

"SIGH NO MORE, LADIES": MARRIAGES OF SUBMISSION IN SHAKESPEARE'S
THE TAMING OF THE SHREW AND *MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING*

by

JENNIFER SUZANNE DROUIN

Thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts (English)

Acadia University
Fall Convocation 2000

© by JENNIFER SUZANNE DROUIN, 2000



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Voire référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-54528-8

Canada



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1	
Marriages in Early Modern England	7
Chapter 2	
Marriage in <i>The Taming of the Shrew</i>	20
1) Linguistic subjugation	20
2) Rhetoric and rape	36
3) Domestic violence	46
4) Material dependence	57
5) Kinship and gift exchange	65
6) Submission in marriage	74
Chapter 3	
<i>Much Ado: Shrew Revisited</i>	77
Conclusion	112
Bibliography	115

Abstract

This thesis is a comparative study of marriages of submission in William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*. It examines the submissive role in marriage to which loquacious women are confined and their loss of linguistic freedom. It critically analyzes the patriarchal social order in which early modern women are mere commodities or objects of male sexual desire, and the threat that these verbal women pose to the social order.

This thesis argues and concludes that *Much Ado About Nothing* can be read as a revision of *The Taming of the Shrew* in regards to its discourse on women and marriage and regarding the playwright's treatment of the characters, particularly Beatrice and Katherina. It compares the process by which both women are tamed and silenced in their transition from witty, free-spirited women to silent, obedient wives.

Dedication

To my husband Guy
for his patience,
encouragement, and
des promenades au soleil.

Special thanks
to Dr. Jessica Slights
for her immense aid in
the supervision of this thesis.

Introduction

If one name in the field of literature has commanded more respect than any other, it is surely that of William Shakespeare, the playwright recently voted "Man of the Millennium" by the people of Great Britain. But if the nature of Shakespeare's authority has changed little over the last two and a half centuries, the social context of the audiences that view his plays certainly has. For this reason, it is necessary to constantly reassess Shakespeare's plays in light of the new contexts in which they are performed. The objective of this thesis is to examine two of Shakespeare's plays using criteria developed by contemporary feminist scholars, such as Lynda E. Boose, Jyotsna G. Singh, Jean Howard and others. The thesis takes as its focus two comedies, *The Taming of the Shrew* (composed circa 1589 according to Brian Morris, the Arden editor of the play) and *Much Ado About Nothing* (composed circa 1598). These two plays deal with the role that marriage plays in ensuring the collective good of a society. This thesis examines the role in marriage to which the women characters of the play are confined by the strict social order of the early modern period, and pays particular attention to the linguistic power these women seek to exert.

Although the subject of both plays is the same—convincing resistant women to enter into marriage—the plays treat this subject in subtly different ways as Shakespeare presents the same theme from different perspectives. In the first play, the discourse propagated by the play is presented directly to the audience in a long, concluding monologue, whereas in the second play the same discourse is presented much more indirectly. While many critics, such as Angela Pitt in 1981 in *Shakespeare's Women* and

Irene Dash in her *Wooing, Wedding and Power* of the same year, have mentioned briefly some similarities between the two plays, especially that the character of Beatrice appears to be modeled on Katherina, and while a comparison of the plays has been the subject of a brief article by Ann Blake, an in-depth analysis of the similarities between the two plays with respect to the submission of women in marriage has not yet been undertaken. This thesis fulfills that need, and argues that *Much Ado About Nothing* can be read as a revised version of *The Taming of the Shrew* in which Shakespeare softens but does not reject his original discourse concerning the role of women in marriage.

The first chapter of this thesis provides a historical context for the subsequent discussion of *Shrew* and *Much Ado* by drawing on research by several scholars, most notably Ralph A. Houlbrooke's *The English Family 1450-1700* and Constance Jordan's *Renaissance Feminism*, with brief reference to Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage In England 1500-1800*. The purpose of establishing this historical context is to frame the state of gender relations in Elizabethan England, and to give a description of typical marriage customs practiced during the early modern period. This chapter examines, therefore, the general criteria considered by parents and young couples when arranging marriages, especially socio-economical factors, and looks briefly at the notion of romantic love in these marriages. The role of kinship structures is explored in this chapter in anticipation of the subsequent application of this notion to the analyses of *Shrew* and *Much Ado*. This first chapter also places Shakespeare's plays within the context of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, and the context of the rise of Puritanism in England. Finally, this chapter contains an exploration of the distinction between the more common characteristics of comedy and tragedy and the notion of marriage as

comic closure, drawing on the theories of Lisa Hopkins in *The Shakespearean Marriage: Merry Wives and Heavy Husbands*.

The second chapter discusses *The Taming of the Shrew*. The analysis of *Shrew* entails a critical evaluation of how Katherina is forced to submit linguistically, physically, sexually, economically, and emotionally to her husband Petruchio. The chapter begins with Katherina's verbal protests before her marriage, and explores specifically Katherina's anti-social use of her tongue within the historical context described by Lynda E. Boose's article "Bridling Scolds and Scolding Brides". The discussion then moves to how Petruchio tames Katherina's linguistic freedom. After a brief exposé on the necessity to read the play from an anti-revisionist perspective, the discussion turns to how Petruchio subverts and appropriates Katherina's speech by constructing himself as a rhetor, a Renaissance ruler through words. Using the Renaissance theory of rhetoric described by Wayne A. Rebhorn's article "Petruchio's 'Rope Tricks': *The Taming of the Shrew* and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric," I expose how Petruchio constructs himself as a rhetor-ruler in order to dominate Katherina and subvert her speech. This linguistic domination is briefly compared to sexual domination as well by exposing the connection between rhetoric and rape. The discussion then turns from Petruchio's linguistic and sexual domination of Katherina to his physical and economic domination, drawing on research from Emily Detmer's article "Civilizing Subordination: Domestic Violence and *The Taming of the Shrew*" and Natasha Korda's article "Household Kates: Domesticating Commodities in *The Taming of the Shrew*". This part of the chapter examines how Petruchio's taming of Katherina fits the contemporary definition of domestic violence and how it forces Katherina to create a

bond with him which is often mistaken for love but is in fact a survival technique common to victims of violence. Petruchio's enforcement of Katherina's economic and material subjugation is illustrated using Korda's explanation of the role of cates in early modern households. Turning from cates to Kate herself, I illustrate how Baptista's daughters are commodities or objects of gift exchange. The principle model for this analysis of gift exchange comes from Jyotsna G. Singh's article on *The Tempest* in the collection of essays *Feminist readings of early modern culture*. Finally, I conclude by illustrating how Katherina's famous last speech propagates the dominant masculine discourse of the period that women should submit to their husbands on all the levels examined in this chapter: linguistically, physically, sexually, economically, materially, and emotionally.

The third chapter of the thesis discusses *Much Ado about Nothing*, and argues that this play can be read as a softened version of *Shrew*, that is, *Much Ado* indirectly advances the same discourse as *Shrew* but employs a less blatant method that contemporary audiences tend to find less offensive to women. As in the analysis of *Shrew*, the analysis of *Much Ado* focuses on the interaction of the more prominent couple, Beatrice and Benedick, and looks particularly at Beatrice's resistance to entering into the institution of marriage. Beatrice's use of her tongue, through the appropriation of penetrating, masculine wit, is of central importance in the analysis of her progression from an independent, sharp-tongued woman to an obedient and silent wife. The argument that Beatrice loses her verbal mastery when she marries draws principally on the research of four critics, Jean E. Howard, Michael Friedman, Camille Wells Slight, and Harry Berger, but also strongly relies on the theoretical paradigms established in the

previous chapter in regards to feminine speech and rhetoric. The discussion then turns to Don Pedro's plot to convince Beatrice and Benedick to marry each other and examines the gendered discourse that contributes to this outcome. The issue of gift exchange is also examined by applying the theoretical principles from chapter II to the marriage of Hero and Claudio. I then proceed to the question of Don Pedro's and Claudio's denunciation of Hero and the association between women's speech and wantonness. This leads to a discussion of gender stereotypes in early modern England, especially in relation to the issue of cuckoldry. A brief examination of the silence of the secondary characters precedes a return to the question of the silencing of Beatrice's wit by marriage, and the chapter concludes with a comparison between the silencing of Katherina and Beatrice.

The thesis concludes with the argument that *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing* are two different approaches undertaken by Shakespeare to advance the same discourse, that women must submit themselves completely in marriage, and this submission is only complete when it includes not only her body and soul but her freedom of speech as well. Common to both plays is the prominence of a woman's unruly tongue in the beginning of the play and her remarkable silence in the end once she submits herself to the role of obedient wife. Both husbands, Petruchio and Benedick, are offended by their bride's speech, Petruchio because Katherina overshadows his own supremacy and Benedick because Beatrice wounds his ego, and both succeed in silencing their new wives, Petruchio by appropriating Katherina's tongue to serve his own discourse and Benedick by completely stopping Beatrice's mouth. This thesis traces, then, the masculine discourse of the subjugation of women in marriage through two plays

and concludes that the discourse effectuates the same result in each play: the total submission of the wife through her enforced silence.

Chapter I. Marriage in Early Modern England

In *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, marriage has the common goal of restoring social order. In defense of this broad theoretical argument, this chapter analyzes the socio-historical context of Elizabethan marriages since any argument concerning the role of marriage in Shakespeare's plays would undoubtedly be incomplete without a thorough examination of the reigning social order and the typical customs governing marriage ceremonies in early modern England. Generally, early modern marriages often took the form of a gift exchange arranged by the parents of young couples in order to secure various material benefits for both of the families concerned.

The social historian Ralph Houlbrooke, building upon the often unconfirmed theories of Stone, offers valuable insight into the reasons why marriages were arranged by whole families, explaining that "in the eyes of the Church which was chiefly responsible for developing the law and theory of marriage, wedlock was properly a matter of concern not only to those joined together in it, but also to their parents" (68). This perception of marriage as a concern of the whole family was so strong as to raise questions of consent to determine if the parents could force their children into profitable but distasteful marriages against their will. Houlbrooke comments that "[f]rom the twelfth century onwards, the canon lawyers viewed the consent of the parties as the indispensable core of a valid marriage" (68). He goes on to add, however, that this in no way signified a free choice on the part of the woman or her suitor:

Nevertheless, ... it was good that in such matters young folk follow the advice of father, mother and friends, unless their counsel was contrary to

the their duty to God. The Church courts do not seem to have encouraged children to go against their parent's wishes either in making their own matches or breaking those arranged for them. (68)

The exercise of free will in decisions concerning marriage was thus rare as it was perceived as an issue affecting the entire family, if not the whole community in some cases.

Houlbrooke discerns four criteria on which the choice of marriage partners was based in the period from 1450 to 1700: "the advancement of the individual or the family, the ideal of parity, the character of the proposed partner, and personal affection or love" (73). The advancement of the individual or the family was the most important criterion in the choice of marriage partners, adding weight, therefore, to the theory that marriage was principally a form of gift exchange. Even when the marriage did not secure concrete material benefits, it always forged ties of kinship between families and in this way augmented the potential resources on which a family could draw in future times of financial crisis. It allowed as well for a combined pooling of resources to increase productivity in business or agriculture, reducing thus the costs associated with these activities. Houlbrooke explains that a "suitable marriage, especially among the propertied classes, was one which gave the individual and those closest to him potentially useful new kinsmen, and increased the number of people through whom favours might be sought and advancement achieved" (73-74). This often affected the community at large, especially in rural regions, because the "need to use marriage to gain useful allies made for the choice of partners from within one's own region" (74), and reduced, therefore, the possibility of marriage between communities because the ties forged would be

less helpful if the new kinsfolk were not immediately available to contribute their resources.

The material sustenance of the family and marriage's potential to lessen the burden played an important role, then, in the choice of marriage partners. Houlbrooke explains that a "father's ability to provide for the rest of his children often depended upon his heir's making the most advantageous match available to him" (74) in order to allow the son to contribute his new-found wealth to his father's household. It was for this reason that "[m]en sometimes deliberately sought wives whose dowries would enable them to discharge debts or mortgages" (74). Houlbrooke concludes that "the prominence of financial criteria, then, was certainly not due only to the arrangement of marriages by parents and kinsfolk; suitors were often keener than their elders in their pursuit of fortunes" (74). Petruchio in *The Taming of the Shrew* is a prime example of a suitor in pursuit of fortunes.

This notion of the acquisition of property and wealth through marriage led in some cases to more emphasis being placed on the business aspect of the marriage than the union of the couple:

The wealthier the parties to a marriage, the more prominent in general was the place occupied in the marriage agreement by property arrangements. ... among the upper classes marriages were the occasion for the making of carefully worded treaties or settlements, which grew more and more elaborate as time went by. It was of course essential to sort out these property arrangements before an irrevocable contract had been exchanged or solemnisation had taken place. (Houlbrooke 83)

This attitude was reflected in the symbol of the dowry which was the father's payment to the husband in exchange for the assurance that the daughter/wife would be provided for by her husband not only throughout his life but after his death as well. Originally, by "common law, the widow was entitled to enjoy a third part of her husband's land in dower" (83), but this later changed and "it became increasingly common to specify a 'jointure' (lands or income to be held jointly by the husband and wife, and then by the widow alone)" (83). However, the value of this land fell sharply between the mid-sixteenth and early eighteenth century to only half of the traditional third of the husband's land, leaving some widows inadequately provided for as the result of these negotiations between patriarchs.

Houlbrooke's second criterion, the parity of the partners, was again not necessarily in the interests of the marrying couple, but more in the interest of maintaining proper social order under the guise of concern for the couple. While explaining that in literature "some writers gave due weight to temperamental compatibility" as well as "similarity of ages", mostly in the interests of reinforcing the husband's authority, Houlbrooke concedes that "[m]ost important of all was parity of rank. The authors of domestic counsel claimed that social disparity between partners would have bad effects on their subsequent relationship and the internal balance of marriage" (75). This consideration in the choice of spouses served, then, to fortify the already present class divisions of English society.

The third criterion, the personal character of the intended partner, carried little weight in the decision and came into consideration only after the first two criteria had been met, as again we see in the study of *Shrew*. Houlbrooke explains that "[b]irth and

property were important qualifications, but, these provided, what recommended ... matches was personal character. This, *together with the dispositions of parents*, also bulked large in the paternal advice on the choice of wives given by ... Elizabethan fathers" (75; emphasis mine). This description could lead one to conclude that men married not only their wives but their wives' parents as well, and if their wife's character was not always agreeable they could console themselves with having at least chosen their in-laws well. It appears that provided the first two criteria were met and that the husband interacted well with his wife's family, he could tolerate marrying a wife with whom he was incompatible, especially since the wife's character is defined here less by her personality or her affection for her husband and more by religious and domestic virtues:

The writers of Christian counsel ... naturally saw personal piety as an indispensable quality in a prospective spouse. Riches of mind, in particular the fear of God ... were to be preferred to riches of body or temporal substance. In practice estimates of personal worth were often based on practical considerations of skill and competence, whether within house and kitchen or in running farm or business. (Houlbrooke 75-76)

The fourth criterion, the notion of romantic love, played a limited role in the decision to marry, and was subjugated to concerns more rooted in the daily struggle for survival. While recognized as an important aspect of marriage, the idea of love itself could still have "a number of meanings, ranging from friendship to passionate mutual absorption" (76). The general perception among the upper classes at the time was "that mutual affection could easily develop within marriage between well-matched partners. In this view a strong prior attraction between prospective spouses was inessential" (76).

This belief in the potential for the development of love after marriage did not exclude completely, however, the idea that at least some prior affection would significantly augment the chances of the marriage being more than simply a business contract. Houlbrooke comments that even among the upper classes, "it could be recognised that a basic personal compatibility was a prerequisite for the subsequent development of affection" (76). He adds that the "Church's teaching, though often vague on this point, tended to suggest that the origins of married love preceded the union of the couple" (76), suggesting that this was a generally accepted notion agreed upon not only by the families but also the clergy. The acceptance of prior mutual love by the clergy was nonetheless limited to simple affection as "[p]assionate love was widely condemned as irrational and disruptive," and the "Church was hostile to any passionate and exclusive devotion to an earthly creature which might dim the individual's awareness of God" (77) despite a certain literary tradition that made the notion of ardent love less fearful in the minds of individuals in the general educated population.

Jordan also argues that romantic love played only a minimal role in marriage in the early years of the seventeenth century, the period shortly after Shakespeare wrote these two plays and, we can assume, during that time as well. In discussing the "depoliticization of marriage" in this period, Jordan states that "treatises conceding legitimacy to a wife's demands for more autonomy ... qualified, first, the extent to which the family constitutes a little government or state; and second, the kinds of power and authority husbands and fathers can exercise within it" (287). She further comments that the efforts of the women who demanded this revision of traditional marriage agreements "produced a picture of marriage as personal in nature, excellent to the extent that it

reflected the goodwill of its parties rather than their willingness to perform specific duties" (287) which would contain the role of the woman within fixed boundaries. Scholars could see the renegotiation of marriage roles and the greater attention to the necessary place of romantic love within it as a victory against the use of marriage as patriarchal gift exchange, but Jordan warns against this hasty conclusion. She argues that most often "attention to the affective side of marriage did not alter its essential character: husbands were to control wives, their minds, bodies, and property. Love and devotion were important but they were still elicited in relations between a superior and his subordinate" (287).

Hopkins views marriage and the family as being in a state of flux at the time that Shakespeare composed his plays, drawing on Stone and Frances Dolan to support the argument that two major aspects of marriage were affected by rapid change, its ethos and the actual ceremony. While some elements remained unchanged such as the age of consent (12 for girls and 14 for boys), others had not been clearly established. Hopkins notes, for example, that "marriages could be conducted in private without even any witnesses, but it was vastly preferable for them to be performed in public," and "contracts could be either immediately effective or deferred verbal promises" not binding until consummation (1). Hopkins acknowledges Stone as having formulated a model for this radical change in which marriage is believed to have moved "away from extended kinship groupings towards what we would now recognise as something roughly resembling the modern nuclear family," and cites Dolan's theory that there was "a crisis of order, focusing on gender relations, that began around 1550, peaked in 1650, and passed by 1700" (2).

