tapster (barman) says to Sly, “you had best get you home, / For your wife will curse you for dreaming here tonight.” “Will she?” Sly replies. “I know now how to tame a shrew. / I dreamed upon it all this night till now.” Some productions have used this material to close out the play, since it effectively brings the play back to where it began: at the tavern with the drunken tinker.

Arin Arbus has chosen to include much of the text of the Induction. She writes, “The Induction is a mysterious and essential device which sets down all the major themes of the play (class and gender wars, role playing and transformation) and establishes the central story, to dizzying effect, as a play within a play...This meta-theatrical structure is deeply connected to the piece’s meaning.”

---

*4 Lines 178-81 in Texts and Contexts, 153-54*
The Taming of the Shrew has incited as much controversy for its depiction of the interaction between the sexes, or sexual politics, over the course of its long, tortured history as any of Shakespeare’s so-called problem plays. It has compelled heated debates and imaginative interpretations since it was first performed in the early 1590’s, and centuries later, Shrew still divides artists and audiences alike. Some see it as a play about the domination and submission inherent in marriage and the patriarchal society from which it emerged; some view the play through the lens of their own time, revising the play to reflect the prevailing attitudes on relations between genders; others see it as a play about love and marriage; still others view it as a play about theatre and role-playing. Much of the tumult surrounding the play has focused on how compliant or submissive or ironic or even mechanical Katharina’s final speech is delivered. Ultimately the extent of the controversy depends on how the sexual politics are enacted or envisioned.

An early example comes from John Fletcher, a playwright and collaborator from Shakespeare’s own company. Fletcher flipped the sexual politics of The Taming of the Shrew, in which Katharina is allegedly tamed by Petruchio, in his response entitled The Woman’s Prize, or The Tamer Tamed, written sometime around 1611. Scholar Frances E. Dolan notes, “This play suggests that not all Shakespeare’s contemporaries assumed that Petruchio had triumphed [in taming Katharina] decisively.” The Tamer Tamed begins after the mysterious death of Katharina—the play hints that Petruchio may be the cause—and Petruchio is haunted by his tumultuous relationship with her. Theirs was not a happy marriage, but one of constant struggle since Katharina was never truly “tamed.” In a way, Fletcher seems to be commenting on the flaw in Petruchio’s strategy: Kate could never have been tamed since she not only refused to accept the natural order of things, but she also did not understand the nature of her true powers as a wife. Petruchio’s new wife Maria very clearly understands her powers and “constantly asserts her desires and needs, conspires with other women, and participates fully in negotiations with her husband for a marriage on her terms.” She holds the keys to both the household and the marriage bed, and she bars him from both until he amends his ways and behaves like a proper husband, not the rough, domineering tamer, but a patient guardian and companion to his wife, the weaker vessel. The Tamer Tamed seems to have been as well, if not better received than was Shrew during the first half of the seventeenth century.

For the following hundred years, The Taming of the Shrew only existed in performance in the form of strange adaptations or highly truncated afterthoughts, one of which was to become extraordinarily popular. David Garrick’s pleasant milquetoast diversion Catharine and Petruchio, revised and rewritten from the text of Shrew in 1754, is worth discussing with regard to Garrick’s revision of Katharina’s final speech where he rearranges and reassigns her lines. Gone is any sense of uncomfortable ambivalence for the audience. First Garrick breaks up the speech with prods from Petruchio, “Why, well said, Kate,” and “On, on, I say.” Then, Garrick cuts her short at “And craves no other tribute at thy hands, / But love, fair looks, and true obedience— / Too little payment for so great a debt.” Baptista declares his daughter tamed and offers up a second dowry. Petruchio gallantly declines, acknowledges her complete transformation, and then completes Shakespeare’s
original speech. “How shameful,” he says, “‘tis when women are so simple
/ To offer war where they should kneel for peace, / Or seek for rule,
supremacy, and sway, / Where bound to love, to honor, and obey.” And thus the play ends. One can imagine Petruchio’s self-satisfied smile as he finishes up these lines and looks into Catharine’s adoring, deferential face. Some of the finest actors of the eighteenth and nineteenth century performed Garrick’s adaptation, sometimes revising the revision. John Philip Kemble’s adaptation gave birth to Petruchio’s whip, a traditional prop that lasted to the end of the twentieth century. Scholar Elizabeth Schafer writes, “…the overall effect of [Catharine and Petruchio] was to produce a simple, farcical battle of the sexes, which proclaims the duty wives have to submit and makes The Taming of the Shrew seem a masterpiece of ambiguity and complexity by comparison.”

Since it was restored in the late nineteenth century to the text of Shakespeare’s First Folio, The Taming of the Shrew has continued to be a touchstone upon which both men and women, critics and producers, have measured their acceptance of—or revulsion from—the sexual politics from which the play emerged and still contains. Some historicists and feminists see Shrew as a marriage-play. But where others might see it as exemplifying the day-to-day concessions that two fiery lovers must make in order to thrive, historicists “bind” Shrew to the time in which it was written. Scholar Lynda Boose writes,

To insist upon historicizing this play is to insist upon placing realities from the historically literal alongside the reconstructive desires that have been written onto and into the literary text. It is to insist upon invading privileged literary fictions with the realities that defined the lives of sixteenth-century “shrews”—the real village Kates who underwrite Shakespeare’s character. Ultimately, it is to insist that a play called “The Taming of the Shrew” must be accountable for the history to which its title alludes. However shrewish it may seem to assert an intertextuality that binds the obscured records of a painful women’s history into a comedy that celebrates love and marriage, that history has paid for the right to speak itself, whatever the resultant incongruities.

Rather than apologize for or agonize over “the play’s formidable show of patriarchal domination,” historicists use artifacts from Shakespeare’s cultural tradition to illuminate the condition of marriage during Shakespeare’s time. A woman’s behavior could be considered domineering or shrewish if she talked too much or too loudly, gossiped and/or scolded too much, beat or humiliated her husband, withheld sex, or any number of other offenses. Dolan asserts, “But above all, they strive for mastery.” Recent scholarship has centered on societal and governmental tools of taming, or righting the natural order. From “cucking,” strapping a woman to a stool or a specially designed chair and repeatedly dunking the offending woman, to being forced to wear a “scold’s bridle,” punishment ranged from humiliation to downright torture. Husbands who did not control their shrewish wives could also be humiliated by the community, by being forced to ride backward on a horse or donkey.

---

3 In Texts and Contexts, 1589
5 Dolan, Texts and Contexts, 10
—indicating that his passivity has upset the natural order of the community. Other productions see the play as an historical artifact to be updated to comment on the politics of domination and submission that the so-called sexual revolution of the late 1960s sought to blow apart. In 1973, Charles Marowitz sought to highlight the cruelty of a paternalistic world by turning The Taming of the Shrew into a tragedy called The Shrew. “Shakespeare’s combative couple,” he said, “had to leave the realms of farce and transmute themselves into a kind of Grimm fairy-tale world of sinister archetypes and hopeless victims9.” In order to accomplish this, he edited and re-organized Shakespeare’s text and added some of his own. The production was filled with both physical and psychological violence, the worst of which was the addition of a rape scene. Marowitz viewed Petruchio’s ‘taming’ of Katharina as a particularly cruel form of brainwashing and torture, and the delivery of her final speech showed that the process was complete. Wearing an “institutional gown,” she recited the speech mechanically and as if her life depended on it. Although the tragic revision of The Taming of the Shrew—or at least of Katharina—was not necessarily new when Marowitz’s production was staged, his vicious interpretation affected many later productions, if not always in text then in intention. Often these productions insist on Katharina’s physical, but not mental, submission, and her final speech is performed with extreme sarcasm, dripping with irony and cynicism.

Some productions and scholarship see Shrew as Shakespeare’s great treatise on marriage, with an emphasis on negotiating sexual chemistry between Katharina and Petruchio as much as their domestic roles. Harold Bloom believes, “One would have to be tone deaf (or ideologically crazed) not to hear…a subtly exquisite music of marriage at its happiest9” and scholar David Daniell writes, “It is a truly Shakespearean marriage-play, and as such takes marriage seriously and makes as high a claim for the state of matrimony as, from experience of him elsewhere, we should expect Shakespeare to do10.” Arin Arbus has directed her production from a similar point-of-view:

For me, Shrew is a great love story. It’s one of Shakespeare’s only investigations into the struggles within a marriage. The core of the play is an intimate, brutal, profound, hilarious negotiation between a husband and wife about the terms of their contract, about their respective roles and responsibilities.

Productions that are interested in marriage dynamics also emphasize theatricality as exemplified in the Induction, and it is clear that in order to accentuate Shrew’s theatricality, as in director John Barton’s 1960 production, the Induction must be included (for a discussion on the Induction in The Taming of the Shrew, see page 7 of this Viewfinder). Barton was one of the first directors to include the Induction and keep Christopher Sly on stage through the entire production, constantly reminding the audience of the fiction and the farce of the play-within-a-play. He also focused on restoring Shakespeare’s poetry; speaking with “an intelligent understanding of the form and expression of the text”11; and using the quick dialogue between Katharina and Petruchio to accentuate their physical chemistry. The result apparently softened the sexual politics of the play. Scholar Graham Holderness writes, “Barton was content both to revive the play as a high-spirited farce, and to retain in place

---

8 In Shakespeare in Performance: The Taming of the Shrew, edited by Graham Holderness, 92
9 Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human, 33
10 “The Good Marriage of Katherine and Petruchio” in The Taming of the Shrew: Critical Essays, 71
11 Holderness, Shakespeare in Performance, 29
those romantic and sentimental appropriations of the taming plot which deliver it as a playful and energetic love-story. Barton’s Katharina and Petruchio were very much in love from the very beginning. Played by the handsome and charming Peter O’Toole, Petruchio’s motivations to tame Katharina came out of playfulness and sexual attraction. Peggy Ashcroft’s Katharina, then, became a spirited participant, drawn in by Petruchio’s masculinity, hesitant, but willing to submit to the promise of love fulfilled. Ashcroft approached Katharina’s final speech “with an eager, sensible radiance.” Barton’s production and others like his have been seen as both a faithful representation of Shakespeare’s play and a backlash to feminism.

There are, of course, those individuals who simply do not like the sexual politics of the play, and therefore seek to dismiss it altogether. Scholar Penny Gay writes, “It is worth questioning whether The Taming of the Shrew would still be in the dramatic repertoire if it did not have the magic name ‘Shakespeare’ attached to it.” For Gay and other critics, the play’s inherent misogyny, made even more distasteful by the notion that Katharina was originally played by a boy who, as the Lord says in the Induction, would “well usurp the grace, / Voice, gait, and action of a gentlewoman.” Katharina’s suffering, starvation, sleep-deprivation, and even final speech are wiped away by the comedy of drag, of “a male performance of female compliance.”

So familiar is the dynamic between Katharina and Petruchio, the tamed and the tamer, that most readers or playgoers enter the world of the play visualizing a brutal or manly or crazy Petruchio, a strong or wild or beautiful or ugly Kate, each depending on the particular fantasy or nightmare of the individual. And it is upon this imagined Petruchio and Katharina that the actor, director, scholar must decide the manner and totality of her compliance. Just as Bloom asserts, “The perpetual popularity of the Shrew does not derive from male sadism in the audience but from the sexual excitement of women and men alike.” Penny Gay states, “…Shrew has remained consistently popular because it reinforces a profoundly-held belief of its audiences…It offers the audience the chance to revel in and reinforce their misogyny while at the same time feeling good. It ends happily, so all must be right with the world.” And so the argument continues.
The following quotes are selected perspectives on the play from notable scholars and artists.

“. . . the last scene [of The Taming of the Shrew] is altogether disgusting to modern sensibility. No man with any decency of feeling can sit it out in the company of a woman without being extremely ashamed of the lord-of-creation moral implied in the wager and the speech put into the woman’s own mouth.”
—GEORGE BERNARD SHAW, 1897

“Kate is a woman striving for her own existence in a world where she is a stale, a decoy to be bid for against her sister’s higher market value, so she opts out by becoming unmanageable, a scold. Bianca has found the women’s way of guile and feigned gentleness to pay better dividends: she woos for herself under false colors, manipulating her father and her suitors in a perilous game which could end in her ruin. Kate courts ruin in a different way, but she has the uncommon good fortune to find Petruchio who is man enough to know what he wants and how to get it. He wants her spirit and her energy because he wants a wife worth keeping. . . . Kate’s speech at the close of the play is the greatest defence of Christian monogamy ever written. It rests upon the role of a husband as protector and friend, and it is valid because Kate has a man who is capable of being both, for Petruchio is both gentle and strong (it is a vile distortion of the play to have him strike her ever). The message is probably twofold: only Kates make good wives, and then only to Petruchios; for the rest, their cake is dough.”
—GERMAINE GREER, THE FEMALE EUNUCH, 1970

“I think that The Taming of the Shrew has been bedeviled in the past by a lot of horseplay, a lot of rough-house and also a tremendously flamboyant, twinkling, bridling, high-spirited young colt image of Petruchio, the gay, dashing cavalier that, ‘By God, come kiss me, Kate’, tames the young lass and brings her to heel. As with almost all of Shakespeare’s comedies, it really is a more serious play than people have taken it for…as for Kate, I’ve always wanted to get away from this game, this twinkling, bridling, high-spirited young colt image of her. These things give the audience the impression that there’s going to be a great deal more humour than, in fact, there is in the play. It’s a play about many important themes in family life — fathers who distribute their love unfairly between their children and then are surprised to find that the deprived child is behaving cantankerously; the failure of men to recognize who the truly valuable woman is and who can see in cantankerousness nothing but viciousness; the failure of unsophisticated lovers to see that the young and the bland is more likely to be the shrew than Kate herself. “
—JONATHAN MILLER, 1981
"Is there any reason to revive a play that seems totally offensive to our age and our society? My own feeling is that it should be put back firmly on the shelf."
—MICHAEL BILLINGTON, THE GUARDIAN, 1979

"Those critics who find [Katharina] degraded in Act V tend to ignore the much worse degradation of her situation in Act I."
—KENNETH MUIR, SHAKESPEARE’S COMIC SEQUENCE, 1979

"Kate and Petruchio . . . clearly are going to be the happiest married couple in Shakespeare."

"After [the sun and moon scene], the victory is all [Kate’s], and like most human wives that are the superiors of their husbands she can afford to allow him mastery in public. She has secured what her sister Bianca can never have, a happy marriage."

"In medieval mystery plays and Tudor interludes, shrews were already married to their pusillanimous husbands and were shown as domestic tyrants. Male fears of female freedom were projected onto the wife, who was truly a threatening figure because she treated her husband as he normally would have treated her. When the husband attempted rebellion, he usually lost. Shakespeare departs from this literary tradition in order to sketch Kate as a victim of the marriage market."

“To dramatize action involving linguistically powerful women characters militates against Tudor and Stuart ideologies of women’s silence. To maintain their status as desirable, Shakespeare’s heroines frequently must don male attire in order to speak: Rosalind, Portia, even the passive Viola. The conflict between the explicitly repressive content of Kate’s speech and the implicit message of independence communicated by representing a powerful female protagonist speaking the play’s longest speech at a moment of emphatic suspense is not unlike Freud’s female patient who ‘pressed her dress to her body with one hand [as the woman] while trying to tear it off with the other [as the man].’"
—KAREN NEWMAN, FASHIONING FEMININITY AND ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA, 1991
“The play explores the arbitrariness, variety, and fluidity of roles and their constructive as well as constricting potential ... Through its array of role changes, Taming demonstrates that stable identity can persist beneath radical transformations of role ... and that role playing can create some flexibility within social hierarchies without threatening their essential stability.”

—CAROL THOMAS NEELY, BROKEN NUPIALS IN SHAKESPEARE’S PLAYS, 1985

“What I’m saying [in Kate’s final speech] is, I’ll do anything for this man. Look, would there be any hang-up if this were a mother talking about her son? So why is selflessness here wrong? Service is the only thing that’s important about love. Everybody is worrying about ‘losing yourself’—all this narcissism. Duty. We can’t stand that idea now either. It has the real ugly slave-driving connotation. But duty might be a suit of armor you put on to fight for your love. I don’t think the last speech jumps out of nowhere. It’s the logical emotional end.”

—MERYL STREEP, 1978

“And in the end
The love you take
Is equal to the love
You make”

—LENNON AND MCCARTNEY
THE PLAY: SELECTED PERFORMANCE HISTORY

1594 First known performance of The Taming of the Shrew, performed on tour at Newington Butts, within the modern borough of Southwark, London.

1610-31 Acted by the King’s Men at both the Globe and Blackfriars, according to title page of 1631 quarto.

1633 Performed at King Charles I’s court, followed two days later by The Tamer Tamed (a response to Shrew by John Fletcher written around 1611, in which Petruchio’s new wife tames him). Shrew is “liked,” but The Tamer Tamed is “very well liked” according to Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels.

1633-34 The Master of the Revels records a performance by Thomas Killigrew’s company, the King’s Company, of a ‘Revived Play Taming the Shrew.’ If the reference is to Shakespeare’s play, it is the last recorded performance of the play as Shakespeare wrote it until 1844.