The forty-five year reign of Queen Elizabeth I can be seen as at least one factor contributing to the destabilization of the general perception of the role of women in society at this time. Since she was "revered as the Virgin Queen, and a fierce example of femininity, she may be said to serve as a model for an alternate image of woman" (Hopkins 4). Her reign sparked "a heated controversy over the position of woman" and "played a major role in awakening an interest in the subject of woman" (4); however, this was not the only influence in the general change in the perception of the role of women in England.

Hopkins mainly attributes the destabilization of gender relations in British society to "the rise of Puritanism, the extreme wing of the new Protestant Church" (3). While Catholicism focused on the performance of rituals and put more authority in the hands of the priest, "Protestantism, by contrast, stressed the personal, interior nature of human communion with the divine and the necessity for self-regulation in the case of men, and, for the weaker, more fallible sex, spiritual guidance by husband or father" (3). The household was perceived by Protestants as "a small, self-sufficient enclave, a miniature commonwealth, where, in accordance with all morals of good government, the paterfamilias would take full responsibility for the moral, physical and spiritual prosperity of his wife, children and servants" (3). This conception of the family reinforced, then, patriarchal dominance of women's souls as well as their bodies.

While these new Puritan values tended to abhor enforced marriage, Hopkins points out that this attitude did not resolve the issue of consent to marriage. Despite the fact that "there was to be no pressure on the young to marry a partner whom they loathed, parents still retained a considerate moral authority," due to which their children often

considered themselves as "having merely a right of refusal rather than one of unfettered choice" (4). There was, moreover, a "new emphasis on the benefits of what is often termed 'companionate' and perceived as the only morally acceptable lifestyle" at the time which allowed even priests to begin to take wives and which "radically demonised" alternate choices such as "to be single or, even more unacceptably, to be promiscuous or to be openly homosexual" (4). The reinforcement of traditional values by Puritanism served, therefore, to limit the choices available to women within the boundaries of social acceptability and thus forced many to agree to marriage against their desires.

Jardine also qualifies Puritanism as an ideology which ultimately served to promulgate control over women despite any claims it made of liberating them through the advocacy of consent to marriage over coercion. Jardine states, "[j]ustification for subjugation altered towards sophisticated mutual consent theories, but the actuality of a woman's role in the household remained, as far as one can discover, unchanged" (43). She argues against any liberation brought by Puritanism, saying that instead "it sounds suspiciously as if ... the Protestants maintained that moderation in marital relations made the task of authoritative control of wives simpler" (43).

Hopkins concludes that marriages in Shakespeare do not follow these Puritan ideals and tend to align "more closely with an aristocratic ethos, which minimised the role of love within marriage, and stressed instead compatibility of background" (9). She places Shakespeare "closer to this than to the romanticised perspective of the bourgeoisie, which very often provided Puritanism with its strongest supporters" (9). Aristocratic marriages "tended to operate as a much looser tie and to function less in terms of a lifelong bond than of a union whose specific purposes were the cementing of

alliances and the production of children" (9). Drawing on research from several scholars, Hopkins concludes that it was "a common view that happiness was not a consideration in the marriages of the aristocracy, which were seen as far more likely to be arranged for financial and kinship considerations," and this contributed to an "increased strain on aristocratic marriages just at the time Shakespeare was writing" (9-10). The "aristocratic ethos" described by Hopkins characterizes the two plays studied in the subsequent chapters where the cementing of alliances and kinship ties is an important factor in all the marriages; however, the plays are characterized by more bourgeois Puritan values as well, such as the conception of the household as a miniature commonwealth in which the husband is king in *Shrew* and the demonization of remaining unmarried in *Much Ado*.

Since early modern marriages were greatly concerned with creating kinship alliances, Hopkins presents the hypothesis that despite uniting man and woman, they were also perceived as a means of strengthening the homosocial bonds which structured society by emphasizing the dichotomy between the sexes. To support this theory, she points out that Shakespeare's characters invest a great deal of emotional energy in same-sex friendships, and although "initially, such links may seem to be threatened by marriage—such a fear is, indeed, expressly articulated by a number of characters, including Benedick in *Much Ado About Nothing* ... — ... such homosocial bonds can negotiate the marriage tie with a striking degree of success" because they depend on "a strongly drawn distinction between the sexes" which is enforced by the "polarisation of sexual roles effected by marriage" (13). For this reason, Hopkins argues:

marriages in Shakespeare function not only, and perhaps not even primarily, to regulate relationships between the sexes, but also to regulate

and facilitate relationships within same-sex groups, and to ensure the maintenance and perpetuation of the structures of civilised society as a whole. (13)

This notion is examined in further detail in my studies of *Shrew* and *Much Ado* in regards to the relationships between Baptista, Petruchio, Hortensio, and Lucentio as well as the interactions between Leonato, Don Pedro, Claudio, and Benedick in an effort to discern not only the relations between men themselves but also with their intended wives.

A final characteristic of Shakespearean marriages often mentioned by scholars is its use to provide comic closure to the play. French mentions that the comedies often end with the marriage ceremony, but fail to portray the conditions of the marriage itself subsequently (30), a statement which is true in the case of *Much Ado* as well as in regards to *Shrew* where the solemnization of the marriage is postponed until the final act. Hopkins also discusses the role of marriage as an appropriate provider of comic closure because of its focus on the collective which stands in opposition to the emphasis on the individual found in tragedy:

Marriage both counters this element of separation by showing humans in a relationship which is, in theory at least, one of indissoluble bonding, and also holds out the promise of renewed life in the birth of offspring (referred to both in the words of the marriage ceremony and in Elizabethan wedding customs ...). (17)

She adds that even though birth places emphasis on the forthcoming experiences of the new individual, "the social ritual of marriage, with its stress on continuity and group survival" still counterbalances "the finality implied in the death of the tragic individual"

(17), and its implied harmony renders it appropriate for use as comic closure. Hopkins advances the idea:

In *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, *Othello* and *Macbeth*, worlds may be broken and assumptions overturned; in the comic universe, however, the world not only remains fundamentally the same, but it is indeed reinforced by the reaffirmation of that most basic of all props of social and patriarchal order, marriage. (18)

It is appropriate for both *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing* to end in marriage or the consummation of marriage because marriage provides comic closure to both comedies by reinforcing the patriarchal social order.

The socio-historical context of Shakespearean marriages explored in this chapter sets the stage for an in-depth analysis of both *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing* in the next two chapters, for the marriages in these plays share the characteristics as typical marriages in early modern England. In the following two chapters, we see how Shakespeare's marriages reflect his time, that is, how economic profit and the forging of kinship ties supersede the notion of romantic love. We also see that the marriages in *Shrew* and *Much Ado* reflect the tensions of Shakespeare's time and the crisis of social order regarding the role of women provoked by the alternate image of woman provided by Queen Elizabeth I. Just as many men sought to eliminate this alternate image by forcing Queen Elizabeth to marry and give up her power to a male ruler, so too do Shakespeare's male characters in these two plays seek to contain the threat to social order posed by unconventional women by making them submit themselves to patriarchy. Shakespearean marriages, as I explain in the next two chapters,

do not encourage progressive change in traditional, gendered marriage roles but seek rather to contain any gender-related crises in the social order by creating a model in which the audience is encouraged to laugh and delight at the failure of free-spirited women to resist the gendered role imposed on them by a patriarchal social order which always withstands the threat of progressive change. In the next two chapters, we see two alternate images of woman that are crushed as these women are forced to conform to patriarchal social norms.

Chapter II. Marriage in *The Taming of the Shrew*

Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* disguises behind comedy and farce the violence towards women inherent in early modern marriages. The play teaches men how to dominate their wives by policy rather than force, and how to control them more effectively, principally by denying them language. The male hero, Petruchio, succeeds in enforcing the total submission of his bride Katherina; he dominates her linguistically, physically, sexually, emotionally, materially, and economically. From the very beginning of the play proper, and even in the Induction, wives are portrayed as objects rather than human beings. Women are commodities that reaffirm male dominance through their potential to reinforce or to elevate the social and economic status of the men who assume the role of their masters. For the women in this play, linguistic power is the only means of resistance against total patriarchal domination, but for the heroine it is ultimately not enough.

1) Linguistic subjugation

Katherina is distinguished from the other women in the play because she attempts to make use of her one means of resistance to patriarchy, her tongue. The use of physical force by women was highly criticized and punishable, as the characters' reactions to Katherina's few justifiable physical attacks illustrate, so verbal resistance was a more viable option for women to defend their own interests. Gremio gives the play's first description of Katherina when he replies to Baptista, "To cart her rather. She's too rough for me" (1.1.55),¹ and immediately her tongue becomes her distinguishing characteristic.

¹ All citations from *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing* are taken from the Arden editions.

Gremio not only insults Katherina by associating her with prostitutes and scolds (who were traditionally punished by being publicly drawn through town in a cart similar to that for criminals taken to the gallows, or by being whipped at the tail of a cart), but also characterizes her as a shrew since "rough" describes her tongue. The emphasis on her unruly tongue is further highlighted in contrast to Lucentio's subsequent idealized description of her sister Bianca's "silence" as "Maid's mild behavior and sobriety" (1.1.70-1). This first scene establishes that Katherina's crime in this early modern context is not her violence, but her determination to exercise free speech in a world where silence in women is associated with chastity. Masculine contempt for Katherina derives from her attempt to infiltrate a space from which women are excluded, public speech, as Tranio's criticism confirms when he faults her primarily with having begun "to scold and raise up such a storm / That mortal ears might hardly endure the din" (1.1.172-3). He then describes her as "curst and shrewd" (1.1.180), which the Arden edition of the play glosses as "cantankerous and sharp of tongue". To further emphasize his point, Tranio again contrasts the two sisters, describing "The one as famous for a scolding tongue / As is the other for beauteous modesty" (1.2.252-3). He leaves no doubt that his masculine judgment as to Katherina's unattractiveness and to Bianca's charm is purely a question of how often, or more importantly in what manner, each uses her tongue. Fineman describes Bianca's silence in contrast to Katherina's shrewish tongue:

Bianca does in fact speak quite often in the play ... but the play describes this speech, as it does Bianca, with a set of images and motifs, figures of speech, that give both to Bianca and to her speaking a specific phenomenality which is understood to be *equivalent* to silence. This

quality, almost a physical materiality, can be generally summarized ... in terms of an essential visibility: that is to say, Bianca and her language both are silent because the two of them are something to be *seen*. (147)

Young women, as objects of male sexual desire, are meant to be seen and not heard.

Before she may become a suitable bride and object of male desire, therefore, a verbal woman such as Katherina must be silenced, and enforcing this silence is one of the principal concerns of the patriarchs of the play, both her father who wants to sell this object of male desire and Petruchio who wants to purchase her. Lynda E. Boose gives a feminist explanation for this male need to control women's speech:

the talkative woman is frequently imagined as synonymous with the sexually available woman, her open mouth the signifier for invited entrance elsewhere. Hence, the dictum that associates "silent" with "chaste" and stigmatizes women's public speech as behavior fraught with cultural signs resonating with a distinctly sexual kind of shame. ("Scolding Brides" 196)

Katherina's speech not only defies masculine authority, and appears as a threat because with it she can potentially publically usurp masculine power, but also identifies her as unchaste and, thus, possibly tarnished goods in the male economic system of the exchange of brides. Her desire for free speech, her dominant character trait in the first four acts, is contrary to social order on several levels. Hence, Baptista and Petruchio are obligated either to silence her or to appropriate her speech for their own benefit, and this is the real purpose of the latter's "taming-school" (4.1.54).

In their first encounter, knowing that "she rail[s]" (2.1.170), Petruchio decides to

manipulate language to subdue Katherina. An able rhetor, he has just manipulated Baptista by excessively flattering Katherina, and now he wants to impress on her as well his linguistic superiority. His very first words to her are an insult:

PETRUCHIO. Good morrow, Kate, for that's your name, I hear.

KATHERINA. Well have you heard, but something hard of hearing:

They call me Katherine that do talk of me.

PETRUCHIO. You lie, in faith, for you are call'd plain Kate,

And bonny Kate, and sometimes Kate the curst;

But Kate, the prettiest Kate in Christendom,

Kate of Kate Hall, my super-dainty Kate ... (2.1.182-8)

He calls her "curst", mocks her name, and insists, despite her protest, on diminishing her further by calling her Kate rather than Katherine. By attacking her name, he sets out to destroy her identity in order to allow himself to mold a new one for her.²

In the ensuing battle of words, Petruchio becomes immediately acquainted with the strength of Katherina's tongue. For her, it is her only means to ward off the advances of a suitor whom she sees as, and repeatedly states is, a "fool" (2.1.212, 251). Her speech here is self-defense, just as it is in the first scene when she is forced to protest, "is it your will / To make me a stale amongst these mates?" (1.1.57-8). Throughout the play, she is obligated to defend herself verbally, and sometimes physically, because even her father does not defend her interests. Moreover, Katherina's need to defend herself "seems the greater when we note that she is the only Shakespearean comic heroine without a female friend at any point in the play" (Weil 74-5). Knowing that real agency is impossible for

² For this reason, I insist on referring to her as Katherina rather than Kate throughout this thesis (except in the discussion on cates) in order to respect the identity that Petruchio denies her.

women in this social context, Katherina hopes that through speech she can effect a performative gesture, and thus exercise some form of control, however small, over the gift exchange economy in which she is a mere commodity. She is not free to choose her husband, but she does believe that by refusing Petruchio she can avoid being given to him (since Petruchio has not yet manipulated her into believing that her father has already consented to this). She criticizes Petruchio overtly, and at the same time she criticizes more subversively the institution of marriage itself. As Karen Newman explains, "her sexual puns make explicit to the audience not so much her secret preoccupation with sex and marriage, but what is implicit in Petruchio's wooing—that marriage is a sexual exchange in which women are exploited for their use-value as producers" (94). Katherina uses her speech much more tactfully than the men who criticize her realize, and she shows the audience that she is not merely a loud shrew but an intelligent woman.

At the same time, Katherina is no doubt aware of the limits of the power of words for women. As Boose explains in detail in her article "Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds", free speech could have real, physical consequences for early modern women. The very threat of being bridled could often impose self-censorship upon outspoken women. Despite being outlawed, the scold's bridle, an instrument of shame and torture, was nonetheless still used,³ and even though it is not present in the play itself, an Elizabethan audience would have been aware of its presence lurking in the margins of

³ The scold's bridle was a iron headdress with a large, spiked mouthpiece. Colourfully painted to attract attention and attached to a chain, it was used to parade a woman in public to shame her into silence. The spiked tongue depressor, or gag, was sometimes so large as to simulate raping the mouth when put in place. When the chain was pulled the spikes caused the mouth to bleed and the mouthpiece could knock out a woman's teeth. One first-person written account of its use dates to 1656, and there is evidence of its use as late as the 1830s. For further details and illustrations, see Boose, "Scolding Brides", esp. pp 205-212.

the play. When Baptista makes the decision literally to sell Katherina to Petruchio in exchange for a jointure for her widowhood, Katherina has no choice but to stand by in silent consent. Baptista gives more weight to Petruchio's false masculine rhetoric than to Katherina's true feminine protest that Petruchio is a "madcap ruffian and a swearing Jack" (2.1.281). Just as Baptista does not know or care that Petruchio is lying when he says that Katherina has consented to marry him, she does not know that Petruchio also lied when he told her that Baptista had already consented to the marriage. Petruchio subverts her linguistic power by manipulating language, first Baptista's conditions and then her protests, because as a man his words carry more weight. When he says, "If she be curst it is for policy" (2.1.285), that is, that they have agreed in private that she would continue to be curst in public, and then announces that she has agreed to marry him, nobody questions his statements. Petruchio denies Katherina language by negating the meaning of her words, and eventually she is left to conclude that her protests are useless. She has no choice but to stand by in silent consent as Baptista sells her to a man she despises.

Petruchio's first step towards "taming" Katherina is successful because it touches her linguistic power, the most important part of her character, and denies the meaning of her words. After the wedding, Petruchio employs again the same tactic as in the wooing scene when he pretends that Katherina means for the others to go to the feast without her. "They shall go forward, Kate, at thy command" (3.2.220), he declares, even though it is clear that she is expressing her desire to stay and attend the banquet with them. He subverts the power of her speech by construing the meaning and then imposing his own meaning before she can correct for the others Petruchio's intentional error. He then insists on taking her away in order to protect her from supposed thieves. Her family and

friends obviously do not want to kidnap her, and would be glad to "rid the house of her" as soon as the banquet is finished (1.1.144-5), but because Petruchio acts as though his words determine the very nature of reality, and because nobody is willing to defend Katherina's interests anyway, his assertion that they are thieves from whom he must rescue her goes unchallenged.

Once he has brought Katherina to his "taming-school", Petruchio doesn't change his strategy to break her will, he simply adds material deprivation as an added incentive for her to change. Maintaining superior linguistic power over her remains his desire, and enforcing the meaning of his own words remains his principal means. Newman explains:

Kate is figuratively killed with kin-dness, by her husband's rule over her not so much in material terms—the withholding of food, clothing and sleep—but the withholding of linguistic understanding. As the receiver of her messages, he simply refuses their meaning; since he also has the material power to enforce his interpretations, it is his power over language that wins. (95)

Petruchio doesn't simply withhold food to foreground Katherina's comparative physical weakness, or even simply to show her material dependence on him, but also to teach her that the only permissible use of her tongue is to sing his praises and express her gratitude. He announces:

this kindness merits thanks.

What, not a word? Nay, then, thou lov'st it not,

And all my pains is sorted to no proof.

Here, take away this dish. (4.3.41-2, 44)

Feminine speech is permitted only in the service of masculine ends, such as confirming the notion that a woman is weak and would starve to death without a man to provide for her—an idea which Katherina comes to voice in her final speech. Criticism, or even passive resistance through silence, is outlawed in Petruchio's regime. Katherina's freedom of speech must be forfeited and then transformed to serve his purposes alone.

Petruchio also enforces his linguistic superiority in his interaction with his servants and the tailor who become casualties of a domestic war. His attack on the tailor is intended to show Katherina that he "rails, and swears, and rates" (4.1.171) better than even she does:

O monstrous arrogance! Thou liest, thou thread, thou thimble,

Thou yard, three-quarters, half-yard, quarter, nail,

Thou flea, thou nit, thou winter-cricket thou!

Brav'd in mine own house with a skein of thread?

Away, thou rag, thou quantity, thou remnant,

Or I shall so bemetee thee with thy yard

As thou shalt think on prating whilst thou liv'st. (4.3.107-114; emphasis mine)

While not aimed at Katherina, this ploy is more effective than any threat Petruchio could have made directly to her. He can be excessively violent towards the tailor and still remain free from any reproach, from the audience's perspective, since he doesn't actually attack his wife. Although he speaks to the tailor, it is Katherina who is the real target and whom he "kills ... in her own humour" (4.1.167). When he tells the tailor that he will not be crossed in his own house, Katherina knows that his words are intended for her as well. In fact, Petruchio later makes explicit the reason for his rages: "Look what I speak, or do,

or think to do, / You are still crossing it" (4.3.189-90). His goal is to make Katherina realize that woman's speech must never contradict the established, and in his view inherently true, male discourse. Her plea for free speech, however moving or elegant, is useless:

Why, sir, I trust I may have leave to speak,
 And speak I will. I am no child, no babe.
 Your betters have endur'd me say my mind,
 And if you cannot, best you stop your ears.
 My tongue will tell the anger of my heart,
 Or else my heart concealing it will break,
 And rather than it shall, I will be free

Even to the uttermost, as I please, in words. (4.3.73-80)

The point of his taming school is not only to make her no longer believe these words but to force from her the very will to utter them. In the end he is successful in doing so, this speech being her last real protest before he succeeds in curbing her tongue.

In addition to Petruchio's numerous direct references to Katherina's speech, the play also situates Katherina's flaw in her mouth through its many images of animals that can have their mouth bridled. The play contains frequent references to horses; first the description of Petruchio's horse before the wedding, and then Katherina's horse on the journey home. Among its many diseases, Petruchio's horse is "troubled with the lampass," a swelling within the mouth, and wears a "half-cheeked bit and a headstall of sheep's leather, which being restrained to keep him from stumbling, hath been often burst" (3.2.49, 54-57). This description serves to make the audience aware of Petruchio's

strength and lack of compassion in wielding a bridle. Petruchio's horse is supposed to set an example for Katherina, and to act as a warning of how one with either a perceived or real "disease of the mouth" can easily be bridled again and again, no matter how often the bridle may break. It is possible to imagine Katherina battered down to a weak condition similar to the horse's if she does not restrain her tongue and submit herself to Petruchio's will. Added to the implied comparison between Katherina and itself, the horse also serves, by its ragged and inappropriate appearance at the wedding ceremony, to shame Katherina and to prove that no matter how outrageously Petruchio may act, nobody will challenge his actions in her defense. As a man and the head of a household, Petruchio is immune to the judgment of others; Katherina, however, is not. His outrageous behavior and late arrival on a sickly horse are "[n]o shame but [hers]" (3.2.8), and this "threat of being made spectacle is an important aspect of shrew-taming" (Newman 92).

Among the possessions to which Petruchio compares Katherina after the wedding are his "horse", "ox", and "ass" (3.2.230), three animals which he can bridle and master. On the journey back to Petruchio's house, Katherina's horse stumbles, and again Katherina and a horse's bridle are mentioned in the same phrase. Grumio describes:

how [Katherina's] horse fell, and she under her horse ... how she was bemoiled, how he left her with the horse upon her, how he beat me because her horse stumbled, how she waded through the dirt to pluck him off me, how he swore, how she prayed that never prayed before, how I cried, how the horses ran away, how her bridal was burst (4.1.65-72)

Not only is Katherina demeaned in the image which leaves her trapped under a horse in a mire, but she is also compared to the horse in a description that is ambiguous as to

whether the burst "bridal" is the horse's or Katherina's. With a pun on bridal/bridle, Grumio's account of events can refer to her ruined bridal feast from which she is stolen by Petruchio's early departure as well as the metaphorical bridle which Petruchio is attempting to place on her by curbing her free speech and will. It is especially ironic that it is Grumio who gives this account since it is also he who, when initially describing Katherina to Petruchio, is the first character to make the comparison between women and horses. He says that Petruchio would be better to marry "an old trot with ne'er a tooth in her head, though she have as many diseases as two and fifty horses" than to marry Katherina (1.2.78-80). Nevo notices Petruchio's association of Katherina with horses when, at their first meeting, Katherina "finds herself judiciously examined for faults much as if she were a thoroughbred mare at a fair" (45). Petruchio judges the quality of Katherina's physical form, appearance and movement:

Kate like the hazel-twig

Is straight and slender, and as brown in hue

As hazel-nuts and sweeter than the kernels.

O, let me see thee walk. Thou does not halt. (2.1.247-50)

His assessment of her resembles that of someone who is purchasing an animal and must decide whether or not it is a worthy investment. While pretending to flatter her, he is really characterizing her as an animal that is bought and sold, and thus he is also reinforcing the idea that she is commodity in a marriage market dominated by male notions of gift exchange. In addition to these various direct comparisons between women and horses, the play is pervaded by "low culture" references to horses in puns on the words "reign" and "rein", "mount", "ride", and "bridal" (Boose 199). Associations

between Katherina and other animals are also pervasive, particularly the falcon which must be trained by Petruchio to "know her keeper's call" (4.1.181).

When he boasts of having "politicly begun [his] reign"/rein over his falcon (4.1.175), Petruchio expresses his desire to dominate Katherina both in public as well as within his private household since "politicly" not only evokes the idea "through policy" but also "in the political" or public scene. Petruchio's wish to dominate Katherina's speech in public as well as in private means that he is obligated either to force Katherina from the public stage and eliminate altogether the threat that she use any linguistic power, or to control her public actions by controlling her speech. He cannot allow her to dominate a public scene because if she does Petruchio's own presence is diminished and his masculinity itself then becomes highly questionable. Thus, a significant part of the struggle between Katherina and Petruchio is for domination in public. Having already convinced her to call the sun the moon, on the road back to Padua Petruchio stages the first public test of his dominance of her speech, that is, the first test in the presence of someone other than Petruchio's close friend Hortensio and the servants who form part of Petruchio's private household. She must describe the old man Vincentio as a "[y]oung budding virgin" (4.5.36). She must demean herself in front of a stranger by using her speech to confirm Petruchio's absolute power, and then she must beg pardon for her "mad mistaking" (4.5.48) as if the error were her fault alone and not Petruchio's doing. Soon after, he again makes her submit to his will in public by giving her the ultimatum of either kissing him against her will, or leaving Padua before she sees her family and being forced to return to the isolation of his country house. She is ashamed to kiss him in the street, and sees it as making a public spectacle of herself, but has no choice if she wants

to escape temporarily the almost prison-like confinement of his taming school.

Katherina's last speech particularly demonstrates Petruchio's need for control over his wife in the public eye, and by the end of the play he has this control since Katherina has been so worn down that she no longer has the strength or will to resist his usurpation of the power of her speech. She has little choice but to forfeit her linguistic power, that is, the power to question and criticize the patriarchal social order, to that same patriarchal order that her words here reinforce. Since Katherina's threat to the male social order is posed through her public speech, her submission to that patriarchal order is only complete when it is made public before the whole bridal party which is regrouped for Bianca's feast. Katherina's speech, the longest in the play, makes her a spectacle for male eyes and the object of attention in a dramatized version of her own feast. Being the center of attention for one day in her life at her own feast is an honour which she was previously denied because Petruchio knew at the time that she was not tame enough to occupy the public scene in a properly submissive capacity. As Boose explains:

it is Kate who displaces Bianca as the virtuous and honored bride. This displacement converts what was billed as Bianca's bridal feast into the missing communal celebration to honor the earlier marriage that Kate's staged submission here recuperates into communal norms. Neither the feast nor the postponed consummation may take place in this play until the hierarchical features of the marriage rite have thus been restoratively enacted. ("Scolding Brides" 182)

At the first feast, Katherina, still largely in control of her tongue, would have been the dominating subject, but in the final speech she has become the passive object carrying

out her master's wishes. She comes when he calls, and she follows his instructions to teach the widow her duty as wife. By carrying out his commands when the other wives refuse, Katherina confirms Petruchio's role as the dominant subject of the feast since he is the only husband with an obedient wife. Katherina's tongue is no longer unruly by criticizing patriarchy but instead serves patriarchy by validating its self-proclaimed authority. Katherina's final speech acts, therefore, as comic closure for the play's Elizabethan audience because it restores social order to its "proper" gender hierarchy in which the woman is inferior to and dependent on her husband, and because it provides the added humour of seeing the wild falcon finally swallow her pride and "stoop ... [to] her lure" (4.1.178-9).

Katherina's final speech is highly problematic for a contemporary audience because of its demeaning demand for the subjugation of women in marriage. Its interpellating discourse addresses itself directly to all women in the audience and creates such an uncomfortable feeling that one is often tempted to excuse or rationalize that sentiment through the popular argument that the speech should be delivered ironically and is really a satirical criticism of patriarchy. This is a revisionist reading of the play. Anti-revisionists, however, believe that the reader/audience must confront the play as it is written, even if certain of its misogynist aspects make us uncomfortable. Shirley Nelson Garner, for example, argues for an examination of why we still accept certain out-dated attitudes in Shakespeare's work that we would reject easily in the work of another author:

Interpretations of the play that stress its farcical elements or view the ending as ironic are often efforts, I think, to keep the play among the "good," to separate Shakespeare from its misogynist attitudes, to keep him

as nearly unblemished as possible. These efforts to preserve *Taming* suggest that in our time it has become one of the problematic plays in Shakespeare's canon. They demonstrate how relative to time and place are the ideas of "good" and "bad". (106)

This tendency to ignore questionable attitudes is really a disguised attempt, conscious or unconscious, to keep the play in the canon, a canon which itself can be denounced as a white, imperialist, masculine construct.

Boose, on the other hand, theorizes that readers are tempted towards a satirical reading because "[u]ltimately, what is under covert recuperation and imagined as tacitly at stake is the institution of heterosexual marriage", and, by encouraging a notion of a mutual love not necessarily present in the text, critics eliminate this threat to the institution of marriage (181). She encourages us, therefore, to avoid a revisionist reading, and to choose rather to situate Katherina's final speech in its historical context in order to receive it, as much as possible, as would an Elizabethan audience. Katherina's speech, neither excessive nor ironic, is a mock reconstruction of traditional Elizabethan wedding vows and echoes early modern values, argues Boose. When Katherina concludes, "place your hands below your husband's foot. / In token of which duty, if he please, / My hand is ready, may it do him ease" (5.2.178-80), her gesture is not a farcical element designed to make his demand for submission seem ridiculous. She leads the other women by example with the gesture that was traditionally expected of her despite legally being a historical anachronism in Shakespeare's time:

For what transpires onstage turns out to be a virtual representation of the ceremony that women were required to perform in most pre-Reformation

marriage services throughout Europe. In England this performance was in force as early as the mid-fifteenth century and perhaps earlier; and it may well have continued in local practice even after Archbishop Cranmer had reformed the Book of Common Prayer in 1549 and excised just such ritual excess. Kate's prostration before her husband and the placing of her hand beneath his foot follow the ceremonial directions ... for the response the bride was to produce when she received the wedding ring and her husband's all-important vow of endowment. (Boose, "Scolding" 182)

This ceremony was maintained even into the eighteenth-century by French women who customarily pretended to drop the ring as an excuse to stoop before their husband's feet; therefore, it is quite reasonable to assume that the practice would not have automatically ceased in the forty years between its official removal from the English marriage ceremony and Shakespeare's play (Boose 183). It certainly would have been a practice relatively well known to the members of a sixteenth-century audience, and most likely not perceived as irregular or offensive, and thus written seriously rather than as farce.

If Katherina's speech and prostration are approached, then, as gestures made in all seriousness, it is clear that Katherina is submitting herself to Petruchio's rule. Boose compares Katherina's speech to Richard II's "Mark, how I will undo myself" because of its "self-abnegating rhetoric" (179). Katherina's speech must necessarily be honest in the context of this play because only her sincere and voluntary submission can authenticate Petruchio's role as master and confirm the restoration of social order needed to resolve the play's comic structure. Petruchio would be aware of the falseness of an ironic submission, in which case he would not feel his authority affirmed, and social order,

represented by patriarchal rule, would not be restored.

The speech emphasizes that women must submit their freedom of expression to their husband's rule, confirming that Katherina's fault was situated in her tongue, for according to the masculine discourse that Katherina reproduces here, "A woman mov'd is like a fountain troubled, / Muddy, ill-seeming, thick, bereft of beauty" (5.2.143-4). A woman, like Katherina, who voices the anger in her heart is considered unseemly, whereas a woman, like Bianca at the beginning, who is silent is considered beautiful. The dominant masculine discourse that Katherina voices here equates virtue and beauty in women with silence, and for this reason Katherina is considered the perfect bride, and her submission provides comic closure to the play, when she no longer uses her tongue to voice her own thoughts but those of her husband.

In addition to Petruchio's need to control publicly Katherina's speech so that it serves the dominant masculine discourse rather than her own, several other elements in the play also lead the reader/audience to consider Katherina's final speech in an anti-revisionist light. Among these elements are the Renaissance perception of rhetoric, the politics of domestic violence in early modern England, and changing economic conditions and values.

2) Rhetoric and rape

Renaissance theories of rhetoric are closely linked to the values concerning feminine speech already examined in this chapter. The art of rhetoric was perceived as a strictly masculine domain, and its use was associated with masculine ideals of domination and power. Wayne A. Rebhorn's analysis of five possible meanings of Grumio's ambiguous word "rope-tricks" (1.2.111) illustrates the relationship between

rhetoric and masculine power. It can signify, most obviously, "rhetricks", the emendation used by most editors because of Petruchio's railing and the subsequent reference to "figure". A second sense is that Grumio is mockingly associating Petruchio with the lower classes because he employs "tricks worthy of hanging", and this reading is compared to Vincentio's similar denunciation of Biondello as a "crack-hemp" (5.1.40). Alternately, "in keeping with Petruchio's bawdiness, 'rope-tricks' has been read as a bawdy allusion where 'rope' betokens 'penis,' as in *The Comedy of Errors* (4.1.2 [sic]; 4.4.46)" (294). A fourth possible meaning is a pun on "rape tricks". Finally, "rope tricks" has "also been read as a play on 'roperipe', a pejorative adjective for the use of extravagant language and inkhorn terms rather than plain speech" (295). In any case, Rebhorn concludes that all these possible meanings "point to a conception which makes rhetoric a matter of power, control, and coercion, turning the rhetor into a decidedly masculine figure who is represented as a ruler, a civilizer, and also, more disturbingly, a rapist" (295).

Rebhorn's description of the Renaissance rhetor fits very well Shakespeare's portrait of Petruchio as a man who sees himself as a ruler and civilizer of Katherina and who twice alludes to rape. Rebhorn adds that "writers on the art celebrated the rhetor as a figure of power whose skill with words enabled him to control, shape, and transform the beliefs and behavior of those around him" (298), and if "the orator moves his audience, he does so for the sake of power, at least according to Renaissance writers" (299). Petruchio subjugates Katherina's speech to his own will, and he transforms her beliefs on women's independence through a show of force of his own speech in order to dominate her. Rhetoric was perceived as the act of a necessarily masculine figure imposing his

will on a weaker figure; the orator "impresses or imprints himself on those who listen to him" like a seal upon soft wax, and this image "stresses the utter passivity and helplessness of the auditor" (303). Ideally, this impression of the rhetor's will is so forceful as to constitute penetration of the auditor's soul; as Rebhorn explains, the orator has the "ability to penetrate the listener in order to possess him or her fully" (304). This description of rhetoric fits Petruchio's philosophy who himself praises "eloquence" as "piercing" (2.1.176), indicating that he conceives of it as a weapon with which to stab a listener. Rhetoric is a battle of wills, and Petruchio is "arm'd to the proof" (2.1.139-40) to impose his will on Katherina's.

Rhetoric also directly involves "rope tricks" in the sense that it was believed to involve the "idea of tying or binding" because of its power to "allure" minds (302). Rebhorn explains that in Latin the "verb *allicio* comes from *lacio*, which also means 'to allure,' but a clearer sense of its significance can be grasped from its nominal *laqueus* which means 'snare' or 'noose'" (303). Thus, for Roman and subsequently Renaissance rhetoricians, "the orator control[s] the auditor by ensnaring him or her with a rope of words" (303). Grumio's "rope tricks" suggests, then, that Petruchio will ensnare Katherina, and implicit in this act is the use of aggression and force.