1667- Various performances of adaptations are recorded, including Sauny the Scot: or, The Taming of the Shrew by John Lacy (seen by Samuel Pepys in 1667); and Catharine and Petruchio, the extremely popular adaptation by David Garrick, which is first performed in 1754 with Garrick in the role as Petruchio and Hannah Pritchard as Catharine. It plays in England and America up until the mid nineteenth century. Garrick’s is the most popular version of Shrew, eclipsing the original for almost a hundred years. Over the years, the title characters are played by leading actors, including Henry Woodward, Kitty Clive, Sarah Siddons, John Philip Kemble, and in 1867, a young Henry Irving and Ellen Terry. Neither of these adaptations include the Induction.

1844 Benjamin Webster, manager of the Haymarket Theatre in London, and J.R. Planché revive Shakespeare’s original text in an unusually stripped down, almost Elizabethan production. They include the Induction in the production.

1887 American producer Augustin Daly revives the play in New York, with Ada Rehan as Katharina and John Drew as Petruchio, at his theatre Daly’s on Broadway (at 30th St.) in New York City. The production runs for over 120 performances and is the opening production at Daly’s Theatre in London in 1889.

1904 Oscar Asche and Lily Brayton, themselves a married couple, win great success with their production at London’s Adelphi Theatre in 1904.

1913 Martin Harvey is the first director to use portions of the Sly material found in The Taming of a Shrew interspersed throughout the production.
1929 Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks star in the film of The Taming of the Shrew, the first feature-length sound production of a Shakespearean play. Pickford winks at the camera after delivering Katharina’s final speech.

1931 Harcourt Williams directs Shrew at the Old Vic in London. Williams’ is the first significant production staged in the style of Italian Commedia dell’Arte.

1935 Harry Wagstaff Gribble directs Lynn Fontanne and Alfred Lunt at the Theatre Guild in New York, and then it tours the country. The production and Fontanne and Lunt’s backstage antics are said to have inspired Kiss Me Kate.1

1948 Kiss Me Kate, the Cole Porter musical based on The Taming of the Shrew and the 1935 Gribble production, premieres on Broadway starring Alfred Drake and Patricia Morison.

1960 John Barton’s production for the Royal Shakespeare Company includes additional Christopher Sly material from The Taming of A Shrew. Sly, his ‘wife’ and the Lord remain as an onstage audience throughout. At the end, the players pack up their costumes and set, and walk off the stage. Peggy Ashcroft and Peter O’Toole play Katharina and Petruchio.

1978 Michael Bogdanov directs a disturbingly misogynistic modern dress production starring Jonathan Pryce for the Royal Shakespeare Company. The production begins with Pryce, playing Christopher Sly and, eventually, Petruchio, yelling a misogynistic rant at a theatre staff usher. In New York, Wilford Leach directs Raul Julia and Meryl Streep in a production at the Public’s Delacourte Theatre. The production focused on the love found within the Katharina and Petruchio story.

1999 Gil Junger directs a modern film adaptation of Shrew called 10 Things I Hate About You starring Julia Stiles and Heath Ledger. The film updates the story by transforming it into a high school romantic comedy.


---

The most celebrated and widely produced of the world’s great playwrights, Shakespeare was born and raised in the small country town of Stratford-upon-Avon, where his parents were prominent citizens, though his father, a tanner and glove-maker, seems to have suffered financial reverses around the time young William’s formal education apparently ceased in 1577. He married a local girl, Anne Hathaway, in 1582, and over the next decade the marriage produced three children. Shakespeare’s only son, Hamnet, died at age 11, in 1596; his daughters Judith and Susanna survived him.

How and why Shakespeare entered the theatrical profession is unclear. He seems to have come to London in the late 1580s, and quickly made himself indispensable as a reviser of old plays and a supplier of new ones. By 1594, he had become a shareholder, along with the prominent actor Richard Burbage and the latter’s business-manager brother, Cuthbert, in the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, one of the dominant theatre companies of its day, popular with the public and frequently in demand for performances at Queen Elizabeth’s court. In the reign of her successor, King James I, the troupe was officially taken under royal protection and became the King’s Men.

While he appeared regularly in works by others, Shakespeare’s principal function seems to have been turning out new plays for his companies. Working in all the standard genres of the time—tragedy, comedy, romance, and episodes from British history—he rapidly developed both remarkable expertise and a startlingly individual, innovative style. The Taming of the Shrew was one of his earliest plays, possibly his first. It was extremely popular with audiences in the Elizabethan era, prompting a sequel by John Fletcher soon after (A Woman’s Prize, or The Tamer Tamed, also performed by the King’s Men). It later inspired numerous adaptations.

Shakespeare retired from the King’s Men around 1612, spending the last years of his life with his family in Stratford, where he died in 1616. His plays have never been off the stage. Theatres return to them time and again for their brilliant storytelling, theatrical excitement, incisive character expression and memorably intense poetry. To this day, Shakespeare is still the most performed, translated, adapted, quoted, analyzed, and discussed author in the entire history of dramatic literature. Figures from his plays like Hamlet, Falstaff, Lear, Rosalind, Viola, Shylock, Prospero, Petruchio and Kate have virtually taken on an independent existence in the world.
THE PLAYWRIGHT: TIMELINE

1558 At the age of 25, Elizabeth Tudor is proclaimed Elizabeth I Queen of England, succeeding Mary I.

1564 William is born to John Shakespeare and Mary Arden of Stratford-upon-Avon.

1565 John Shakespeare is made an alderman of Stratford.

1566 James Stuart is born to Mary Queen of Scots and Henry Stuart. Elizabeth is made his Godmother.

1568 John Shakespeare is elected Bailiff of Stratford.

1569 Richard Burbage is born. Richard, the son of James Burbage, will eventually play most of Shakespeare’s leading parts like Hamlet, Richard III, Othello, and Lear.

1572 The “Act for the Punishment of Vagabonds” is enacted, requiring all companies of players to be authorized or licensed by individuals of the nobility. With licensure comes the financial backing and stature that solidifies and legitimates repertory companies in London, effectively laying the foundation for the explosion of dramatic literature, players, and purpose-built theatres of the following decades.

1576 James Burbage opens the Theatre, London’s first purpose-built playhouse, north of the city walls.

1578 Mary Arden Shakespeare pawns her estate at Wilmcote and her lands at Snitterfield to help pay off family debts.

1580 John Shakespeare is sued for his inability to redeem Mary’s pawned properties.

1582 18-year old William Shakespeare marries Anne Hathaway.

1583 Susanna is born to William and Anne Shakespeare.

1585 Twins, Hamnet and Judith, are born to William and Anne Shakespeare.

1587 John Shakespeare is fined for not attending church.

1587 John Shakespeare loses his position as alderman.

1590 Henry VI, part 1

1591 Henry VI, parts 2 and 3

1592 Theaters are officially closed in London due to an outbreak of the plague.

1593 In London, deaths from the plague are listed at over 10,000.

Throughout this timeline, plays listed alone under a specific year denote the probable year in which the play was written.
1594  London’s theaters officially reopen. William Shakespeare becomes a shareholder in the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, helmed by James Burbage and his sons, Richard and Cuthbert.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona; Love’s Labour’s Lost; King John “Venus and Adonis” and “The Rape of Lucrece,” Shakespeare’s epic poems, published.

1595  Richard II; Romeo and Juliet; A Midsummer Night’s Dream

1596  John Shakespeare is granted a coat of arms.

Shakespeare’s son, Hamnet, dies at the age of eleven.

The Merchant of Venice; Henry IV, Part 1

1597  James Burbage refurbishes the Blackfriars Theatre, located within the walls of the City of London. The company is unable to occupy it due to complaints from its neighbors. Various companies of boy players are allowed to occupy the Blackfriars after 1600.

The Merry Wives of Windsor

1598  James Burbage’s the Theatre is closed. Building materials from the Theatre are used in building the Globe.

Henry IV, Part 2; Much Ado About Nothing

1599  The Globe opens.

Henry V; Julius Caesar; As You Like It

1600  Hamlet

1601  John Shakespeare dies.

Twelfth Night; Troilus and Cressida

“The Phoenix and the Turtle,” Shakespeare’s last epic poem, is published in Robert Chester’s Love’s Martyr.

1602  All’s Well That Ends Well

1603  Queen Elizabeth dies, and James VI of Scotland is declared James I King of England.

The Lord Chamberlain’s Men, Shakespeare’s Company, are licensed by King James and renamed the King’s Men.