The early modern conception of rhetoric included the belief that it was an art that men practiced not only for special allocutions but in everyday life as well, as when Tranio suggests to Lucentio to "practice rhetoric in [his] common talk" (1.1.35). Petruchio makes use of his skills as a rhetor throughout *The Taming of the Shrew*, and especially when he sets out to woo Katherina and then to tame her. In the first instance, before he even meets Katherina, he expresses the belief that his rhetoric will be powerful

enough to woo her: "For I will board her though she chide as loud / As thunder when the clouds in autumn crack" (1.2.94-5). Petruchio's conviction that he will "board" Katherina illustrates that he thinks he possesses all the typical qualities of the Renaissance rhetor. Firstly, he will board her in the sense that he will address her with his rhetoric and woo her, that is move her emotions. Secondly, the word "board" implies that he may also accost or assail her, in the sense of sexual assault and possibly battery, and thus demonstrate his power over her. He conceives of his speech as louder and more powerful than thunder, and he later makes a similar claim to Baptista when he compares the strength of his words to a hurricane: "Though little fire grows great with little wind, / Yet extreme gusts will blow out fire and all" (2.1.134-5). Petruchio equates himself with natural forces capable of destroying whatever is in their path.

As a rhetor, Petruchio is apt with metaphors and figures, and in addition to comparing himself to forces of destruction, he compares himself to other images of power as well, such as a warrior, explorer, adventurer, hero and soldier:

Have I not in my time heard lions roar?

Have I not heard the sea, puff'd up with winds,

Rage like an angry boar chafed with sweat?

Have I not heard great ordnance in the field,

And heaven's artillery thunder in the skies?

Have I not in a pitched battle heard

Loud 'larums, neighing steeds, and trumpets' clang? (1.2.199-205)

Portraying himself as a hero strong enough to tame lions, the sea, the wind, boars, and opposing soldiers is part of Petruchio's self-image as a rhetor, and from his perspective

his warrior-like power over all obstacles is proof of his ability to tame the tongue and will of an unruly woman just as effortlessly. Since, according to Rebhorn, "Renaissance treatises see the orator as leading or dragging, ruling or dominating, even tyrannizing those who listen to him" (301), it is normal here for Petruchio to construct an image of himself that matches that of a hero or ruler. For him, Katherina is a subject onto whom he will, with the strength of his words, enforce his own will like a conqueror.

The animal imagery so prevalent throughout the text plays an important part in the conception of Petruchio as rhetor and of Katherina as his subject. Rebhorn explains that often in Renaissance treatises, "the orator is presented as a civilizer, someone who uses his verbal artistry to control or tame unruly listeners necessarily presented as savages or animals" (312). In order for the audience of *Shrew* to accept that Petruchio is justified in taming Katherina, she must necessarily be presented as savage, uncivilized, and even demonic. In addition to horses and falcons, she is often associated with the devil as well (1.1.66, 2.1.26). Petruchio's speech, then, in which he brags of his exploits in conquering nature and its elements, foreshadows how he will also tame the unruly, supernatural elements of Katherina using both the force of his words as rhetor and his physical superiority as warrior. Petruchio's wooing and taming of Katherina can, of course, be "seen as a self-serving rationalization which mystifies the orator's verbal violence and savagery, his metaphorical rape of others, by disguising it under a supposedly humanizing sweetness" (312). The perception that Katherina needs taming at all is the result of a decidedly masculine discourse concerning women's speech, and the audience/reader is never given more than a surface look into her thoughts and the reasons that motivate her behavior. In fact, Rebhorn argues, the "play is filled with characters

[similar to Petruchio] who justify their social, economic, and political domination of others by identifying those others as animals ready for taming" (312), and the prevalence of this attitude of superiority serves to justify by association Petruchio's role as civilizer of Katherina. The Lord's description of Sly as a "monstrous beast" and "swine" (Induction.1.32) coupled with Hortensio's description of Bianca as a "proud disdainful haggard" (4.2.39) both serve to diminish the severity of the construction of Katherina as an animal that one must "break ... to the lute" (2.1.147) and a "haggard" who must be trained to "come and know her keeper's call" (4.2.180-1). The association of Katherina and others with "savage" animals has the sole purpose of justifying the role of Petruchio and the other men as supposed "civilizers" and thus excusing their behavior.

Thus, having constructed a self-image as conqueror and tamer of savages, Petruchio sets out to woo Katherina believing that his words will overpower hers. Despite his bravado, he is perhaps less prepared for the ensuing battle of wits than he would like to admit. Katherina's wit destabilizes Petruchio's self-image as conqueror, and he is forced to insist upon his sexuality by means of bawdy puns in order to highlight his masculinity and implied superiority. Katherina's resistance is accomplished by insisting just the opposite, that he is a "jade" (2.1.201), a "craven" (2.1.225), and a fool (2.1.212, 223). Eventually, therefore, Petruchio is forced to abandon this tactic, "setting all this chat aside" (2.1.261), and temporarily to reject rhetoric in favour of the simple brute power inherent in masculinity: "And will! you, nill you, I will marry you" (2.1.264). Yet, even though he claims to speak in "plain terms" (2.1.262), Petruchio still employs rhetoric, using the false words "your dowry 'greed on" (2.1.263) to move Katherina to feel no choice but to submit to his will.

Although it is not ultimately the means by which he forces Katherina to accept his marriage proposal, Petruchio's use of bawdy puns in the wooing scene is still an effective tactic in his taming process. His bawdiness raises disturbing questions concerning power and sexuality because it "is marked throughout the play by a strong element of phallic aggression which presents masculine sexuality as a form of attack and domination" (305) which Katherina does not fail to remark. In addition to Petruchio's own use of bawdiness to assert his power, Rebhorn points out that:

the play contains a tissue of allusions to various sorts of rapes and analogous notions of (usually) male domination, ranging from the offer to show Christopher Sly erotic pictures of Adonis, Io, and Daphne (induction, 2.47 ff.), through Lucentio's reference to the rape of Europa (1.1.164-67), down to Petruchio's praise for Kate as 'a second Grissel / And Roman Lucrece' (2.1.295-96). (306)

Added to these allusions is also the suggestion that Grumio's "rope-tricks" signifies "rape tricks". Together, all these references to rape lead the reader or the audience to conclude that, like bridling, sexual violation is always present in the margins of the play as a punishment for women who fail to acknowledge men's superior physical, sexual, and linguistic power. It is not unreasonable to assume that a barely veiled threat or allusion to Petruchio's power and right to rape her also hides itself among the remarks made during his "sermon of [her] continency" (4.1.170). Even if the point of this offstage, and unwitnessed, sermon is more likely to let the audience believe that he doesn't actually touch her at all, it still evokes the possibility that he can, and, as her husband, even has the right to rape her if he so desires.

Using numerous examples from Renaissance treatises, Rebhorn convincingly argues that rape was implicit in the early modern conception of rhetoric because it penetrated to the core of the auditor and the orator imposed his own will on this person. He explains that "what was crucial in legal definitions of rape in Renaissance England was not the fact of sexual violation so much as the taking or possessing of someone against her will", and at the time "conception proved consent" (306) since it was commonly believed that a woman could not conceive against her will. Rebhorn concludes that this "dictum clearly gives priority to the issue of will and makes bodily penetration secondary. Petruchio's treatment of Katherine amounts to co-opting her will. ... it makes Petruchio's intended 'persuasion' the functional equivalent of a sexual assault" (307). He further supports this argument with the etymology of the key notion of ravishment since it was also believed that rhetoric should "ravish and transport" the listener: "Both English *ravish* and French *ravir* derive from Latin *rapere*, which means to seize or snatch or possess as well as to rape, and is the source of English *rape*. *Rapere* is, of course, used in Latin treatises on rhetoric ..." (308). Thus, for Rebhorn and

for virtually every Renaissance writer on the subject ... rhetoric resembles rape insofar as it clearly involves the orator's assertion of his own will in co-opting the less powerful wills of those he addresses in a verbal act of violence identified as the binding, seizing, and possessing of their spirits.

(309)

Therefore, even though Petruchio does not consummate his marriage with Katherine until the very end of the play, and he even "actually uses sexual deprivation as one of the methods for controlling her", "the absence of the sexual act is more than compensated for

by the bawdiness and aggression which characterize Petruchio's language and behavior" (306). The physical threat of rape, as well as its more metaphorical form through rhetoric, are a constant presence for Katherina and play an important part in Petruchio's taming of her.

To enhance the perception of the Renaissance rhetor as conqueror, he was not only seen as a rapist or sexual conqueror but as a physical conqueror as well. Rebhorn explains that "Renaissance writers celebrate the rhetor as the so-called Hercules Gallicus ..., [who] was depicted in Marseilles as the god of eloquence, leading his followers by means of chains of gold and amber that connected his tongue to their ears" (310). The Renaissance rhetor was seen as a warrior who could conquer the mind, will, and body of his subjects, and in *Shrew* Petruchio is directly associated with the ideal rhetor-conqueror. While trying to dissuade him from courting Katherina, Grumio tells Petruchio, "Yea, leave that labour to great Hercules" (1.2.254-5). Like Hercules who succeeds where others fail, "Petruchio proves his manliness by embracing what other men fear (marrying a shrew) but also by working alone. In many of the shrew-taming ballads and plays, men use the assistance of friends to help bring about the rebellious woman's subordination" (Detmer 281). Petruchio sees himself as Hercules, able to conquer she whom other men have failed to subdue, and so great as to do so alone, without significant aid from Hortensio or others. Since he eventually does succeed in courting and taming Katherina, by the end of the play Petruchio sees himself, and is perceived by the other men, as greater than even Hercules. Petruchio has replaced Hercules as the ideal rhetor, conqueror, and tamer; one can almost visualize the gold chains by which he leads Katherina to kneel before him and place her hand at his foot.

Petruchio, then, exhibits a desire to control Katherina linguistically, sexually, and physically, and shows that he has power to do so. Within the Renaissance discourse of rhetoric, he sees himself as a conqueror, civilizer and ruler, and sees Katherina as a subject over whom he will "politically [begin his] reign" (4.1.175). Given the political context that was to emerge shortly in early modern Europe, Rebhorn suggests:

Petruchio can be seen as intending to act out—indeed, to carry to its logical conclusion—the fantasy of control at the heart of absolutism, not just in his taming and ruling over Katherina generally, but in the principal sign he demands of her, a sign which is calculated to confirm his status as monarch and her own as obedient subject. (302)

Katherina submits to his will and gives this status-confirming sign on the road back to Padua when she agrees with his statement that the sun is in fact the moon. She confirms his status as a ruler who has the power to make any declaration he desires without opposition. As a ruler who can name objects, Petruchio is receiving from Katherina the confirmation that he even has the power to determine the nature of her reality:

As he proclaims the right to call the sun the moon or a man a woman, Petruchio arrogates to himself both the power of Adam, who first gave names to all things and served frequently in the Renaissance as the model for patriarchal rule, and the power of God, the creator and patriarch of all patriarchs. Petruchio's proclamation amounts to an assertion that he can—and will—create the world through his words; he indulges a fantasy of ultimate power that Katherina confirms as she tells him: 'What you will have it named, even that it is' (4.5.21). (Rebhorn 302)

Attempting to assume the power of Adam or God illustrates Petruchio's desire to be an absolute ruler. Not only does Petruchio desire to be an absolute ruler, he truly does become one, fulfilling thus his ultimate goal of acquiring "quiet life, / And awful rule, and right supremacy" (5.2.109-10). Through his use of rhetoric, by which he proves that Katherina is defenseless against his wooing and taming, he effectively establishes himself as ruler of both her person and her speech.

The Renaissance conception of rhetoric forces the audience, therefore, to receive Katherina's final speech from an anti-revisionist perspective. When Petruchio commands the other husbands to "bring [their] froward wives / As prisoners to her womanly persuasion" (5.2.120-1), he is disguising the fact that he controls Katherina's speech and that her words are his rather than her own. By characterizing Katherina's discourse as "womanly", he is camouflaging the fact that it is really nothing more than a reiteration of his own masculine discourse. A woman's discourse would not have the authority to hold another "prisoner", not even another woman, as Katherina illustrates early in the play when she is forced to snare her sister with a real rope because her words alone are not powerful enough to perform "rope tricks". It is only Petruchio's masculine rhetoric that has this power, and, in the case of Katherina's final speech, it is really Petruchio's rhetoric which is used to hold prisoner the women while they listen in silent captivity and without interruption to the masculine discourse for which Katherina's tongue is merely the vehicle of delivery.

3) Domestic violence

Of course, Petruchio's taming of Katherina is not due solely to his use of rhetoric; however, his self-image as rhetor-ruler who imposes his will with "rope tricks", that is,

tricks of force, foregrounds the more important means by which he tames her, that is, with violence. As Rebhorn concludes, "the male rhetor Petruchio will always triumph not because he is a rhetor, but because he is male and can resort to traditional social and legal prerogatives to gain his end" (318). Among these social and legal prerogatives are violence and the right to impose his will and to discipline his household with force if necessary, or even if desired. Petruchio is a violent man, and there can be no doubt that the frequent displays of his inherently violent nature play a role in Katherina's eventual submission to him. He may not physically hit her; however, he makes it very clear that he can and will if she does not acknowledge him as her "lord, [her] king, [her] governor" (5.2.139).

The fact that Petruchio often threatens Katherina with violence but never actually hits her illustrates how the play reflects a change that was taking place in early modern England's moral code concerning what today would be termed domestic violence. Katherina herself presents the emerging discourse of how men should treat their wife when she provokes Petruchio during their first encounter to test whether or not he would respond with violence. She flatly tells him, "If you strike me, you are no gentleman" (2.1.220), and as such summarizes the new theory towards domestic relations that was emerging in England. Appropriately, Petruchio replies with words rather than blows and thus begins his reign "politicly" (4.1.175). In accordance with the Renaissance conception of rhetoric, those who sought to reform the current methods of household discipline encouraged husbands to maintain order by means of words or policy rather than violence; however, as Frances Dolan remarks, "policy was preferable to violence, not because it was humane but because it was more effective" (15). By attempting to

allure the will rather than beat the body of their wives, men were in a position to encounter less resistance to their wishes. A physical beating leaves a mark that acts as a reminder of wrongs enacted against the wife and provokes her to rebel and seek redemption for those wrongs. Coercing the will is a more subversive approach to imposing a wife's subordination since it leaves no physical reminder and thus gives her less reason to resist or rebel. As an added bonus for those men seeking to reform household disciplinary practices, by choosing to define violence solely in terms of physical injury, domination and the subordination of women are legitimized, and the violence inherent in such domination is obscured and trivialized.

Focusing exclusively on Petruchio's taming methods rather than Katherina's experiences as shrew, the objective of *The Taming of the Shrew* is to demonstrate an effective means of enforcing discipline in a household without crossing the line that separated the "permissible" discipline that was a superior's responsibility from the excessive violence of a domestic tyrant. The play can literally be read as an instruction manual for husbands designed to teach them a new method for "ingeniously complying with early modern wife-beating reforms" (Detmer 274) without losing any of their authority as ruler of the household. Detmer explains:

Petruchio's taming "policy" dramatizes how abstention from physical violence works better—for men. The play encourages its audience not only to pay close attention to Petruchio's method but also to judge and enjoy the method's permissibility because of the absence of blows and the harmonious outcome. (279)

Since, from the perspective of an early modern, male audience more sympathetic to

Petruchio rather than Katherina, at the end of the play there is no "real" physical harm done and the "problem" of the shrew has been resolved, Petruchio's method is seen as effective and praise-worthy. The banquet itself can be read as a celebration of Petruchio's success as tamer more than in honor of Lucentio and Bianca's marriage. Petruchio is at the forefront of the scene, despite attention being momentarily diverted to Katherina during her speech, and since the play does not end with her speech but with Petruchio's victory over the other men in the contest, it could be said that the ending is constructed to serve as a lesson: to the "winner" (5.2.188), that is, to the man who tames efficiently by policy, goes the spoils.

It is somewhat surprising that a society that sanctions the use of such torturous instruments as the scold's bridle would be concerned with limiting the use of violence against women in the home; however, this paradox can be attributed to the distinction between public shaming rituals organized and carried out under the watchful eye of an entire community and private violence enacted by only one man within the confines of his home. Detmer remarks that the "same culture that still 'felt good' about dunking scolds, whipping whores, or burning witches was, during this period, becoming increasingly sensitive about husbands beating their wives" (273), but, as Dolan has pointed out, this uneasiness towards wife-beating was not due to a guilty conscience or out of concern for the well-being of wives, so these potential reasons for changing practices were never mentioned. Detmer highlights the fact that "[w]hether they focus on lawfulness, efficacy, or civility, reformers are careful to construct their arguments against wife-beating without questioning the wife's subordinate position" (278). The real reason for changing the methods of enforcing household discipline, she explains, was to

"enhanc[e] men's ability to subordinate", and, in order to encourage the change to more effective methods of subjugation, reformers constructed their argument so that it became a question of the husband's reputation:

"An Homily [of the State of Matrimony]" argues that only the "common sort" use "fist and staff" to rule a wife. Thus a notion of civility recasts physical violence as weak and, at the same time, brutal. Husbands who rely on physical strength rather than reason come to be regarded as less manly and less human. (278)

Katherina's assertion that Petruchio is not a gentleman if he hits her is a direct reference to the new philosophy concerning domestic discipline, and it acts as a reminder not only to Petruchio but to the audience as well. Petruchio's self-restraint confirms that he is indeed a gentleman, and thus an appropriate suitor for the "young and beauteous ... gentlewoman" Katherina (1.2.85-6). His manner also "establishes his 'public covenant with patriarchy'" (280) since he respects the rules laid out by patriarchal reformers. Because Petruchio's status as a gentleman is determined by his response to Katherina, Detmer states: "Boose argues that class issues are displaced onto gender issues, but in the context of wife-beating reform, class and gender issues are interdependent" (280). Petruchio cannot call himself a gentleman unless he respects, to some degree at least, Katherina as a member of the "weaker sex" to which he must do no harm, and, conversely, Katherina cannot be guaranteed a life of protection free from physical harm unless she marries a gentleman who will respect those rules.

Being a model for other men to emulate, Petruchio's reaction to Katherina's test deserves a close examination, for even though he does not hit her, he still responds with

violence. His first response is to threaten physical violence, "I swear I'll cuff you, if you strike again" (2.1.218), and this threat in itself could be considered a form of violence. Secondly, according to Detmer, "he uses an alternative means of force: he physically holds her for the next twenty-seven lines. Kate is momentarily held prisoner" (282) until she pleads, "Let me go" (2.1.235). Like the rhetor's rope tricks, "*Taming* by policy often relies on bondage and threats ... [and] the wife-beating reformer's emphasis on 'blows' makes other coercive and threatening behavior appear to be outside the model for what counts as domestic violence" (282). Like early modern rhetoric, contemporary "domestic violence is any act of coercion that aims to nullify a person's will or desire in order for the abuser to gain dominance" (283). Petruchio's actions of taming Katherina clearly fit this definition, and from their very first encounter he engages in violent behavior against her.

It is evident that the concept of domestic violence did not exist in early modern England and did not have the same cultural meaning in that society as it does now; however, since the model for domestic violence now being deconstructed by many contemporary feminists was put in place by early modern reformers who qualified "any action except beating [as] permissible, even praiseworthy" (282), Detmer suggests that it is useful to employ "a 'strategically anachronistic' practice of reading" (283) to this concept. By applying theories about violence formulated in contemporary situations, it is possible to develop an alternative reading of *Shrew* that gives new insight into Katherina's experiences as taming victim, especially since her feelings are not directly developed in the text. An informed reading between the lines reveals that Katherina's reactions to her taming are similar to those experienced by hostages in a 1973 bank

robbery in which the hostages bonded with their captors. The phenomenon has been named the Stockholm syndrome, and Katherina exhibits very similar symptoms. Detmer explains the conditions necessary for the creation of a situation hospitable for the development of the Stockholm syndrome:

The Stockholm syndrome occurs when: 1) a person threatens another's survival and is perceived by the other as able and willing to carry out his/her threat; 2) the threatening person shows the other kindness; 3) the victim is unable to escape from the threatening person; and 4) the victim is isolated from outsiders. (284)

All of these conditions apply to Katherina's situation during the play, particularly at the taming school.

Petruchio threatens Katherina's survival, and she perceives him as willing and able to carry out his threat. In their first encounter, he threatens to cuff her, and he warns her that he will marry her even against her will which he does succeed in doing. Before the marriage ceremony, he leaves her standing at the altar long enough for her usually unsympathetic father to describe Petruchio's actions as "an injury" (3.2.28). During the ceremony, she witnesses him strike the priest and throw sops in the sexton's face (3.2.161, 171), and since nobody intervenes or protests against this highly inappropriate behavior she is left to conclude that he has the absolute power to do whatever he pleases. She sees the lamentable condition of his horse and can deduce his mistreatment of the animal. He kidnaps her from her family with his sword drawn (3.2.234). Without offering aid, he leaves her lying in the mud with a horse on top of her (4.1.67-8), and then swears at her enough to make her pray as she never had before (4.1.70-1). She witnesses

him beat Grumio (4.1.68), curse his servants unrelentingly (4.1.112-6), strike them repeatedly (4.1.135 SD, 142 SD), and throw food and dishes (4.1.152 SD). From Katherina's point of view, "there is no way to know how long this 'brawling' might last" (287). Petruchio denies Katherina food and sleep (4.1.184-5) for no apparent reason, and later tells her "[t]were deadly sickness or else present death" (4.3.14) if she eats or sleeps, a phrase which can be interpreted by her as a death threat. He allows his servants to taunt her (4.3.31-2), and makes her watch Hortensio eat when she herself is starving (4.3.50). He rails and rants at the haberdasher and the tailor, and then makes her present herself to her family as a disgrace in "mean habilements" (4.3.167). He rails at her, and threatens to keep her forever confined from her family (4.3.190-1). This series of violent, controlling behavior gives Katherina more than ample reason to believe truly that her survival is threatened. She has seen him act violently towards several other people, and has every reason to believe that he may carry out the threats he has made against her if she does not comply with his wishes.

Like the Stockholm captor, Petruchio shows Katherina some limited kindness, but it is always alternated with aggression, and the combination of the two conflicting gestures serves to confuse her perception of him as dominator. Petruchio even directly expresses that this is a key element of his strategy: "to kill a wife with kindness" (4.1.195). His tactic can signify not only being kind in comparison to beating or using her same kind of shrewishness against her, but also to kill while simultaneously being kind. Making her wait at the altar, for example, is an injury to her, so when he finally does appear, his arrival is perceived as an act of kindness because it saves her from overwhelming shame. In a certain sense, even "Petruchio's mock rescue combines

kindness with aggression and confuses Kate's sense of his domination" (286) in a manner similar to when he "rails and swears and rates" yet "does it under name of perfect love" (4.3.12). Each time that he offers her food or sleep or new clothing, the offer appears to be an act of kindness, but it quickly becomes an act of aggression and a way for him to deprive her again and thus assert his authority. The voyage to visit her family is an act of kindness, but he threatens to take it away in an act of aggression. Katherina is left bewildered, unable to determine if he is a protector or an aggressor. Detmer explains the motivation behind this type of conflicting behavior, and why it is an effective means for Petruchio to gain control over Katherina:

As researchers have found, in a situation that is totally violent, victims soon give up trying to please. When, however, abusers show kindness and concern for their victims, it creates an emotional bond: abusers 'ease the emotional distress they have created and ... set the stage for emotional dependency.' Alternating coercive threats and kindness sets up a situation where victims *actively* look for ways to please rather than upset their captors. (286-7)

Katherina soon learns that she must please Petruchio because she is dependent on him for material needs such as food, sleep, clothing, and shelter; therefore, she, "like other hostages, finds that the key to survival will be to 'actively develop strategies for staying alive.' In Kate's situation these strategies entail denying her sense of reality and speaking as if she sees the world through Petruchio's eyes" (284). When on the road back to Padua she replies, "Forward, I pray, since we have come so far, / And be it moon, or sun, or what you please. / / Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me" (4.5.12-5), she is weary,

frustrated, and has no choice but to give the only answer that she believes will allow her to survive, that is, to escape the taming school and return to the familiar comfort and relative security of her family.

Taking her away from her family is a key element in Petruchio's taming strategy since it heightens Katherina's feelings of helplessness, leaving her isolated from anyone who might intervene on her behalf or defend her interests. The kidnapping disguised as a rescue proves that she cannot escape from Petruchio's presence, even for a few minutes, now that she is just another of his chattels. She has no resources at her disposal in her new unfamiliar environment, and she is conscious that she is totally dependent on Petruchio. The servants, over whom she would normally have a position of authority coupled with a certain companionship as Petruchio's dual subordinates, all refuse to help her and participate actively in taming her with their taunts and then refusal of food. The father who should protect her has just given her against her will to a man she hates, and Baptista has made it clear that he is more concerned with getting rid of her than defending her. Because she is completely isolated in a hostile and strange environment, Katherina has no choice but to internalize her feelings and to bond with her captor if she wants to survive and escape the isolation of the country taming school. When, in her last verbal protest that contains a "substantial sense of self and autonomy" (288), she asserts, "I will be free / Even to the uttermost, as I please, in words" (4.3.79-80), Petruchio denies the meaning of her language. He pretends that Katherina is commenting on the inferior quality of the haberdasher's cap and agreeing with him that she shall not wear it. He completely ignores, and thus denies, her plea to speak her mind. She learns that to escape isolation she must follow his example and voluntarily deny, or at least claim to deny, the

reality of her language, as she does when she calls the sun the moon and Vincentio a young virgin. These episodes are not playful word games among lovers; they are a confirmation of Petruchio's supreme authority and of Katherina's defeat. These episodes prove that for Petruchio "the field is won" (4.5.23).

Since the play is a comic tale, supported by a romantic subplot, the bonding between Katherina and Petruchio that is typical of the Stockholm syndrome is frequently mistaken for love. It is not love; it is a false bonding created from Katherina's necessity to survive Petruchio's taming school. As Detmer describes it, the "heterosexual romance plot of the play encourages readers to see this [coercive] bonding as 'love' and to disregard the violence of taming" (289). The scene most frequently cited as an example of this blossoming love, when they kiss in the streets of Padua, is really simply another example of Petruchio's absolute rule over Katherina. He exercises his power by forcing her to choose between the lesser of two evils: kissing him in public against her will, or returning to the isolation of the taming school. A false, involuntary gesture of love does not, however, constitute real love, only the illusion of it. This illusion is sufficient for Petruchio since his concern is merely the appearance of having wooed Katherina for the benefit of the other men that he will encounter at the banquet. Once he has conquered her will, he doesn't need her love because he has the power to command the illusion of it, and all that matters for the others, such as Baptista, is the appearance of love, not its reality. Provided that the subjugation of Katherina is real, her love for him is not necessary. When she delivers her speech and then places her hand at his foot, it is not a gesture of love but rather a gesture of defeat, similar to waving a white flag before an invading army to avoid further bloodshed. Petruchio is this invading army. He sees himself as a soldier

at war against Katherina's loud alarms, and his victory is expressed in the military terms of winning the field. At the end of the play, then, Katherina is not expressing her love but her surrender.

4) Material dependence

Petruchio, therefore, tames Katherina by means which today would be considered domestic violence but which conform perfectly to the limits imposed by early modern wife-beating reforms. He does everything but strike her, and this minimum of restraint is enough not only for him to preserve his status as a gentlemen but for him to be praised as a man above all others, having succeeded in taming Katherina's will and her tongue where others like her father had failed. Succeeding in this first task of taming Kate also has the benefit of allowing Petruchio to succeed in his ultimate goal, attaining cates, since the first goal gains him a reward from Baptista with which he can acquire the second. Petruchio's reason for coming to Padua is to "wive it weathily" (1.2.74) or to acquire Kates/cates, the two acquisitions being interdependent. He is a member of "the new gentry, who continually sought to improve their estates through commerce, forays into business and overseas trades, or by contracting wealthy marriages" (Korda 120). As a gentleman with a significant inheritance from his father, Petruchio seeks to better his financial and social status by acquiring further wealth. Katherina's dowry is a source of great wealth, especially given Baptista's desire to be rid of her, and in Petruchio's eyes it is yet another way for him to better his father's fortunes. Petruchio sees the marriage as a small investment, Katherina's jointure, that will yield a much greater return, her dowry and half of Baptista's lands after his death. By displaying his past profits and acquiring Kate, he profits more and acquires cates.

Korda examines in detail this interdependency between Kate and cates and reveals that it is much more than a simple pun on her nickname. Korda recognizes that *Shrew* also illustrates an early modern change in economic production and market values. In this newly developing economic system, cates are important for their value as status objects, that is, symbolic rather than economic capital. Korda explains that cates are defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as "'provisions or victuals bought (as distinguished from, and usually more delicate or dainty than, those of home production)'" and are thus "exchange-values—commodities, properly speaking—as opposed to use-values, or objects of home production" (109). Cates privilege "delicacy of form over domestic function" in order to act as "signifiers of social distinction or differentiation" (113), and in this way they are similar to brides who are valued for their delicacy among the higher classes and for their domestic abilities among the lower classes. Kate, then, is not just a cate in name but also in nature since as a young gentlewoman she is a commodity on the marriage market. In early modern England, a bride, like a cate, is a status object that is exchanged in a capitalist system, and Katherina is the object of the economic transaction between Baptista and Petruchio.

In addition to being a cate herself, part of Katherina's taming involves learning to manage cates. Korda argues that the taming prepares Katherina for her new role as wife in the new gentry where an important part of her husband's climb up the social ladder requires that she consume and display cates properly in order to give the appearance of wealth without creating debt for Petruchio. Korda explains that the "housewife's 'vicarious consumption' positions her as a status object, the value of which derives precisely from its lack of utility: 'She is useless and expensive', as Veblen puts it, 'and she

is *consequently* valuable" (114). Katherina must be taught by Petruchio to consume cates for the benefit of impressing others but to do so strategically so as not to create debt in the process of displaying his wealth. In effect, Korda's argument provides an alternate or additional reason for the taming, yet ultimately the consequences for Katherina are the same: deprivation of material goods, submission of her will and internalization of her desires.

Petruchio begins Katherina's education on cates when they first meet, calling her, "my super-dainty Kate, / For dainties are all Kates" (2.1.188-9). As Korda explains, Petruchio is not simply identifying Katherina as a cate herself but also as a consumer of cates:

The substantive dainty ... designates something that is "estimable, sumptuous, or rare." In describing her as a "dainty," Petruchio appears to be referring to her value as a commodity, or cate, on the marriage market Yet Petruchio's reference to Kate as "super-dainty" refers to her not as a commodity or object of exchange between men but rather as a *consumer* of commodities. she is "over-nice," not so much discriminating as blindly obedient to the dictates of fashion. (117)

Although there is no textual evidence to indicate how Katherina is dressed in this particular scene, she does exhibit signs later that she wishes to follow the dictates of fashion when she identifies the cap as one that "doth fit the time, / And gentlewomen wear such caps as these" (4.2.69-70). Because Katherina is "super-dainty" and desires to consume cates, Petruchio believes that he has the right to tame her, for the "housewife's consumption of cates ... was in the early modern period thought to be something wild,

unruly, and in urgent need of taming" (118).

Petruchio is not the only character to believe that Katherina's consumption of cates must be tamed. Tranio also expresses this idea, and Baptista seems to agree with him. Tranio tells Baptista, in reference to Katherina, "'Twas a commodity lay fretting by you" (2.1.321), and Baptista replies that the gain he seeks is "quiet in the match" (2.1.323). Korda argues that Katherina's "fretting" refers not only to her excessive verbal fretting but also to her excessive consumption of cates:

The verb *to fret* ... means "to eat, devour [of animals]; ... to gnaw, to consume, ... or to wear away by gnawing" or reflexively, "to waste or wear away; to decay." Kate's untamed, animal-like consumption ... wears away both at her father's resources and at her own value as well. In describing Kate as a "fretting commodity", as a commodity that not only consumes but consumes itself, Tranio emphasizes the tension between her position as a cate, or object of exchange, between men and her role as a consumer of cates. (119)

Petruchio's task, then, as husband is to succeed where Baptista has failed, to tame Katherina's consumption of cates so that it serves Petruchio's economic purposes rather than her own desires. He must make Katherina conscious of the role of cates in determining class status and of her role as a manipulator of cates whose task is to improve the social standing of the man who provides those cates. It is to become Katherina's responsibility as an early modern housewife to maintain the "proper balance of economic and symbolic capital within the household economy. The trick of good housewifery in this period ... is knowing how to manipulate status objects for others and

knowing how not to be taken in by them" (124).

To accomplish his task of transforming Katherina's values concerning cates, Petruchio imposes on her his own conception of them. He arrives at the wedding wearing "a pair of old breeches thrice turned" (3.2.42) in order to shame her into remembering the importance of maintaining a good public display of cates and to remind her that "To [him] she's married, not unto [his] clothes" (3.2.115). He then takes her to his country house and sends ahead word to assure that it will be in orderly condition with nicely groomed servants attending their arrival. His purpose is to stress that appearance does not constitute reality since the servants prove to be disorderly and unable to provide for the travelers' basic need of sustenance. Then, by "feeding her with nothing but the *'name of meat'*, with cates in their pure form as signifiers of taste and social distinction, Petruchio aims to bring home to her their lack of substance, or stuff" (125). After his lesson, he tests her with the lure of further cates, only to call them worthless and subsequently prove their hollowness:

We will return unto thy father's house,
 And revel it as bravely as the best,
 With silken coats and caps, and golden rings,
 With ruffs and cuffs and farthingales and things,
 With scarfs and fans, and double change of bravery,
 With amber bracelets, beads, and *all this knavery*. (4.3.53-8, emphasis mine)

After this speech on the superfluous nature of cates, Petruchio proceeds to dismiss the cap that he places before her as a "silken pie" (4.3.82), that is, unnecessarily extravagant, and the gown as being full of unnecessary cuts and snips (4.3.90), similar perhaps to

Regan's gown which Lear criticizes because it "scarcely keeps [her] warm" (2.2.459). In Petruchio's philosophy, superfluous cates, constructed "[a]ccording to the fashion and the time" (4.3.95), serve "to make a puppet" (4.3.104) out of the overzealous consumer. They must not be purchased out of desire but out of the need to make a good public impression; therefore, Katherina must learn to judge when their purchase is necessary according to the example of frugal consumption advocated by Petruchio's taming method. As Korda summarizes, "Petruchio's taming strategy is accordingly aimed not at his wife's productive capacity—he never asks Kate to brew, bake, wash, card, or spin—but at her consumption. He seeks to educate Kate in her new role as a consumer of household cates" (112).

As members of the new gentry, Petruchio and his father have had to climb the social ladder by accumulating wealth through frugality while still appearing rich, since for "the mercantile classes conspicuous consumption functioned as a necessary (though not always sufficient) means to elite status; for the lesser gentry it was an unwished-for consequence of it" (121). Petruchio's class status forces him to maintain a complex balance: "he must restrict his wife's consumption without abolishing it entirely, must ensure that it adequately bears testimony to his own elite status without simultaneously leading him to financial ruin" (123). This social background perhaps makes Petruchio somewhat sensitive to issues of class struggle and the fact that a man can become a gentleman without being born one. To illustrate the reality of social disparity to Katherina, he explains:

For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich,

And as the sun breaks through the darkest clouds,

So honour peereth in the meanest habit.