1604  Measure for Measure; Othello

1605  King Lear


Macbeth; Antony and Cleopatra

1607  Coriolanus; Timon of Athens; Pericles

1608  The King’s Men are permitted to occupy the Blackfriars Theatre.

Mary Arden Shakespeare dies.
THE PLAYWRIGHT: TIMELINE

1609  Sonnets published.
      Cymbeline
1610  The Winter’s Tale
1611  The authorized King James Bible published.
      The Tempest
1612  Shakespeare retires to Stratford.
      Henry VIII co-written by John Fletcher and Shakespeare; Cardenio, a play that is not extant
1613  The Globe catches fire during a performance of Henry VIII and burns down.
      Two Noble Kinsmen co-written by John Fletcher and Shakespeare.
1614  The Globe is rebuilt and opens.
1616  Shakespeare dies on April 23 and is buried in Stratford’s holy Trinity Church.
1619  Richard Burbage dies.
1623  The First Folio of Shakespeare’s complete works is published.
      Anne Hathaway Shakespeare dies.
1625  King James dies and is succeeded by Charles I.
Although America had only just entered the collective imagination of early modern England when he wrote his plays, Shakespeare eventually became an American institution. In the nineteenth century especially, Shakespeare was enormously popular in America. During his travels to the U.S. in the 1830’s, French writer Alexis de Tocqueville discovered Shakespeare “in the recesses and forests of the new world...There’s hardly a pioneer’s hut that does not contain a few odd volumes of Shakespeare. I remember that I read the feudal drama of Henry V for the first time in a log cabin.” In his book Notions of the Americans, published in 1833, writer James Fenimore Cooper called Shakespeare, “the great author of America.” And Ralph Waldo Emerson said of Shakespeare:

...he is like some saint whose history is to be rendered into all languages, into verse and prose, into songs and pictures, and cut up into proverbs; so that the occasion which gave the saint’s meaning the form of a conversation, or of a prayer, or of a code of laws, is immaterial, compared with the universality of its application...He wrote the airs for all our modern music: he wrote the text of modern life; the text of manners: he drew the man of England and Europe; the father of the man in America...he read the hearts of men and women.

Many great English Shakespearean actors visited America. One prominent English Shakespearean actor after another—George Frederick Cooke, Edmund Kean, Junius Brutus Booth, Charles and Fanny Kemble, Ellen Tree, William Charles Macready—sought the fame and financial rewards that awaited them in their tours of the United States. They made their way east and then by boat along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Shakespeare was in large and small theatres, in hotel lobbies and in bars on billiard tables, in mining camps and on riverboats throughout America. Historian Lawrence Levine wrote:

Shakespeare’s plays had meaning to a nation that placed the individual at the center of the universe and personalized the larger questions of the day. Shakespeare’s characters—like the Davy Crocketts and Mike Finks that dominated American folklore and the Jacksons, Websters, Clays and Calhouns who dominated American politics—were of epic proportions: their passions, appetites, and dilemmas were larger than life.

Shakespeare was so popular in the nineteenth century that the best actors grew wealthy.

During the California Gold Rush, 2,000 people saw Hamlet and King Lear in San Francisco’s Jenny Lind Theatre. Othello and Macbeth were seen throughout California in towns such as Ted’s Valley, Chip’s Flat, Rattlesnake, Mud Springs and Red Dog. When a miner was appreciative, he threw a bag of gold dust or nuggets onto the stage. In How Shakespeare Won the West, Helene Wickham Koon writes,

The average miner was between twenty and thirty, had at least a sixth grade education and was familiar with Shakespeare...They
spent long days knee deep in water, digging, chopping and washing
the stubborn rock...they suffered from almost unbearable loneliness and
suicides were common. When they did find gold they were eager to
enjoy it and they flocked into towns...The miners may have felt a special
kinship with Shakespeare’s larger-than-life characters, perceiving them as
living epic lives like themselves...The violent confrontations of an Othello
or Macbeth were paralleled every week on the streets of Poker Flat and
Hangtown. The language did not trouble them. The ringing Elizabethan
cadence was not alien to a generation raised on the King James Bible.

American audiences in these frontier theatres were comparable in rowdiness
to those of Shakespeare’s theatre, the Globe. In Sacramento, a gallery
audience reportedly threw “cabbages, carrots, pumpkins, potatoes, a wreath
of vegetables, a sack of flour and one of soot, [and] a dead goose” when
they didn’t like the actor’s enactment of Richard III.

Seeing a Shakespeare play was like going to the movies: the play was the
main attraction, but Shakespeare was presented along with other popular
entertainments. One could see As You Like It alongside magicians, gymnastics,
songs, and comedians. So ingrained had Shakespeare become that
Shakespearean parody entered American humor. Richard III, the most popular
play in the nineteenth century was lampooned in a version called Bad Dicky.
There were other parodies like Julius Sneezer, Hamlet and Egglet, and Much
Ado about a Merchant of Venice. By 1884 Shakespeare was so well known
to the American public that Samuel Clemens (as Mark Twain) could rely on
their familiarity with the texts. In Huckleberry Finn, his parody of poor Hamlet
is a comic masterpiece:

To be, or not to be; that is the bare bodkin
That makes calamity of so long life;
For who would fardels bear, till Birnam Wood do come to Dunsinane,
But that the fear of something after death
Murders the innocent sleep,
Great nature’s second course,
And makes us rather sling the arrows of outrageous fortune
Than fly to others that we know not of.
There’s the respect must give us pause:
Wake Duncan with thy knocking! I would thou couldst;
For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor’s wrong, the proud man’s contumely,
The law’s delay, and the quietus which his pangs might take,
In the dead waste and middle of the night, when churchyards yawn
In customary suits of solemn black,
But that the undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns,
Breathes forth contagion on the world,
And thus the native hue of resolution, like the poor cat i’ the adage,
Is sicklied o’er with care,
And all the clouds that lowered o’er our housetops,
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action.
’Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. But soft you, the fair Ophelia:
Ope not thy ponderous and marble jaws,
But get thee to a nunnery—go!

4 In “William Shakespeare and the American People,” 45
Among many of my Shakespeare loving friends, The Taming of the Shrew is considered a bit of an embarrassment. As one of my favorite critics, Michael Feingold, once wrote that Shrew purports a “redneck, barefoot-and-pregnant view of a woman’s role that makes the play repulsive to reasonable human beings.” It has certainly been performed as a sad, misogynistic tale about an abusive husband, a bitter struggle for power between a man and a woman in which the woman is broken and the man is victorious. For me, that interpretation holds little interest. Perhaps because I grew up with the privileges that emerged as a result of the feminist movement, I am able to view the play, as a feminist, from a different lens. For me, Shrew is a great love story. It is one of Shakespeare’s only investigations into the struggles within a marriage. The core of the play is an intimate, brutal, profound, hilarious negotiation between a husband and wife about the terms of their contract, about their respective roles and responsibilities.

In this central story, The Taming of the Shrew, Shakespeare depicts a rough, sexist, classist world filled with tricksters, clowns, fools, brutes and con-men. It is a dog eat dog world. Almost everyone is out for himself-scheming, hiding beneath disguises, attempting to subvert the prescribed hierarchies, fooling each other, breaking the rules. Most characters cannot see beyond the surface. In this world, marriage is a transaction.

Kate and Petruchio are pioneers—they are the only characters in the play who see things as they are and refuse to accept them. They each do this in their own way. Petruchio responds to the world by refusing to take things seriously. He mocks tradition, ceremony, decorum, and custom. Kate rails against the world—against her sister, her father, the suitors, the tutors. Both Kate and Petruchio are fiercely individualistic—willing to fly in the face of tradition and to boldly speak out against the superficial values of their society. Once married, Kate and Petruchio are confronted with the terrifying challenges of encountering life together as a couple.

Petruchio is one of the few men in all of Shakespeare who has the vision and the chutzpah to teach a woman how to love. As Germaine Greer writes, “Petruchio is man enough to know what he wants and how to get it.” His methods are maddening, improvisatory, ridiculous, but they most assuredly have a purpose. And a profound one at that. Petruchio shows Kate that marriage has the potential to be a partnership, where both voices are essential. His antics inspire empathy in her. He enables her to understand that he loves her for her mind, not her looks or her clothes. And in the sun and the moon scene, they discover how to play, how to say ‘yes’ to each other.

Kate has been misjudged by everyone all her life. Her violent temper is a result of that fact. Until she meets Petruchio, nobody has ever seen her for who she is. Throughout the course of the play, Kate discovers that she is not the person that everyone always told her she was. Petruchio helps her uncover new facets of herself, and, in doing so, she is freed from the role of the shrew. Just like actors in a play, she can continually reinvent herself, adopt different roles, believe in fictions. All while remaining true to herself.

What is remarkable about their relationship is not that they fight. War in marriage is a given. But that through their wars they find love and mutual admiration. By the end of the play, they have fallen in love. They have found something very special together. And they know it. They are the only people on the stage who possess anything of value.

There is a beautiful quote from the film My Dinner with Andre which reminds me of Petruchio’s final and most important lesson: “I realized that what I wanted most in my life was to always be with her. But at that time, Wally, I hadn’t learned what it would be like to let yourself react to another person, to follow your impulses with another person from moment to moment along a chain of feeling that can change from one second to the next. And you see, if you can’t react to another person, then there’s no possibility of action or interaction, and if there isn’t, then I don’t really know what the word ‘love’ means – except duty, obligation, sentimentality, fear.” This is the terrifying, exhilarating territory of Shrew.
Donyale Werle’s set for The Taming of the Shrew, directed by Arin Arbus, is made of reclaimed wood and sustainable materials, which gives it a sense of age and warmth. Werle’s intention is to evoke many different locations—a tavern, an innyard, the main street of a ghost town, the frontier…whatever the setting requires in any given scene.
Donyale Werle’s scenic design for The Taming of the Shrew was realized by Paper Mâché Monkey, a Brooklyn-based art and design studio that uses sustainable, green practices to create specialty scenery, props, and costume crafts for on- and off-Broadway clients. The studio debuted their work in with the creation all of the handcrafted set dressing and props for Bloody Bloody Andrew Jackson on Broadway. Founders Kenneth Grady Barker and Meghan Buchanan answer questions from the Theatre’s education and humanities department.

Q: You describe Paper Mâché Monkey “as a creative team, [priding] itself on being comprised of multi-disciplined designers and sculptors in their own right.” Is there a line between design, sculpture, and set building? If so, where is that line?

A: For many companies, I think there is a much more distinct line than the ones we have created for ourselves at Paper Mâché Monkey. We are each artists and designers in our own right, and we try to take on projects in which we are not only building something, but also contributing a thoughtful aesthetic expertise. I don’t think there is necessarily a line, but really a marriage of sculpture, fabrication, and the art of set design.

Q: Donyale Werle has described her process as collaborative and a “team-based approach.” How would you describe your collaboration with her? Especially with respect to the Shrew set?

A: We have had the opportunity to work on several shows with Donyale, and have really developed an understanding working together. Her designs have a specific direction, but are also open to interpretation. We respect what she has put on the table, and she acknowledges that we are not only builders, but artists that are able and willing to enhance her design. Everyone’s ideas count in this process (and we hire people who have equally great ideas). For us, it’s a very liberating and truly collaborative process.

Q: What does “sustainable” mean to you?

A: We have had a lot of conversations regarding sustainability. As we all know, the theater is an inherently wasteful industry. Shows are built out of entirely new materials, installed, performed on, and dumped in the trash sometimes in a matter of weeks. Though convenient for a show’s quick turn-over in a theater, this practice is not good for the environment. Large amounts of perfectly good materials go to waste constantly, especially in an urban area as big as New York City. Finding and re-purposing those waste materials to create new sets and props is just one step that we can take toward a greener theater. To us, sustainability is thoughtful resourcefulness.

Q: Where did the set’s salvaged wood come from? Were there any other materials salvaged for the project?

A: The wood in our show came from a number of places. Build It Green and Materials for the Arts are a couple of our “go to” resources for doors, lumber, paint, and fabrics. We have also established a relationship with a company that recycles the wood from used shipping pallets to create new ones for sale. We were able to talk them out of some of their lumber...
prior to manufacturing. We claimed and re-purposed 14 theatrical flats and several jacks from a movie set that had wrapped up production a couple weeks ago. We received an email that the entire set was all headed for the trash, so we hopped in a truck and went to pick it up. This is oftentimes how it works when a large community knows that you are working in a recycled sustainable way: it is more or less organized scavenging.

Q: Considering the many fire and building codes and safety requirements involved in building a set, have you found that using recycled or salvaged materials means that the actual building process is more labor intensive, especially considering that the Shrew set is mostly wood?

A: Building codes, fire codes, and actor safety are some of our utmost concerns. Using re-purposed materials means we are paying much closer attention to the condition of the materials prior to use than if we were buying new lumber. While recycled materials oftentimes are much cheaper than buying new, the time spent processing the materials (sanding wood down and picking out old staples) is significant. The budget, in that regard, is reallocated away from the new material costs to an investment into human labor, which we as a studio feel much more proud to support as an ongoing resource.

Q: What will happen to the set materials after Shrew closes?

A: This is an on-going question. There is a giant network in New York of people looking for materials to reuse and recycle into new things. As a studio, we try to take back what we can to reuse materials into other projects. We list items on group forums and contact others who feel might benefit from our sets. Many of the props are on loan from other theaters, and will go back into their rightful owners who generously let us borrow them. As a whole, we make an effort to find a new home for as many of the materials as we can, in order to save them from being thrown out completely.

Photography courtesy Paper Mâché Monkey and Donyale Werle.

In addition to Bloody Bloody Andrew Jackson (Broadway), Paper Mâché Monkey created the handcrafted set dressing and props for Merchant of Venice (Broadway), Wonderland (Broadway, Straz Center, FL), Peter & the Starcatcher (New York Theatre Workshop), costume crafts for Measure For Measure (Public's Free Shakespeare in the Park) and sculptures for YouTube & Google video shoots (Newseum, Washington D.C.). They can be found at www.papermachemonkey.com

Kenneth Grady Barker’s design credits include Birthday Boy (World Premier, Berkshire Theater Festival), K2 (BTF), All Shook up (Barrington Stage Company), Electra in a One Piece (The Good Company), Mine (Slant Theater Project), Call Me Anne (Access Theater), and Dogs (Grid Company). His associate/assistant design credits include Peter and the Starcatcher (New York Theater Workshop), Bloody Bloody Andrew Jackson (Public and Broadway), Broke-ology (Lincoln Center Theater), Dance Dance Revolution (Ohio Theater), and Pippin (Mark Taper Forum), and Williamstown Theater Festival.

Meghan Buchanan has spent a significant time working in the downtown theater scene, creating 5 years worth of props and costumes for Richard Foreman’s Ontological Hysterical Theater. Her shows at the OHT include Zomboid, Wake Up Mr. Sleepy Your Unconscious Mind is Dead, Deep Trance Behavior in Potatoland, Astronome: A Night at the Opera, and Idiot Savant (props only.) Meghan has served as Prop Designer/Prop Master for the Actors Studio at Pace University, Williamstown Theater Festival, New York Theater Workshop, The Roundabout Underground, Primary Stages, Classic Stage, as well as the 40th Anniversary Concert production of Hair, and JolliShips the Whizbang at Ars Nova. Meghan designed the set for the NYMF production of Rainbow Around the Sun, and the costumes for the Paper Industry’s Sine Wave Goodbye. She received her BFA in Scenic and Costume Design from the University of Oklahoma.
Anita Yavich’s design sketches for The Taming of the Shrew reflect the late 19th century American frontier setting chosen by director Arin Arbus.
THE PRODUCTION: COSTUMES

Hortensio
Hortensio as Litio
Bianca Minola
Katharina Minola

Katharina’s wedding dress
Katharina’s new dress
Biondello
Petruchio

Petruchio’s wedding suit
Grumio
Grumio’s wedding suit
Sugarsop
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The Tailor
The Pedant
Vincentio
Widow

Dennis Bukoski, Kathryn Saffell, and Saxon Palmer in The Taming of the Shrew, photo by Gerry Goodstein
Varin Ayala (Biondello)
NY theatre: 365 Days/365 Plays (The Public); Las Facultades, The Beep (Pregones); …Barber-Surgeons (Studio 42); The Dweller (INTAR); End of Summer, Love’s Labour’s Lost (Kaleidoscope at Cherry Lane). Regional theatre: The Motherf**ker with the Hat (TheaterWorks), God’s Board Meeting (The Blank), Underground (Boston Court), The Road to Washington (Mountain Playhouse), Angels in America (Civic Theatre of Allentown). TV/film: “Lie to Me,” Antifaz. Training: The Actors Center Conservatory, Shakespeare Lab at The Public.

Denis Butkus (Lucentio/Sugarsop)

Paul L. Coffey (The Lord)

Matthew Cowles (Christopher Sly/The Merchant)
Has made a living dying. He made his debut in Edward Albee’s Malcolm in which he, as the title character, married the nymphomaniac and died from sexual hyperesthesia. Not all his death adventures have been so exotic, but they have been plentiful. His characters have been shot by bullets and arrows, and thrown from high places in The Juror (by Alec Baldwin) and “All My Children.” Cowles had the honor of dying twice in The King Stag at Yale Rep, adapted and directed by Evan Yiorioulis.