What, is the jay more precious than the lark

Because his feathers are more beautiful? (4.3.169-73)

Petruchio is attempting to convince Katherina that despite appearing as a "madcap ruffian" (2.1.281) he is really an honourable gentleman. Being, however, a trick of rhetoric, his attempt is less than convincing. His words here do not reflect his previous or subsequent actions. Petruchio's rhetoric and his excuse that he must deprive Katherina for economic reasons do not excuse the violence inherent in this part of his taming. While he may believe that he is justified in teaching Katherina to learn the true value of cates, his taunting method of placing them before her and then taking them away is nonetheless unjustifiably cruel whatever his reason.

In his final taming test, Petruchio seems again to justify his malice by the constraints of his class status. He makes Katherina destroy her fashionable cap similar to the one with which he taunts her earlier. To prove to the other men that she is tamed, that is, to make a spectacle of her for the visual pleasure of other men, Petruchio commands her to take off her cap and "throw it under foot" (5.2.123), a gesture which the other women recognize is "a silly pass" (5.2.125) and "a foolish duty" (5.2.126). Making her destroy her prized, hard-won, and possibly only possession is surely another form of abuse, but from Petruchio's view it is also the ultimate point of his earlier lessons: cates, such as the cap, should be used to prove one's wealth before others. Thus, the destruction of the cap "represents not a renunciation of the commodity but rather an affirmation of its power. It is a gesture of conspicuous yet carefully controlled waste, demonstrating both Petruchio's ability to afford superfluous expenditure and his control over his wife's

consumption" (127). Petruchio's use of his cates is calculated in order to acquire more wealth, and his deceptively carefree attitude towards the destruction of the cap hides his real motivations. In addition to making a spectacle of his wife and proving his superiority as tamer, the gesture is also an insidious means of increasing his own wealth because Baptista is taken in by this carefully constructed display and rewards Petruchio with an additional twenty thousand crowns. Katherina loses her cherished cate and Petruchio profits from this loss, thus proving that the cap was not really for Katherina's pleasure but for Petruchio's economic interests. Katherina's manipulation of cates is confined to the sole purpose of increasing her husband's credit because, as Korda observes, the "vicarious consumer consumes not for herself, in her own interest, but for that of her husband" (128).

Katherina's final speech reflects this attitude by which society acknowledges only the husband's economic efforts and successes while the wife's contribution to the household economy is diminished and eventually forgotten. In her speech, Katherina presents the now-traditional masculine discourse that argues that a woman's place is in the home, and as such she should be grateful that her husband provides for her since she makes no contribution herself:

Thy husband is thy keeper,
 that cares for thee,
 And thy maintenance; commits his body
 To painful labour both by sea and land,
 To watch the night in storms, the day in cold,
 Whilst thou liest warm at home, secure and safe;

And craves no other tribute at thy hands

But love, fair looks, and true obedience;

Too little payment for so great a debt. (5.2.147-55)

According to this ideology, the wife should be grateful to remain safe at home, and she should willingly pay her husband obedience since she is in his debt for the sacrifices and labours he makes protecting and supporting her. This ideology presents a gendered division of labour, and it is this view which has kept women out of the remunerated workforce for centuries. It negates the value of the unpaid labour done by women within the household, both daily tasks and the care of children. Korda argues that as a result of this type of ideology women's household work is no longer even considered labour at all:

It becomes the ideological burden of Kate's final speech to conceal the economic underpinning of her symbolic labor, to render them culturally invisible. The speech accomplishes this task by defining the housewife's (nonproductive) activity as a form of leisure rather than labor. (128)

This gendered division of labour praised in Katherina's final speech is highly ironic because in rendering invisible her role as manager of a household, it also renders invisible her role as manipulator of cates, the role for which Petruchio's taming helps to prepare her.

5) Kinship and gift exchange

Petruchio's philosophy for acquiring wealth by means of his wife's public appearance and actions reduces Katherina to little more than a commodity, a status object to improve his own image and a bargaining chip in his wagers with other men. To him, she is simply a more expensive and thus more profit-producing animal: "I'll venture so

much of my hawk or hound, / But twenty times so much upon my wife" (5.2.72-3); his frequent comparisons of her to animals illustrate that he has no more respect for her than he does for an animal. This same reduction of women to the ranks of animals or commodities is also a factor in the rationalization of the system of gift exchange by which early modern marriages were arranged. In this system, women are reduced to objects of sexual desire, and the economic and social profit of men is valued above the respect of women.

Baptista's method of contracting his daughters' marriages is a form of gift exchange, especially in the case of Bianca. In each case, more emphasis is placed on the strength of kinship ties and the economic benefits of the union rather than the mutual love of the couple. Katherina is a commodity on the marriage market, and is considered unvendible because her scolding tongue makes her a threat to patriarchal discourse. Bianca, on the other hand, is praised because of her silence, and is thus characterized as a precious commodity. Since Bianca is a prized object of male desire, according to psychoanalytic theory it is reasonable to assume that unconsciously Baptista does not want to part with her; it is expected that he exert "proprietary control over his daughter as a sexual gift" (Singh 200). By accepting, therefore, Tranio/Lucentio's offer, he is seen from a masculine perspective as making a sacrifice and his act of relinquishing his valuable Bianca is seen as a generous gift on his part. Jyostna Singh has examined the theory of gift exchange in relation to *The Tempest*, and the same theoretical principles apply to *The Taming of the Shrew*. Singh states that "[m]arriages are the most basic form of gift exchange, whereby the woman whom one does not take is offered up as precious gift" (199). Singh explains that "the structure of the exchange of women as gifts in

earlier, 'primitive' societies ... served as an idiom for both *kinship* and *competition* among men" (196). These two elements are found in abundance in *Shrew*, the first in each suitor's continual insistence on his paternal ties and the second in the bidding wars over Bianca followed by the tutors' struggle for her attention.

The first of these two issues, kinship ties, is stressed repeatedly in the conversations leading up to the negotiations and is the key that allows the betrothal contracting to proceed. When Lucentio arrives in Padua, his first speeches establish his bourgeois heritage, more for the benefit of the audience than for his servant Tranio who would already be aware of it. He describes his father as a "merchant of great traffic through the world" (1.1.12), thus establishing himself as a gentleman through his father's lineage. Petruchio's opening speeches in the play serve a similar purpose. When Hortensio tells Petruchio that he has found a wife for him, Petruchio replies, "Tell me her father's name and 'tis enough" (1.2.93), showing no desire at all to learn the identity and characteristics of his potential mate. It is Katherina's lineage, and the large dowry implicitly included with her status as a gentlewoman, that is the most important factor. When told Baptista's name and then Katherina's, Petruchio replies, "I know her father, though I know not her, / And he knew my deceased father well" (1.2.100-1), indicating again that for him the father is more important than the potential bride. When Petruchio meets Baptista, he places more emphasis on his father's name and reputation than his own, telling Baptista, "Petruchio is my name, Antonio's son, / A man well known throughout all Italy" (2.1.68-9), to which Baptista replies, "I know him well. You are welcome for his sake" (2.1.70). Petruchio is not accepted for his own qualities but for those of his father, and his father's reputation is sufficient for Baptista to begin

negotiations even though Petruchio is a stranger who may not possess any of his father's noble qualities at all. Petruchio's claim, "You knew my father well, and in him me" (2.1.116), and Baptista's easy acceptance of this argument shows faulty logic, for if the son is not guilty of the sins of the father, by the same token he should not benefit from his noble deeds. Paternal kinship ties should not be sufficient proof of a man's noble character until the man actually proves himself as noble as his ancestors. However, Petruchio never has to prove his own worth to Baptista, and Baptista never questions whether or not he is a suitable husband for Katherina. When Petruchio arrives for the wedding dressed in rags, Baptista is surprised, and clearly Petruchio does not meet Baptista's expectations based on his view of Antonio, but by the time Baptista sees a glimpse of the brute within Petruchio it is too late since he has already made his assessment based on kinship ties alone. Baptista's assessment of Tranio/Lucentio is made on the same basis, for when he learns that Lucentio is "son to Vincentio", he replies, "A mighty man of Pisa. By report / I know him well. You are welcome sir" (2.1.103-5). Given that Tranio is not Lucentio, and that Baptista is later deceived by them and the Pedant, it is clear that this system of recognition of character solely through kinship ties is indeed faulty.

Kinship, however, through the recognition of past ties, does not play a role in gift exchange solely in terms of the choice of the gift recipient; gift exchange also serves as the basis for future relationships, and is one of the principal means by which new kinship ties and male homosocial bonds are forged. Singh explains that the "gift of women was the most profound [in so-called primitive societies, according to Lévi-Strauss, Mauss, and others] because the exchange partners thereby enacted a relationship of kinship"

(198). Singh cites Gayle Rubin who, in "The Traffic of Women: Notes on a Political Economy of Sex", argues:

If it is women who are being transacted, then it is men who give and take them who are linked, the woman being a conduit of a relationship rather than a partner to it. The exchange of women does not necessarily imply that women are objectified... But it does imply a distinction between gift and giver. If women are the gifts, then it is the men who are exchange partners. And it is the partners, not their presents, upon whom the reciprocal exchange confers its quasi-mystical power of social linkage... [Thus] women are *given* in marriage, *taken* in battle, exchanged for favours, sent as tribute, traded, bought, and sold. (Rubin in Singh 199)

Thus, in the ensuing marriages, it is not only Katherina and Petruchio, and Bianca and Lucentio, who are linked, but also, and more importantly from a male perspective, Baptista, Petruchio, Lucentio, and even Vincentio who become kin. The marriage is an opportunity to form male homosocial bonds between the husband and the father, and this bond is further solidified once the marriage produces male offspring since the husband and father are linked by the shared bloodline of the offspring. The wife/daughter is merely a means to transmit the lineage of her father since it is the paternal rather than the maternal bloodline which later serves to identify the offspring as the product of two lineages of good reputation: Antonio's / Petruchio's and Baptista's lineages in the case of Katherina, and Vincentio's / Lucentio's and Baptista's lineages in the case of Bianca.

Competition, the second major component of the gift exchange negotiations, is no kinder to women than is the system of recognition based on kinship ties. This second

element manifests itself first through the economics of the negotiations and then through the actual wooing process. At the beginning of the betrothal negotiations, the suitors are not competing for the bride but rather for the dowry that Baptista offers. As a result, in the same way that women are absent from a kinship system reserved solely for fathers and sons, the voice of women is also absent from the economic discussion. The bride is the object of the negotiations, not a participant in them. In Shakespeare's *Padua*, the bride is a commodity, and the father and the husband are principally concerned with making the most favorable economic exchange possible. On several occasions, the suitors each make reference to the fact that Baptista is "very rich" (1.1.124, 1.2.62), and has "money enough" (1.1.129-30) or "wealth enough" (1.2.85) to make a marriage a profitable transaction. Ironically, the very act of competing for the dowries creates a temporary solidarity and homosocial bond between the suitors. Hortensio and Gremio cooperate in convincing Petruchio to court Katherina and thus liberate Bianca for them to court. Tranio/Lucentio also agrees to cooperate with them following Hortensio's command, "You must, as we do, gratify this gentleman [Petruchio] / To whom we all rest generally beholding" (1.2.271-2). United in their desire for Bianca, competition creates male homosocial bonds similar to the kinship bonds created by the marriage.

In terms of competition for Katherina, Petruchio has no other suitor with which to compete, but he manifests a competitive attitude nonetheless since he is trying to win the prize of the dowry. Baptista's wealth supersedes Katherina's own qualities, especially for Petruchio who is clearly a fortune-hunter brought to Padua by "[s]uch wind as scatters young men through the world / To seek their fortunes farther than at home" (1.2.49-50). He makes no attempt to hide his real motivation "to wive and thrive as best [he] may"

(1.2.55), if "wealthily, then happily" (1.2.75). When told by Hortensio that Katherina is a shrew, Petruchio replies, "Thou know'st not gold's effect" (1.2.92), making it clear that his principal interest is profit rather than mutual love. The condition necessary for the marriage to take place is "if her dowry please" (1.2.183), not whether Petruchio can obtain Katherina's love, a condition that Baptista imposes and then ignores. As Petruchio aptly predicts, love "is nothing" (2.1.130). Baptista is barely concerned with Katherina's welfare and prefers rather to "play a merchant's part, / And venture madly on a desperate mart" (2.1.319-20) in order to seek "quiet in the match" (2.1.323) since he had earlier believed that Katherina was an unvendible commodity on whom he risked to lose money. He acts like a merchant who is relieved to sell defective merchandise, and makes sure that the deal is "clapp'd up ... suddenly" (2.1.317) before Petruchio has a chance to change his mind.

Once Katherina is sold to Petruchio for the price of her "widowhood" (2.1.124), Baptista is free to negotiate the transaction for his more valuable merchandise, Bianca, and the discussion surrounding her marriage is even more axed on economics than the first betrothal contract. The conversation between Baptista, Gremio, and Tranio/Lucentio is literally reduced to a bidding war. Baptista promises that "he of both / That can assure my daughter greatest dower / Shall have my Bianca's love" (2.1.335-7). Baptista acts as though it were he rather than Bianca who determined the object of her affection because affection is not the real issue; the negotiations are a competition to determine which suitor can make the most generous offer. After the two suitors list extensively all the cates which they can offer Bianca, she is given to the highest bidder, Tranio/Lucentio, who "outvie[s]" (2.1.378) Gremio with an offer of "two thousand ducats by the year" as

jointure (2.1.362-3). Baptista again decides who will marry his daughter without so much as asking her opinion of the man with whom she must spend the rest of her life. She is not even present when the contract is agreed upon. It is not surprising, given the lack of respect that he shows for her wishes, that Bianca eventually chooses to get married without Baptista's permission.

The subsequent wooing of Bianca is also portrayed as a stark competition. Lucentio/Cambio and Hortensio/Litio each demands of the other, "give me leave" (3.1.6, 13), and insists on being the first to occupy Bianca's attention. Both demonstrate a possessive and almost aggressive nature when competing for the privacy necessary to court and woo her. She becomes an object over which they fight and plays only a small role herself in the action of the scene. She speaks her own will only once, when she declares, "I'll not be tied to hours nor 'pointed times, / But learn my lessons as I please myself" (3.1.19-20). The remainder of the time she plays the passive role of the prize to be won and refrains from showing mutual interest in either suitor. Rather than express herself openly to Lucentio/Cambio following his declaration of his love and his true identity, "Bianca repeats verbatim the Latin words Lucentio 'construes' Her revelation of her feelings through a repetition of the Latin lines he quotes from Ovid are as close as possible to the silence we have come to expect from her" (Newman 94). The few words of her own that Bianca adds among the Latin, "presume not ... despair not" (3.1.43), are both politely passive and ambivalently uncommittal. Singh's description of Miranda applies to Bianca as well; in both cases, the future bride "has a marginal role within a *kinship* system in which all three males are bonded by their competing claims on her" (198). Thus, once Bianca marries Lucentio, the competition between the suitors

desolves into male homosocial bonds. At the marriage banquet, Lucentio, Hortensio, and even Gremio jest as friends, united from their common struggle for the best prize within the kinship system while Bianca is marginalized offstage, "conferring by the parlour fire" with the other women (5.2.103).

Thus, the system of gift exchange serves to form and solidify male homosocial bonds because of its reliance on kinship ties and its creation of new ties. Since these kinship ties are patrilineal, women are excluded from the process of betrothal negotiations. Their exclusion facilitates their objectification as sexual gifts and economic commodities. Before the marriage, Katherina is aware of the masculine view of women that justifies this commodification of her person, and she specifically makes this male perspective of women the subject of her protests. When Katherina questions, "is it your will / To make a stale of me amongst these mates?" (1.1.57-8), the pun on the possible signification of "stale" as "prostitute" is a protest "against the role in patriarchal culture to which women are assigned, that of wife and object of exchange in the circulation of male desire" (Newman 90). After the marriage, however, her objectification is no longer simply a matter of perspective; it becomes a reality. Petruchio's assertion that she is his "goods" and "chattels" (3.2.228) acts as a performative gesture that essentially accomplishes the "very act of domestication it declares; reduced to an object of exchange, ... Kate is abruptly yanked out of circulation and sequestered within the home, literally turned into a piece of furniture or 'household stuff'" (Korda 122). Petruchio's speech transforms Katherina from an object of exchange on the marriage market to a household use-value and "reverses the processes of commodification" (122). By comparing her to a "series of increasingly homely things", Petruchio succeeds in finally diminishing her to

"a seemingly irreducible substance whose static mobility ('here she stands') puts a stop to the slippage of exchange evoked by his list of goods. Her deictic presence seems to stand as the guarantee of an underlying, enduring use-value" (122-3). Katherina is no longer a piece of merchandise upon which anyone may bid; she is Petruchio's property, and like all purchases he intends to take her home from the market so that she be put to use if and when he chooses. Petruchio's desire to return directly home after the marriage highlights the fact that it is essentially a business transaction for which there is no need for ceremony once the deal is sealed. The process of gift exchange, then, reduces women to the rank of a commodity; however, once the process is concluded and she is no longer the object of competition or attention, she is simply productive yet relatively unimportant "household stuff" (3.2.229).