Olwen Fouéré (The Hostess/Widow)
Recently appeared in The Broken Heart for Theatre for a New Audience and is best known for her extensive work in theatre in Ireland and also works in the UK, France and internationally. Recent stage appearances include her award-winning performance of Sodome, My Love by Laurent Gaudé and a world tour of the Abbey Theatre production of Terminus by Mark O’Rowe. Stage appearances in the US include: Rosaura in Life is a Dream directed by Calixto Bieito at BAM in 1999; Play and Come and Go with the Gate Beckett Festival at Lincoln Center; the title role in Wilde’s Salomé directed by Steven Berkoff at Spoletto Festival USA in 1989. Recent films include This Must be The Place by Paolo Sorrentino and The Other Side of Sleep by Rebecca Daly. www.olwenfouere.com

Andy Grotelueschen (Petruchio)

John Christopher Jones (Gremio/Nathaniel)
THE PRODUCTION: CAST AND CREATIVE TEAM

John Keating (Tranio)

Robert Langdon Lloyd (Baptista Minola/Gregory)
For Theatre for a New Audience he appeared in Othello, Measure For Measure, Macbeth, and The Broken Heart. He was a founding member of Peter Brook’s Paris Company and a member of the Royal Shakespeare Company. American credits include Marat/Sade (Broadway), Lear (San Francisco Opera), Conference Of The Birds (La Mama), The Mahabharata (BAM), VOICEtheatre’s Hay Fever (dir. Shauna Kanter; Woodstock, NY). Television includes “Gefahrliche Traume” (Germany), “Mr Ma And Son” (China), “Fragile Heart” (UK). Film includes Paul Scofield’s King Lear and the music video for “Wrong Number” by The Cure.

Peter Maloney (Bartholomew/Curtis/The Tailor/Vincentio)

Jonathan Mastro (Piano Player/Philip)
Off-Broadway: David Cromer’s Our Town (also original music and music direction). Regional: Broad Stage, Goodman (Frank’s Home and King Lear, dir. Robert Falls) Lookingglass, Second City, Chicago Children’s Theatre, etc. TV: “CBS Sunday Morning,” “Jamie Kennedy Experiment.” Film: Circumstance (co-writer, Sundance Audience Choice Award). Also music director for Emily Bergl (upcoming show at the Café Carlyle, May 2012). Love to S, G and H.

Saxon Palmer (Hortensio)
Theatre for a New Audience: The Broken Heart, Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice (NYC & RSC), The Jew of Malta. Broadway: Three Sisters, Design for Living. Other New York: Measure for Pleasure (The Public Theater), You Never Can Tell (Roundabout Theater), A Flea in Her Ear (Bill Irwin, dir), Twelfth Night (LaMaMa), Bello’s Stratagem (Davis McCallum, dir), Regional: Tonight at 8:30 (Williamstown), King (NY Stage and Film), David Copperfield (JoAnne Woodward, dir), The Pillowman (Wilma), title roles in Hamlet and Coriolanus (John Dillon, dir). Film/T.V.: Limitless, “Law and Order,” “Ed,” “All My Children,” “As the World Turns.” Training: Florida State University and Florida School of the Arts.

John Pankow (Grumio)
Broadway: Cymbeline, Twelve Angry Men, The Iceman Cometh, Amadeus, Serious Money. Off-Broadway: Henry V; Measure for Measure; The Two Gentlemen of Verona; The Tempest; Equivocation; Why Torture is Wrong, and the People Who Love Them; Keep Your Pantheon; Cloud Nine; Aristocrats; North Shore Fish; Italian American Reconciliation. Film: Morning Glory, The Extra Man, To Live and Die in L.A., Mortal Thoughts. Television: “Mad About You,” “Episodes.”

Kathryn Saffell (Bianca Minola)
Native of San Antonio, TX, spent many of her days teaching at The Magik Theatre’s children’s theatre camp. After recently graduating from University of North Carolina School of the Arts with a B.F.A. in acting, she decided to move straight to New York. After making her New York debut as Helen in Franklin Stage Company’s Trojan Women, The Taming of the Shrew will be her Off-Broadway debut.
Maggie Siff (Katharina Minola)

Graham Winton (The Pedant)

Arin Arbus (Director)
Associate artistic director of Theatre for a New Audience, for which she directed Macbeth, Measure for Measure (Lortel nomination for Best Revival) and Othello (six Lortel nominations). She has directed at Houston Grand Opera, Woodbourne Correctional Facility/Rehabilitation Through the Arts, Intiman Theatre, Working Theater, FringeNYC, HERE Arts Center, Juilliard, New School for Drama and Williamstown Theatre Festival Workshop. Arbus was a Playwrights Horizons directing resident and a member of Soho Rep’s Writer/Director Lab, and is a Drama League Directing fellow and a Princess Grace Award recipient.

Donyale Werle (Scenic Designer)

Anita Yavich (Costume Designer)
Theatre for a New Audience: Macbeth, Coriolanus, Švejk. Broadway: Venus in Fur, Chinglish, Anna in the Tropics. New York: The Submission, Coraline, The Wooden Breeks (MCC); Orlando, New Jerusalem, Texts for Nothing (CSC); Henry V (New Victory); Iphigenia 2.0 (Signature). Opera: Cyrano de Bergerac (La Scala, Metropolitan Opera and Royal Opera), Les Troyens (Metropolitan Opera), puppets and costumes for The Sound of Music (Salzburger Marionetten Theater). 2006 Obie Award.

Marcus Doshi (Lighting Designer)
Designs for theatre, opera & dance as well as collaborating with artists & architects on a wide array of non theatrical ventures. With Theatre for a New Audience: Othello (Lortel nomination), Hamlet (Drama Desk & Henry Hewes nominations). Measure for Measure, Macbeth, and The Broken Heart. His work has been seen internationally in Edinburgh, London, Amsterdam, Castres, Venice, Vienna, Kuwait, Mumbai, New Delhi, Phnom Penh and Jakarta, and most recently in Beirut, Lebanon and Tunis & Sousse, Tunisia with the international tour of The Speaker’s Progress, a play written in the shadow of the Arab Spring, with Sabab Theatre. His work has been seen in the US with Seattle, Florentine, Boston Lyric, and Baltimore Operas, Lincoln Center Festival, NYTW, Signature, Civilians, Seattle Rep, Steppenwolf, Huntington, Chicago Shakespeare, Yale Rep, among others. www.marcusdoshi.com.

Michael Friedman (Original Music/ Arrangements)
Theatre for a New Audience: All’s Well That Ends Well. Broadway: Bloody Bloody Andrew Jackson. With The Civilians: composer/lyricist for The Great Immensity, In the Footprint, This Beautiful City, [I Am] Nobody’s Lunch, Gone Missing, and Canard, Canard, Goose? Also music and lyrics for Saved and The Brand New Kid. With Steve Cosson, he is the co-author of Paris Commune. Dramaturg for the recent Broadway revival of A Raisin in the Sun. Barron Visiting Professor at the Princeton Environmental Institute; Artistic Associate at New York Theatre Workshop; MacDowell Fellow, Meet the Composer Fellow, Princeton University Hodder Fellow. Obie Award for sustained achievement.
Jeffrey Horowitz (Producer)
Began his career in theatre as an actor and appeared on Broadway, Off-Broadway and in regional theatre. In 1979, he founded Theatre for a New Audience. Horowitz has served on the Panel of the New York State Council on the Arts and on the Board of Directors of Theatre Communications Group. He is currently on the Advisory Board of The Shakespeare Society and the Artistic Directorate of London’s Globe Theatre. He received the John Houseman Award in 2003 and The Breukelein Institute’s 2004 Gaudium Award. The Taming of the Shrew is the fourth production of Shakespeare directed by Arin Arbus in which Jeffrey and Arin have worked together (Othello, Measure For Measure, Macbeth).

Andrew Wade (Voice Director)

Jonathan Kalb (Dramaturg)
Literary Advisor and Resident Artist at Theatre for a New Audience and Professor of Theatre at Hunter College, CUNY. He has published five books on theater, including studies of Samuel Beckett and Heiner Müller, and written theatre criticism for The New York Times, The Village Voice and other publications. His new book Great Lengths: Seven Works of Marathon Theater was published in October.

Doug Elkins (Choreographer)
Previously choreographed Othello for Theatre for a New Audience. He is a two-time New York Dance and Performance [Bessie] Award-winning choreographer who began his career as a B-Boy, touring the world with break dance groups New York Dance Express and Magnificent Force, among others. He has created over 40 original dances during his career for Doug Elkins Dance Company (1988-2003), doug elkins choreography, etc., and a number of university and professional companies. dougelsinschoreography.com

B.H. Barry (Movement Consultant)
Theatre for a New Audience: Troilus and Cressida, Macbeth, Richard II, Richard III, Saved, Hamlet, Othello, Measure for Measure and Macbeth. Recent productions: Treasure Island (Irondale Center); Happy Now? (Primary Stages); Frank Wildhorn’s Wonderland; Twelfth Night (Westport Country Playhouse); Stiffelio, Simon Boccanegra, La Fanciulla del West and Wozzeck (The Metropolitan Opera); Romeo and Juliet (Salzburg and La Scala); Flora (Spoleto Festival USA). He has been awarded a Tony Honor, a Drama Desk and an Obie for his Fight Directing. L. U. O. K. L. H.

Renee Lutz (Production Stage Manager)
Theatre for a New Audience: The Merchant of Venice [New York, Royal Shakespeare Company and national tour], The Jew of Malta, Othello, Measure for Measure, Antony and Cleopatra, All’s Well That Ends Well, etc. Venues include Barrington Stage, Goodspeed, The Public Theater, La Jolla, Playwrights Horizons, Manhattan Theatre Club, Vineyard and numerous Off-Broadway and regional productions. As always, her best credit and longest run is her husband, actor Gordon Stanley.
Characters of the play: Many of the characters in The Taming of the Shrew are stock comic “types,” or characters who serve as broad and exaggerated representations of a kind of person rather than fully-realized human beings. The stock characters used in The Taming of the Shrew have their roots in the Italian dramatic tradition of Commedia dell’Arte, where actors and actresses donned masks to represent their types and improvised skits and scenes based on a loose outline.

Induction, scene 1

Pausis pallabris: A misquoting of pocas palabras, which means “few words” in Spanish. The phrase was popularized in Thomas Kyd’s play The Spanish Tragedy (c. 1587).

“Go by, Saint Jeronimo”: Sly misquotes another popular line from The Spanish Tragedy, in which the hero is warned “Hieronimo, beware! Go by; go by!” Sly has conflated the name of the play’s hero, Hieronimo, with that of Saint Jerome, best known for translating the Bible into Latin. “Go by” is a dismissive phrase, like “forget it.”

Soto: Most scholars believe that Shakespeare is referring to a character in a play now lost to us.

Induction, scene 2

Burton Heath: Probably Burton-on-the-Heath, a village not far from Shakespeare’s home village of Stratford-upon-Avon.

“On the score”: In debt. Taverns accounts were recorded by scoring, or cutting notches on a stick, wall, or door.

Apollo: Greek god of music.

Semiramis: A queen of ancient Assyria, notorious for her sexual exploits.

“Dost thou love pictures?”: The subject matter of the paintings derives from Ovid’s Metamorphoses, a classical Latin poem about the miraculous transformations of various characters drawn from Greek and Roman mythology. The topics suggest that these may be quasi-pornographic pictures, perhaps the “wanton pictures” mentioned earlier in the Induction.

Adonis: In Greek mythology, a youth whose physical beauty enchanted the goddess Venus as she watched him bathe.

Cytherea: Another name for Venus, goddess of love, who was born off the coast of Cythera.

Io: A virgin raped by Jupiter, the king of the Gods in Greek mythology, who surprised her by hiding himself in a cloud. She was later transformed into a cloud to hide her from Jupiter’s wife, Juno.

Daphne: A nymph who infatuated the god Apollo. He tried to rape her but she was saved by the river god Peneus, who changed her into a laurel tree.

“In this waning age”: In this degenerate time. In the Elizabethan view of human history, it was commonly believed that the world had once existed in a state of grace or perfection, like the biblical Garden of Eden or the classical Golden Age, but was since then steadily deteriorating.

“Because she brought stone jugs and no sealed quarts”: Because she shortchanged her customers. Sealed quarts were quart jugs marked with a seal guaranteeing their size. A plain, unmarked stone jug could appear to hold a quart, yet in reality contain less.

Greece: Possibly Greet, an English village not far from Stratford-upon-Avon.

“Concealed your blood”: Elizabethan doctors believed that sadness, or melancholy, could cause the blood to thicken, which in turn could cause fits of insanity, or frenzy.

Act 1, scene 1

Padua: The Italian city in which The Taming of the Shrew takes place. Padua had a world-renowned university, founded in 1228. Lucentio mentions that he has traveled to Padua to study.

Lombardy: A region in northern Italy. In The Taming of the Shrew, Padua is in Lombardy; in actuality, Padua is in a different region of Italy, the Veneto.

“Treats of happiness / By virtue specially to be achieved”: Refers to the idea that happiness can be obtained through virtuous behavior, which was the argument of the classical Greek philosopher Aristotle’s Ethics. The Ethics, which consist of three texts, study how people should best live, and Aristotle’s writings heavily influenced Elizabethan intellectual thought.

Mi perdona: Italian for “pardon me.”

“Let’s be no stoics nor stocks”: The Stoics were a Greek school of philosophers who believed in the restraint of emotions and the rejection of worldly comforts. Stocks were wooden posts, and incapable of feeling.

“Or so devote to Aristotle’s checks / As Ovid be an outcast quite abjured”: ‘Or be so committed to Aristotle’s moral rigor that the erotic poetry of Ovid is completely rejected.’ Tranio is encouraging Lucentio to enjoy himself while he’s in Padua, and not spend all his time studying.

Pantaloon: Shakespeare identifies Gremio as a pantaloon, another stock figure in Commedia dell’Arte (where the character was known as Pantalone). Pantalone is a wealthy and greedy old man, and his foolishness makes him the butt of the other characters’ jokes.

“To cart her”: Baptista has just given Hortensio and Gremio permission to woo Katharina, and Gremio responds by punning on the word court. Prostitutes were often placed in carts and driven through town as part of their punishment. Unruly women, or shrews, were also sometimes carted and driven through town while fitted with painful “scolds’ bridles”—metal headpieces with an iron bit that extended into the woman’s mouth to depress her tongue.
and gag her.

**Minerva**: Roman goddess of wisdom and creator of musical instruments.

“I found the effect of love-in-idleness”: I fell in love. Love-in-idleness was another name for the pansy, a flower whose juice was believed to make people fall in love—as it does in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*.

“As Anna to the Queen of Carthage was”: In Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Dido is the Queen of Carthage, who kills herself after being abandoned by Aeneas, the legendary founder of Rome. Anna is Dido’s sister, who counseled her to have an affair with Aeneas and who subsequently was the primary mourner at Dido’s funeral.

**Redime te captum quam queas minimo**: Latin for “ransom yourself out of captivity as cheaply as possible.”

“The daughter of Agenor”: Europa, whom Jupiter abducted by transforming himself into a bull and carrying her off when she climbed upon his back.

**Basta**: Italian for “enough.”

**Act 1, scene 2**

*Con tutto il cuore, ben trovato*: Italian for “with all my heart, well met.”

*Alla nostra casa ben venuto, molto honorato Signor mio Petruchio*: Italian for “welcome to our house, my most honored Signor Petruchio.”

**“Be she as foul as was Florentius’ love, / As old as Sibyl, and as curst and shrewd / As Socrates’ Xanthippe”**: The women Petruchio mentions are all famously ugly, old, or shrewish. Sir Florent was the knight in John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, who, to get the answer to a question that will save his life, marries an ugly hag. The Sibyl was a prophetess to whom Apollo granted many years of life as the number of grains of sand she could hold. Xanthippe was the notoriously shrewish wife of Socrates.

**Leda’s daughter**: Helen of Troy, described in classical mythology as the most beautiful woman in the world.

**Paris**: Helen of Troy’s lover. He abducted Helen from her husband Menelaus, which incited the Trojan War.

**Alcides’ twelve**: The twelve labors of Hercules. Alcides was another name of Hercules, derived from the name of one of his ancestors.

**Ben venuto**: Italian for “welcome.” In this context, it means “host.”

**Act 2, scene 1**

**“Lead apes in hell”**: Unmarried women were proverbially said to spend eternity leading apes into hell, because they could not lead children into heaven.

**Bacare**: Bad Latin for “step back.”

**Rheims**: A city in northern France with a renowned university.

**“What downy shall I have with her to wife?”**: Marriage was primarily an economic and/or dynastic arrangement in early modern England. This does not mean that love was irrelevant, but it would not have been the only motivation for this important social institution. It was assumed that love would follow a marriage carried out with proper consideration for all involved. Petruchio here wants to know what Katharina’s family will offer, but follows by indicating what he will provide for her.