6) Submission in marriage

In conclusion, Katherina is tamed entirely, physically, sexually, emotionally, linguistically, economically, and materially, so that there remains no aspect of her former personality upon which Petruchio does not encroach and impose his own values. The combination of all these of these levels of subjugation gives the husband absolute rule, and thus adds political domination to the equation as well, since within the miniature kingdom of the household the husband is king and the wife is subject. Katherina's final speech reflects all of the various aspects of her taming. Using the political metaphor of a king and subject as its binding tissue, Katherina's speech illustrates the physical, sexual, emotional, linguistic, intellectual, economic, and material reasons why women are inferior to men and must therefore submit willingly to them. Physically, according to the masculine discourse that Katherina propagates, women need to be protected, and to lie

"warm at home, secure and safe" (5.2.152) because their "bodies [are] soft, and weak" (5.2.166), their "lances are but straws / [Their] strength as weak, [their] weakness past compare" (5.2.174-5). Having bodies soft and weak, women are supposedly beings of "beauty" (5.2.140), that is, sexual objects, and if they do not portray this image, they are "[m]uddy, ill-seeming" (5.2.144) and nobody will "deign to ... touch" them (5.2.146). Women's physical weakness, in comparison to men, makes them materially and economically dependent on men. "Unapt to toil and trouble in the world" (5.2.167), women must rely on men to provide for their "maintenance" (5.2.149) by means of "painful labour" (5.2.150), and by implied opposition one is consequently led to conclude that women's work, which is not even mentioned in the speech, is really leisure. Since the speech characterizes women as physically inferior and in need of men's material and economic assistance, and since it is also implied that they are intellectually inferior, or "simple" (5.2.162), as well, the speech attempts to justify linguistic and emotional subservience as being natural based on the more physical "evidence" supporting women's subjugation. Thus, love is not shown as an emotion that is freely given, but rather it is associated with "true obedience" (5.2.54), so the wife's emotions must obey her husband's will as well as her body. Self-imposed emotional control is portrayed as a means to acquire the linguistic self-control necessary to show proper obedience. Before her taming, Katherina's heart was too great, and this is shown to be the reason why she would "bandy word for word and frown for frown" (5.2.173). Katherina claims that to be "froward, peevish, sullen, sour" (5.2.158) towards her husband is not to be "obedient to his honest will" (5.2.159). Returning to the political analogy which is used to give solemn weight to the argument, Katherina compares a disobedient woman to "a foul

contending rebel, / And graceless traitor" (5.2.160-1), a comparison which implies religious (graceless) as well as political (rebel, traitor) infidelity. After Katherina delivers this speech, neither Bianca nor the widow speak again for the rest of the play. They are shamed into silence and forced to follow the example of wifely obedience that Katherina establishes. Her speech accomplishes Petruchio's goal when he commands her to teach the other women what duty they owe their husbands. The other women conform to their proper role and patriarchy is reinforced.

Katherina's final speech covers every conceivable reason from a masculine perspective that would supposedly justify the submission of women in marriage in early modern England. Given the persistent and violent taming that she undergoes, it is not surprising that at the end of *The Taming of the Shrew* she allows her voice to be appropriated to serve a masculine discourse that she so strongly resists at the beginning of the play. She has neither the strength nor the choice to resist. From Petruchio's perspective, whose reason for coming to Padua is to "wive it wealthily", his voyage is a complete success because of his shrew taming method. He acquires wealth from the marriage and from his display of the efficacy of his taming technique. He purchases a bride, and uses her to solidify his social status by acquiring more wealth. In the eyes of an early modern husband, Petruchio is a Hercules to be admired and an example to follow. That the very essence of his wife is destroyed in the process is of no consequence; it is, like the second dowry, a bonus.

Chapter III. *Much Ado: Shrew Revisited*

In the approximately nine years between the first performances of *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, Shakespeare had ample time not only to perfect his dramatic skills but also to reevaluate the views propagated by his plays. While the subject of both plays is the same, the suppression of women's linguistic freedom, the tone is less violent and the method of presenting the idea is decidedly more subtle in the second play. In both plays, however, the result is ultimately the same: a free-spirited, highly verbal woman marries and then loses her freedom of speech. Beatrice, is clearly modeled on Katherina, as many critics including Jean Howard and Michael Friedman have observed. Beatrice's most prominent characteristic is her tongue, and she is described by other characters in the play in the same terms as Katherina: "curst" and "shrewd of ... tongue" (2.1.18, 17). Women's speech, then, or rather their silence, is central to the play, as is that of all "inferior" members of Messina's strict hierarchical society. Again, class differences are not wholly independent from gender divisions; rather, the two are interdependent. As in the case of rhetoric in *Shrew*, in *Much Ado* wit is reserved for aristocratic men because its penetrating nature is considered by the characters to be distinctly masculine and, therefore, must not be appropriated by those of lesser class or gender. Thus, illegitimate or socially inferior characters, such as Don John and Dogberry, as well as virtuous women, like Hero and her mother Innogen, are silent, and as she moves towards marriage, Beatrice too tames her loquacity.

There are several reasons in popular Renaissance discourse that explain the male desire to tame a woman's tongue. As I have already explained in the previous chapter,

rhetoric, and consequently wit, was perceived as a penetrating weapon to be wielded only by men, and women had no right to appropriate its phallic power. Moreover, men associated the open mouth of a talkative woman with wantonness, equating the open mouth with other open orifices. Thus, in general, the right to freedom of speech is gendered based on sexual stereotypes. The same stereotypes and gendered principles of speech are perpetuated in *Much Ado About Nothing*. At the beginning of the play the audience remarks among the upper-class women three different examples of feminine speech/silence, each one closer to the masculine ideal. Beatrice speaks continually and with great wit, and if she does not choose to do so herself, no man can restrict her speech. Hero, virtuous and chaste, speaks little and only when spoken to. Innogen, Leonato's wife, speaks not at all and is the ideal aristocratic woman, silently accepting her place at her husband's side as a token object rather than a free-willed human being. If the three women represent a hierarchical chart of wifely silence, by the end of the play the two heroines, Beatrice and Hero, each complete the transition to Innogen's ideal status as they advance towards marriage.

Beatrice's mastery of wit is proven from the very beginning of the play. Her very first words can be read as a mocking insult in anticipation of the ensuing battle of wit in which she defeats her challenger Benedick. While most critics interpret Beatrice's question, "I pray you, is Signior Mountanto returned from the wars or no?" (1.1.28-9), as an indication of her veiled love for him and as a subtle exhibition of desire to be in his presence, her words may also be interpreted quite differently. The epithet "Mountanto" characterizes Benedick as a manly warrior in its allusion to fencing; however, this description is subverted by the mocking tone with which it may be delivered as well as

the possibility of a second significance. Pronounced as "mount onto", the name alludes to Benedick's sexual promiscuity and thus his inconstancy and unfaithfulness which Beatrice later highlights more explicitly. Moreover, by creating a new name for him, Beatrice usurps the masculine power of Adam to name the creatures of the world. Benedick later attempts to reappropriate the power of Adam when he names Beatrice "Lady Disdain" (1.1.109) and "my Lady Tongue" (2.1.258). Slights argues that Beatrice and Benedick "are utilizing the connection between naming and power deeply embedded in Western culture. Adam's ability to name the creatures was interpreted as demonstrating his knowledge of their natures and thus as evidence of his right to dominion over them" (174). Slights adds that "by exercising the power to create names, [they] not only try to claim dominion over each other but pretend to an Adam-like independence from social control" (175). Beatrice, however, is the first of the two duelers of wit to wield the power of Adam, and she does so in the presence of the patriarch Leonato. She shows all the men present that she possesses a masculine wit that places her on equal ground with men in terms of linguistic power. Thus, before he even arrives onstage, Benedick is already beaten by Beatrice whose wit is sharp and ready to attack him. Finally, while the implied desire to see Benedick upon his return from the wars may indicate love or even concern for his safety, it may also be interpreted simply as a desire to engage her wit in competition, especially given that Benedick is the only worthy adversary against which Beatrice may spar, and that until now she has probably been unable to exercise her linguistic abilities to their full potential in the sole presence of Leonato and Hero.

Before Benedick arrives, Beatrice makes several other attacks on him, one of

which ties her to Katherina. After commenting that Benedick is only in the wars because the army "had musty victual, and he hath holp to eat it" (1.1.45), and that he is a "stuffed man" (1.1.53) or mere scarecrow, Beatrice gives an account of their last encounter:

In our last conflict four of his five wits went halting off, and now is the whole man governed with one: so that if he have wit enough to keep himself warm, let him bear it for a difference between himself and his horse, for it is all the wealth that he hath left, to be known a reasonable creature. (1.1.59-65)

In her first encounter with Petruchio, Katherina uses the same proverb as Beatrice in suggesting that her suitor does not have enough wit to keep himself warm (2.1.259). While a common expression, this is only one of many instances where Beatrice's words echo Katherina's. Of more significant interest, this passage also echoes *Shrew* in its horse comparison; however, in this case, the effect is reversed and the brunt of the joke is turned against the man rather than the woman. In *Shrew*, Katherina is frequently compared to a horse; in *Much Ado*, it is Benedick who is compared to one on several occasions. This reversal does not signify a revolution in the gender hierarchy, but it does allow the audience to see that not only women but also men may be bestial or less-than-human in some cases.

Beatrice's first words spoken directly to Benedick are as ambiguous as her first words in the play. She taunts him, "I wonder that you will still be talking, Signoir Benedick: nobody marks you" (1.1.107-8). On the surface, her comment is a biting insult that attacks the most sensitive part of Benedick's ego, his pride in his wit. Alternately, however, some critics believe that Beatrice could also be discretely indicating her

interest in Benedick. Nevo suggests that Beatrice's comment translates into a whole set of unstated messages:

First of all, someone does [mark him]. She does. Clearly she has, provocatively, caught his attention, when (we infer) he was ostentatiously *not* marking her. Then, I wish no one *did* mark you, you great fool, *not* being marked being the greatest punishment possible to a boaster like yourself, and therefore a great revenge. Revenge for what? Not for your not having marked me, certainly. Don't imagine that I mark you, or that you are the least important to me, or that I in the least care whether you mark, marked or will mark me. (167)

As with the majority of Beatrice's lines in the play, the plurality of meaning can lead to several different interpretations depending on the actor's delivery of the line or the way in which the reader imagines the tone. While it is possible to interpret Beatrice's words here as revealing a hidden romantic interest in Benedick, it seems more likely that her real intent is to make the first offensive stab in their "merry war" (1.1.56), and she simply seizes the moment provided by Don Pedro and Leonato's aside. Just as her wit is lightening quick, so too is her initial attack. Once the "skirmish of wit" (1.1.57) with Benedick begins, Beatrice demonstrates her superior linguistic skills in a series of attacks on his person and on his own cherished wit. Beatrice emerges victorious from this first battle by having the last word, "You always end with a jade's trick, I know you of old" (1.1.133-4), after Benedick concedes defeat: "I would my horse had such speed as your tongue, and so good a continuer. But keep your way, a God's name, I have done" (1.1.130-2). Benedick knows that Beatrice's wit is faster than his and can endure longer;

therefore, he attempts to end the battle by associating her with a horse and then making a quick retreat, but Beatrice retorts so that Benedick's jade's trick returns against him to characterize him as horse. Friedman characterizes Benedick's escape attempt as that of a "vanquished soldier [who] retreats from this initial encounter only to attack again later from behind the shield of disguise at Leonato's masque" (353).

In this second skirmish at the masque, Beatrice is again victorious, the target of her insults again being Benedick's wit. It is probable that "Beatrice recognizes Benedick" (Friedman 353), and that she is thus particularly fierce in her attacks knowing that Benedick won't reply and reveal his identity. After Benedick insults her wit, pretending to have heard that its source was the crude "Hundred Merry Tales", Beatrice returns the volley by comparing Benedick to a dull court jester who sulks when nobody laughs at his jokes. Benedick's later account of the incident to Claudio exposes not only the fact that Beatrice "tears his masculine ego to shreds" (Friedman 354) but also his decidedly masculine views on wit and women's speech. He complains that Beatrice insulted him by "huddling jest upon jest with such impossible conveyance upon [him] that [he] stood like a man at a mark, with a whole army shooting at [him]" (2.1.228-231). He concludes, "She speaks poniards, and every word stabs" (2.1.231-2). Benedick's metaphors of being shot by hoards of arrows and of being stabbed with a dagger are both aggressive, penetrating, and thus phallic, images that betray his fear that Beatrice has usurped his masculine dominance. As is the case in the Renaissance discourse of rhetoric examined in relation to *Shrew*, in *Much Ado* wit is a penetrating masculine weapon that women normally do not, and should not, wield. Benedick is destabilized by Beatrice's attack not only because it diminishes him personally but also because it comes from a woman who

has no right to speak in such a masculine manner.

Benedick later makes it clear that he associates wit with a masculine weapon when he tells Claudio, "[My wit] is in my scabbard; shall I draw it?" (5.1.125). Moreover, Friedman reminds us that "Hero's comment on Margaret's verbal thrusts at Beatrice—'There thou prick'st her with a thistle' (III.iv.71)—suggests that wit retains its phallic, masculine character ('prick'st') even when appropriated by women" (353). This view is supported by Benedick's conversation with Margaret in which "he 'claims swordlike phallic wit as masculine prerogative that women wield only through usurpation'" (Friedman 353). He acknowledges that Margaret's wit is masculine despite her gender, but he refuses to cede willingly his own wit to her because it is not to be wielded by women:

BENEDICK. A most manly wit, Margaret, it will not hurt a woman. And
so I pray thee call Beatrice; I give thee the bucklers.

MARGARET. Give us the swords, we have bucklers of our own.

BENEDICK. If you use them, Margaret, you must put in the pikes with a
vice, and they are dangerous weapons for maids. (5.2.15-21)

While Benedick's tone in this bawdy exchange appears to be light and witty, his words convey nonetheless an ominous note of warning that Margaret should refrain from carrying the dangerous and decidedly masculine weapons of wit. By attempting to appropriate his wit and the phallic power that is implicit in it, Margaret, like Beatrice earlier, poses a threat to Benedick's masculinity that leaves him uncomfortable and encourages him to reply with his own threat.

In his account of the encounter with Beatrice at the masque, Benedick goes on to

say, "She would have made Hercules have turned spit, yea, and have cleft his club to make the fire too" (2.1.236-8). Benedick compares Beatrice to Omphale, Queen of Lydia, who made Hercules wear women's clothing and spin cloth while she took his club and lion skin, thus reversing gender roles and appropriating his masculine power. In addition to this direct allusion, however, Benedick's reference to Hercules also evokes the legend of Hercules Gallia, the powerful rhetor. Thus, not only can Beatrice subdue Hercules, but she can also appropriate his linguistic power and become him. Conscious of her ability to appropriate masculine power, Beatrice refuses to accept the subjection that her femininity normally requires of her, and her refusal to accept her gendered role frightens Benedick who does not want to be domesticated like Hercules.

As the play progresses, however, and Beatrice is pushed towards marriage, she is forced to accept the silence that will be required of her once she marries. "Although Hero by habit speaks kindly to men and only when spoken to," argues Friedman, "Beatrice must be slowly trained to moderate her speech before she can become a congenial wife" (354). While at the beginning of the play she refuses "to be overmastered with a piece of valiant dust" (2.1.56-7), once she learns of Benedick's supposed love for her and she hears Hero's brutal attack on her disdain, she vows to tame herself and subsequently tempers her speech to what is appropriate for a married woman. "Beatrice does not question that wedlock, if she chooses it, *requires* such subservience" (354), Friedman writes; instead, she avoids as long as possible entering into a situation in which she realizes she will lose her linguistic freedom. Maintaining her loquacity within marriage is never a viable nor even conceivable option. Frequently, Beatrice makes reference to Hero's silence and displays that she realizes that she will have to act in the

same submissive fashion if she marries. She mocks Hero's submissiveness, and warns her against being too complacent and blindly following her father's wishes: "Yes, faith, it is my cousin's duty to make curtsy and say, 'Father, as it please you': but yet for all that, cousin, let him be a handsome fellow, or else make another curtsy and say, 'Father, as it please me'" (2.1.48-52). While teasing Hero, Beatrice is also expressing her own wariness of being placed in a similar position, a position which she consciously flees with her shrewd tongue. Leonato aptly tells her, "thou wilt never get thee a husband, if thou be so shrewd of thy tongue" (2.1.16-7), and she adopts his advice as a strategy rather than a warning. Unlike Katherina who is ashamed at the prospect (2.1.34), Beatrice rejoices in the idea that she will remain forever a maid and thus "lead ... apes into hell" (2.1.37).

Beatrice's verbal freedom, however, poses a problem for the men around her because it contests their supreme authority. As I discussed in relation to *Shrew*, women's speech was perceived as a threat to men in Renaissance England and therefore discouraged, but it was also condemned for the additional reason that it was associated with sexual freedom. Like Boose, Friedman also remarks that "the writers of Renaissance conduct books for women commonly equated 'the closed mouth' with 'the enclosed body' and condemned the open mouth as a sign of wantonness" (361). This association is assumed to be true by Don Pedro and Claudio when they denounce Hero by charging that she did "Talk with a ruffian at her chamber-window" (4.1.91). Moreover, Don Pedro's subsequent "connection of 'untruthfulness' to unchastity suggests an association between women's verbal license and sexual promiscuity" as well (361). When Beatrice finally does marry, therefore, she must sacrifice her verbal freedom

because her open mouth would characterize her as wanton, and this would soil Benedick's honor based on the assumption that a wanton wife would make him a cuckold. Don Pedro's preference for silent, and thus chaste, women is illustrated at the masque when he tells Hero, "Speak low, if you speak love" (2.1.91), and while he describes Beatrice's wit as "merry" (2.1.294, 312), this is due to the fact that he is not the target of it and that he is undoubtedly relieved that she releases him from his marriage offer. He prefers for women to resemble Hero's unintentional self-description: someone who will "walk softly, and look sweetly, and say nothing" (2.1.80-1). Beatrice does not resemble this ideal of women's silence, and for Don Pedro "[i]conoclastic voices such as hers need to be recuperated or silenced" (Howard 180). His plot to make her accept marriage accomplishes both tasks, recuperating her into the hierarchical gendered social order and then silencing her voice once she takes her place within that order.