**Ask the banns**: Elizabethan marriages were preceded by a public reading of the banns (a formal announcement of an impending wedding) normally at three consecutive Sunday church services.

**Kate Hall**: May mean only “the house Kate rules over” or (ironically) “the house that is known because Kate lives there.” Perhaps a reference to Katherine Hall, a large house in southern England.

**Dainties are all Kates**: Punning on the phrase for “bluffed my way through it.” From the card game Primero, in which the ten was a low-valued card.

**“I swear I’ll cuff you if you strike again”**: Lucentio here wants to know what Katharina’s family will offer, but follows by indicating what he will provide for her.

**“I face it with a card of ten”**: A proverbial phrase for “bluffed my way through it.” From the card game Primero, in which the ten was a low-valued card.

**Hic ibat Simois, hic est Sigeia tellus, / Hic / Here once stood the lofty palace of Agamemnon.**

**Lucentio quickly returns to his lesson so as to avoid**
suspicion. Aeacides was an alternate name for the Greek warrior Ajax, given to him in honor of his grandfather Aeacus.

“The ground of all accord”. The basis of all harmony. Both the ground, or key note, and the scale itself could be called the gamut. The notes of a scale (A, B, C, etc.) were sung on the syllables re, mi, fa, etc., as described in Hortensio’s lesson.

“She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house / My household stuff, my field, my barn, / My horse, my ox, my ass, my anything”: While Petruchio sarcastically accuses the men of coveting Katharina, in fact, in the early modern period in which Shakespeare wrote, Petruchio’s words would be almost literally true. Upon marriage, a woman’s legal identity became subsumed by her husband’s, a condition referred to as coverture. Her right to execute legal arrangements could only be performed through her husband. All property that was not specifically reserved for the woman’s use before marriage, as well as the woman’s right to utilize such property, was transferred to her husband. In practice, however, women often managed the household finances, kept expense accounts, bought necessary goods, and sold some of what they made for extra money. When Sir Anthony Fitzherbert describes a wife’s duties in The Book of Husbandry, he says that wives should “buy all manner of necessary things belonging to a household, and make a true reckoning of what she hath received and what she hath paid. And if the husband go to the market to buy or sell (as they oft do), he then [is] to show his wife in like manner. For if one of them should use [practice] to deceive the other, he deceiveth himself, and is not like to thrive, and therefore they must be true either to other.”

Act 4, scene 1

“Fire, fire. Cast on no water”: An allusion to a popular song, “Scotland’s Burning.” The refrain was, “Fire, fire! Fire, fire! / Cast on water! Cast on water!”

“Be the jacks fair within, the jills fair without”: Jacks and jills refer to the male and female servants of the household, but also to types of drinking cups. Jacks were leather cups that needed to be fully scrubbed on the inside, while jills were a kind of small metal drinking cup, the outside of which required polishing.

“It was the friar of orders gray”: The opening line of a bawdy song about a nun’s seduction by a Franciscan friar.

Choler: Anger; hot-headedness. According to Elizabethan physiology, choler was caused by an excess of yellow bile, one of the four humors (bodily fluids) that determined a person’s mood, health, and personality. Choler was associated with heat and dryness, and therefore burnt and dried-up meat was to be avoided.

“Thus have I politicly begun my reign”. In what follows, Petruchio compares his taming of Katharina to the training of a hawk or falcon. The metaphor connects to other images in the play describing Katharina as a wild creature. But equally important, it marks Petruchio’s claim to be a gentleman and hence perhaps to his insistence on taming rather than physical coercion. According to George Turberville’s The Book of Falconry or Hawking; For the Only Delight and Pleasure of All Noblemen and Gentlemen (1575), falconry was a sport of wellborn men and designed not to break the spirit of the bird but to train it.

“Never looks upon her lure”: Never obeys the falconer’s command. The lure was the device used to recall the falcon.

Act 4, scene 2

The Art to Love: Ovid’s poem on erotic love and seduction. Its Latin name is Ars Amatoria.

“Tricks eleven and twenty long”: Comes from the card game one and thirty, in which the objective is to end with a score of precisely eleven and twenty.

Act 4, scene 3

“Thou liest, thou thread, thou thimble / Thou yard, three-quarters, half-yard, quarter, nail!”. No doubt because of their association with women and women’s clothes, tailors were regarded as effeminate. Petruchio asserts his own masculinity by mocking the tailor’s small size, particularly the inadequacy of his rapidly shrinking “yard” (or “yardstick”), a slang word for penis. A nail was one-sixteenth of a yard.

Act 4, scene 4

“Pitches have ears”: Proverbial for “someone might overhear us.” A pitcher’s handle was called an ear.

Cum privilegio ad imprimentum solum: Latin for “with the sole right to print.” Used to indicate a publisher’s monopoly, and used here to express the husband’s exclusive right to father a child on his wife.

Act 4, scene 5

“Thus the bowl should run, / And not unluckily against the bias”. “Now we are on the proper course.” In the game of bowls, the ball swerves because of a weight (bias) placed on one side. Petruchio claims that his relationship with Katharina now follows her natural inclination rather than running against it.

Act 5, scene 1

Bergamo: Bergamo, an inland city about twenty-five miles northeast of Milan, was notorious for rude speech.

“Cambio is changed”: In Italian, cambio means “change.”

Act 5, scene 2

“A hundred marks”: I’ll bet a hundred marks. A mark was worth 2/3 of a pound. As a laborer in Elizabethan England might make only five or six pounds a year, this was a very large bet.

Crowns: Gold coins.

“Fie, fie! Unknit that threat’n ing unkind brow”: Katharina’s speech ignores the traditional biblical justification for women’s inferiority as punishment for Eve’s transgression in Eden that predominated in texts about appropriate roles for women. Instead, it appeals to a more secular argument grounded in nature and the difference between the sexes: the distinction between women’s “soft and weak and smooth bodies” and those bodies that men commit “to painful labor” for women’s “maintenance.” Also, as Lynda E. Boose points out, Katharina’s final gesture of placing her hand beneath Petruchio’s foot in “token” of her “duty” replicates one of the rituals of the wedding ceremony that women were often required to perform in pre-Reformation England and Europe.
Special Note: All Act, scene, and line numbers noted in this Viewfinder are from the Oxford edition.
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About Theatre for a New Audience

Founded in 1979 by Jeffrey Horowitz, the mission of Theatre for a New Audience is to develop and vitalize the performance and study of Shakespeare and classic drama. Theatre for a New Audience produces for audiences Off-Broadway and has also toured nationally, internationally and to Broadway. We are guided in our work by five core values: a reverence for language, a spirit of adventure, a commitment to diversity, a dedication to learning, and a spirit of service. These values inform what we do with artists, how we interact with audiences, and how we manage our organization.

Theatre for a New Audience Education Programs

Theatre for a New Audience is an award winning company recognized for artistic excellence. Our education programs introduce students to Shakespeare and other classics with the same artistic integrity that we apply to our productions. Through our unique and exciting methodology, students engage in hands-on learning that involves all aspects of literacy set in the context of theatre education. Our residencies are structured to address City and State Learning Standards both in English Language Arts and the Arts, the New York City DOE’s Curriculum Blueprint for Teaching and Learning in Theater, and the Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts. Begun in 1984, our programs have served over 122,000 students, ages 9 through 18, in New York City Public Schools citywide.

A New Home in Brooklyn

After over 30 years of being an itinerant theatre, Theatre for a New Audience has broken ground on a new home in the BAM Cultural District in Downtown Brooklyn. Scheduled to open in fall 2013, our new home will be a place to gather, learn and explore. In it, we will be able to expand our education and humanities programs to include activities on weekends, after-school and during school vacations for students; as well as lectures, seminars, workshops, and other activities for artists, scholars, adults and families.
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**Sustaining Benefactors**
- The Howard Bayne Fund
- The Bay and Paul Foundations
- Bloomberg LP
- The Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation
- Jean and Louis Dreyfus Foundation, Inc.
- The Educational Foundation of America
- The Lambert Foundation

**Producers Circle—The Artistic Director’s Society**
- Axe-Houghton Foundation
- Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
- The Joseph & Sally Handleman Charitable Foundation
- Litowitz Foundation, Inc.
- Laurie M. Tisch Illumination Fund
- The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Michael Tuch Foundation, Inc.

**Producers Circle—Executive**
- Jerome and Dolores Zuckerman Gewirtz Charitable Trust
- The Mnuchin Foundation

**Producers Circle—Associate**
- Actors’ Equity Foundation, Inc.
- Barbara Bell Cumming Foundation
- DeWitt Stern Group, Inc.
- The Friars Foundation
- The Irving Harris Foundation