Beatrice's verbal freedom, comparably much greater than Hero's at the beginning, can be attributed to several factors within the play, and, unlike Katherina, Beatrice is not merely a portrait of the typical shrew without motivation for her behavior. Hero has presumably been raised and educated by Innogen who, chaste, obedient and mute the entire play, is the epitome of wifely virtue and the example that Hero has quite conceivably been taught to follow. Beatrice, on the other hand, like Katherina, has no mother to instruct her on the proper manner for women to speak, or rather to hold their tongues. Unlike Katherina, however, Beatrice does not appear to have a father and is under the care of her uncle. All of Leonato's concerns in regards to aristocratic alliances, dowries, and jointures are solely in terms of Hero, his only daughter. There is significantly less pressure on Beatrice to control her tongue because, unlike Hero, she

will not be the link by which Leonato will forge new alliances and perpetuate his bloodline. Beatrice is not a commodity on Leonato's marriage market, and, therefore, not as highly prized an object of male desire as Hero. Beatrice is simply his charge, and it is his responsibility to care for her and to find her a husband, but not necessarily one through whom he will forge kinship ties. For Leonato, Beatrice's loquacity and rejection of marriage is secondary to his chief concern of finding an acceptable, aristocratic husband for Hero through whom he may improve his own social and economic status.

From Don Pedro's viewpoint, however, Beatrice's chosen celibacy outside of a religious institution, coupled with her disrespect for the tradition of women's silence, is contrary to the gendered social order, and as Prince it is his responsibility to arrange a marriage so that Beatrice, a contentious and subversive element in his well-ordered society, is brought to conform to the gendered role laid out for young women. Since Benedick's professed misogyny and rejection of marriage poses the same threat to the social order, Don Pedro's plan to unite them is a logical solution for eliminating social disorder. His plan is not an attempt to unite two secret lovers. There is never any evidence in his presence onstage to lead him to believe that Benedick and Beatrice are attracted to each other, and he never indicates that he believes them to be attracted to each other already. As Howard describes the situation, "[f]ar from *discovering* Benedick and Beatrice's preexistent love, Don Pedro works hard to *create* it" (177-8). Since there is no preexistent love prior to Don Pedro's intervention, when "the two of them 'fall in love,' they do not obey a spontaneous, privately engendered emotion so much as reveal their successful interpellation into particular positions within a gendered social order" (Howard 178). As the ruling Spanish overlord of this Italian city-state (Slights 198), Don

Pedro does not have to justify his actions. On the contrary, Don Pedro has supreme authority over everyone, including the aged patriarch Leonato who is merely the governor of Messina, not a prince. Leonato, Hero, and the others are more than willing to please their coloniser and at the same time take revenge against friends whom they perceive as social misfits that reject their own married lifestyle. The Prince assumes that it is his right to toy with the emotions of his subjects if it serves his desire to solidify the social order of Messina, and nobody questions his conspiracy against the social renegades. In fact, Leonato and the others utter with pleasure the gendered discourse that Don Pedro conceives for them to repeat, a discourse in which the roles of the "normal" male and female are laid out precisely for Beatrice and Benedick to follow. The discourse that Leonato and Claudio repeat to trick Benedick is quite different from that which Hero and Ursula repeat to lure Beatrice, but both are Don Pedro's conception of the roles that each of these misfits should play in a well-ordered society.

In the first garden eavesdropping scene, Don Pedro controls the dialogue by asking questions that he knows will lead Leonato to respond in a certain manner. He directs the discussion towards the question of Beatrice's supposed love for Benedick, then Beatrice's virtue, and finally he directs the discussion so as to appeal to Benedick's pride. Don Pedro's discourse is designed to swell Benedick's masculine ego, and Benedick's subsequent soliloquy reflects the success of this approach as he is clearly flattered by what he hears. Beatrice is portrayed as "a vulnerable, pitiful victim" (Howard 178) who "falls [down upon her knees], weeps, sobs, beats her heart, tears her hair, prays, curses" (2.3.144-5) and continually writes his name over and over throughout the sleepless night. This account of Beatrice interpellates Benedick to play the role of rescuer, the knight in

shining armour who will save her from herself; hence, he becomes "more 'manly' by accepting his duty to succor women as well as fight in the wars" (Howard 178). Putting aside his pride is presented as "growing up", and the misogyny he has embraced until then, "the meat in his youth that he cannot endure in his age" (2.3.230-1), is "displaced by the maturer pleasure of peopling the world and receiving a woman's adoration" (Howard 178). Thus, the discourse conceived by Don Pedro is an appeal to Benedick's masculinity. Given the authority of these cultural stereotypes, plus the prince's colonial authority and authority inherent in Leonato's age, as a young, Italian man Benedick cannot help but to accept the challenge.

Don Pedro then gives directions to Leonato to order Hero to trap Beatrice in a similar manner. Before the second eavesdropping scene, Hero explains the plan to Margaret and Ursula, and it is clear that both her part in the plot and Ursula's "had obviously been assigned by Don Pedro" (Berger 305), for whom Hero has promised to "do any modest office" (2.1.352) to help her cousin to a husband:

Our talk must only be of Benedick.

When I do name him, let it be thy part

To praise him more than ever man did merit:

My talk to thee must be how Benedick

Is sick in love with Beatrice. Of this matter

Is little Cupid's crafty arrow made,

That only wounds by hearsay. (3.1.17-23)

The plan represents a masculine fantasy by indulging the male ego even in the absence of its subject. The discourse of love seems to resemble more closely Don Pedro's masculine

conception of how women would discuss love interests than a more feminine reality. It is centered on proving the man's worthiness and does not take into consideration the woman's own feelings. The plan does not account for feminine subjectivity and assumes that any woman, even Beatrice who scorns Benedick, would immediately fall in love with him if his qualities and virility are amply made known. Moreover, the "crafty arrow" that "wounds" with words is, like wit and rhetoric, a sign of offensive, masculine linguistic force that Don Pedro seems to have loaned to Hero for his specific purpose rather than a force that she possesses naturally and asserts at will.

Leonato supposedly explains the plan to Hero beforehand so that she need not take any initiative of her own to carry out the Prince's plan successfully. However, when the moment comes to trick Beatrice, Hero, finally able to tell her cousin what she really thinks of her free from the sting of her wit, forgets the original plan that she has just told Ursula. Instead, Hero takes full advantage of the situation to launch a devastating attack on her cousin's behavior. Before discussing Benedick's affection for Beatrice, Hero lists Beatrice's faults: "No, truly, Ursula, she is too disdainful; / I know her spirits are as coy and wild / As *haggards of the rock*" (3.1.34-6; emphasis mine). When she makes Beatrice's verbal freedom the subject of her critique, Hero "only pretends to pretend" (Berger 305) and speaks rather what she really believes, thereby encouraging Beatrice to reform her behavior and conform to the traditional gendered standards of speech that Hero herself represents. Ursula returns the conversation to the subject of Benedick's love, but Hero again uses the ploy as a chance to criticize her cousin's unrestrained speech rather than praise Benedick :

But Nature never fram'd a woman's heart

Of prouder stuff than that of Beatrice.
 Disdain and scorn ride sparkling in her eyes,
 Misprising what they look on, and her wit
 Values itself so highly that to her
 All matter else seems weak. She cannot love,
 Nor take no shape nor project of affection,
 She is so self-endear'd. (3.1.49-56)

Hero's description of Beatrice immediately brings to mind Katherina, for both women are characterized by the same terms. Both are haggards, wild birds that require taming, and both are known for their disdain and scorn of potential suitors. The only difference between the two women is that Beatrice is a haggard "of the rock", that is, a hawk who reaches maturity in the wild before being broken to her captor's will, whereas Katherina doesn't have the opportunity to reach maturity in her will and wit before she is tamed. Otherwise, they are still very similar; just as Katherina resolves to be free at least in words, Beatrice cherishes her wit above all else. Moreover, Hero's critique of Beatrice is all the more bitter because it concludes with an attack on Beatrice's femininity, and thus her identity as an early modern woman. By questioning Beatrice's ability to love, Hero is passing judgment on her ability to be a wife and a mother, the only role generally available to the majority of early modern women besides spinster or nun. In effect, Hero is warning Beatrice that if she does not conform to gender norms and accept to marry, she will lose her identity as "woman" and be forever categorized as "shrew".

In each case, then, the discourse presented to Benedick and Beatrice interpellates him or her to follow traditional gender norms for men or women in a method that is very

similar to how Katherina's final speech interpellates Bianca and the widow to follow the gender norms laid out for them. Benedick must marry to become more "manly", and Beatrice must love him to be a "real" woman. In the feminine version of the trick, however, Beatrice hears little of Benedick's suffering. As a man, he bears his supposed unrequited love with dignity; his passion does not destroy him as it does Beatrice but burns in him "like cover'd fire" (3.1.77). In addition, Benedick is praised considerably more than the men praise Beatrice. Thus, both tricks interpellate the "social renegades into gendered and socially less iconoclastic subject positions" (Howard 178) by presenting a portrait of the ideal gendered behavior that each victim must imitate; however, both of these portraits of gendered norms are painted by a male artist, Don Pedro, and represent, therefore, a masculine view of traditional gender roles.

The actions resulting from this idealization of gender roles necessarily reflects the masculine influence that permeates the discourse. Benedick's reaction is initially distinctly masculine, and Beatrice's reaction adheres to the male fantasy of feminine desire. Benedick declares, "the world must be peopled" (2.3.233-4), and thus assumes with exaggerated male egoism that the fate of humanity rests on his shoulders. Marriage becomes a question of performing a duty and living up to responsibilities, and thus the relinquishment of his cherished bachelorhood becomes in his mind a personal sacrifice for the greater communal good. Beatrice, on the other hand, automatically accepts the guilt imposed on her by others for resisting her traditional role, and therefore she begins to negate herself to expiate this guilt. While Benedick never calls into question his previous behavior, attributing it simply to youth, Beatrice is forced to reevaluate her whole sense of identity and her place in the world. She proclaims, therefore, "Benedick,

love on, I will requite thee, / *Taming* my wild heart to thy loving hand" (3.1.111-2; emphasis mine), accepting much more readily than Benedick the blame for the faults for which the others condemn her. She does not give a reason for her previous behavior nor attempt to justify it as Benedick does, but concedes without protest that she must change.

Beatrice, therefore, unlike Katherina, accepts willingly that she must be tamed "like a bird or an animal being domesticated. [Benedick] becomes the protector and tamer, she the tamed repentant" (Howard 178). Since Beatrice offers no resistance, the process is less violent than in Katherina's case, but the result is ultimately very similar: her tongue is no longer her own. The change in Beatrice's loquacity following the ploy against her is almost immediate as she embarks on a process of self-silencing that prepares her for her new role as a tamed wife. First, Beatrice loses a battle of wits with Margaret who "becomes 'an explicit surrogate for Beatrice' in the exercise of penetrating wit" (Friedman 357), at least temporarily, as Margaret's later skirmish with Benedick illustrates. Then, her verbal mastery having been appropriated by another, Beatrice adheres to women's traditional silence in the church scene rather than using her verbal skills to defend Hero. Throughout Don Pedro's and Claudio's accusations, which she never doubts are false, Beatrice remains unusually silent, partly because even her superior wit is little match for the privilege inherent in their aristocratic male speech, and partly because she has vowed to tame herself to Benedick's loving hand and it is natural for her to assume at first that he supports his male friends. Only after Hero swoons and Benedick makes the crucial decision to remain with Beatrice rather than leave with Hero's accusers does Beatrice finally speak. Like a typical Renaissance woman, she waits for male approval, the departure of the accusers, and Benedick's direct question

"How doth the lady?" (4.1.113), before she speaks. She has tamed her tongue to Benedick's will, and requires his authority to break the silence that she has just adopted.

When she does speak, Beatrice no longer speaks poniards, and in the aftermath of the Hero tragedy she lowers her defenses and reveals her emotions to Benedick, that is, sorrow for her cousin but not necessarily love for him. Conscious already of the limited social power of women outside speech, she has little choice but to submit herself to him entirely by acknowledging her weakness and dependency on him as a man. While many may see her command to "Kill Claudio" (4.1.288) as an assertion of her power over Benedick, it is really an admission of her submission to him. Were he successful in the challenge, Beatrice would be forever indebted to him as the valiant knight who risks his life for her and her cousin's honor. Beatrice acknowledges that "in a world where power resides in the words of powerful men, the violence their speaking can do can be successfully countered—not by the speaking of women—but by the literal violence of the sword" (Howard 180). While she may wish to be a man herself, she is not, and ultimately she must admit to herself and to Benedick that she needs him; however, this need does not necessarily constitute love in the general sense. Rather, as Rose explains, it is closer to the "idea of disinterested love", that is, "the desire, however sincere, to love someone because we believe they love us" (148) as both are led to believe, the "formula" for which is "need" (149). Beatrice's love for Benedick is not romantic love; instead, "she loves him because he is a man, because he is Benedick, the person in the world whom she knows and wants and *needs*" because her "own resources are entirely inadequate" to clear Hero's name (Rose 149). Beatrice's "confession" of love makes it clear that her love is "disinterested"; she is not purposely ambiguous but rather genuinely

disoriented, confused, and grieved:

It were as possible for me to say I loved nothing so well as you, but believe me not; and yet I lie not; I confess nothing, nor I deny nothing. I am sorry for my cousin. (4.1.268-72)

Thus, Beatrice and Benedick are not simply drawn together by the tricks in the orchard but also "by their shared sympathy for the wronged girl" over whose "quasi-dead body" (Everett 82) they form a mutual desire to restore her to her rightful status.

Although Don Pedro and Claudio both wish for Beatrice to submit herself to Benedick's "love", they do not expect his loyalty to her to disrupt his homosocial bonds of loyalty to them. Howard argues that "for Don Pedro their doing ... was not supposed to threaten the patriarchal system. The wife was to be the tamed bird, submissive to her husband's hand, and the bonds between men were not seriously to be disturbed" (180). While marriage may bond a man and woman, the early modern man does not normally break the bond he has with his male companions; on the contrary, male homosocial bonds are supposed to be strengthened by the experience as the young man accepts his adult responsibilities and forges new kinship ties. Claudio exhibits normal male behavior when he offers to accompany Don Pedro on the next stage of his journey immediately after the wedding (3.2.3), and it would be expected of Benedick to make a similar show of loyalty to his superior officer. Don Pedro and Claudio are therefore genuinely surprised by Benedick's challenge and initially do not take it seriously. It is not until after much jesting that they realize that Benedick "is in earnest" (5.1.191), and this only after he announces that he must discontinue from Don Pedro's company and insults Claudio by calling him "Lord Lackbeard" (5.1.189).

After Benedick proves his devotion to Beatrice by challenging Claudio, her submission to him is confirmed in a scene that strongly echoes *Shrew*. Benedick sends Margaret to call Beatrice, and, like Katherina at the end of *Shrew*, she obediently and pleasantly comes when her suitor calls for her. To Benedick's question, "Sweet Beatrice, wouldst thou come when I called thee?" (5.2.41-2), Beatrice answers, "Yea, signior, and depart when you bid me" (5.2.43), thereby expressing her pledge of total obedience to him. Although her subsequent reply, "'Then' is spoken; fare you well now" (5.2.45), displays her wit, her speech is nonetheless considerably moderated so that she no longer speaks poniards to wound him. She has tamed her speech from aggressive to the "teasing, deferential attitude formerly reserved for Leonato and the Prince" (Friedman 356), that is, the tone reserved for men who exert authority over her. She is aware of her dependency on Benedick, so she attempts to make the best of her new situation. Since she can no longer openly employ her wit in her characteristically masculine fashion, she accepts the only other option which is to use her verbal power sparingly and subversively.

While Beatrice's demand that Benedick challenge Claudio disrupts the male homosocial bonds that had been formed in war and strengthened in the wooing process, the return to wooing and marriage renews these bonds. As I have discussed in relation to *Shrew*, marriages arranged for the purpose of gift exchange create kinship ties between all the men involved. This is also true for Claudio and Hero's marriage in *Much Ado*. Hero is a "rich and precious gift" (4.1.27) who may be accepted or given back again, but who is not an individual human being in Claudio's eyes, except when she supposedly exercises her sexuality. Their marriage is clearly one of social and economic alliances

rather than love. Claudio seeks Don Pedro's approval to court her by inquiring, "Hath Leonato any son, my lord?" (1.1.274), and only after hearing the answer, "No child but Hero, she's his only heir" (1.1.275), does Claudio begin to speak of love and admit to his intention of marrying her. Despite Claudio's professions of love, his conversation with Benedick illustrates that Hero, like Bianca, is a commodity:

BENEDICK. Would you buy her, that you inquire after her?

CLAUDIO. Can the world buy such a jewel?

BENEDICK. Yea, and a case to put it into. (1.1.167-9)

Hero is a prized object of male desire, and like Bianca is the link that bonds the men who negotiate for her possession. Leonato is pleased when he learns that his colonial prince may court his daughter, and is equally satisfied when the suitor turns out to be Claudio because the Count has the Prince's personal approval. Since Leonato does not want to lose the favour of his colonial ruler, he has little choice but to offer up Hero a second time. The gift of Hero restores the broken homosocial and kinship bonds between Leonato, Don Pedro, Claudio, and Benedick that the broken nuptials had disrupted. Leonato's words to Claudio before the second wedding, "since you could not be my son-in-law, / Be yet my nephew" (5.1.281-2), illustrate that kinship is more important than love.

Claudio and Hero's marriage, then, is not a marriage of love either the first or the second time. On the first occasion, it is a case of forging kinship ties, and on the second it is about restoring them. Claudio's interaction with Don Pedro illustrates that male homosocial bonds are more important to him than the love of a woman. When Claudio begins to tell Don Pedro of his love for Hero, the Prince cuts him short, mocks his

wordiness, decides unilaterally to woo Hero in his place, and finally "insists on being the author of Claudio's story" (Slights 180). Allowing Don Pedro to appropriate his discourse and to usurp his task of wooing Hero, Claudio is more concerned with pleasing his superior officer than showing his love, a love which in any case is frivolous. His declarations of love are an exaggerated parody of romantic love, and the carefree, deferential attitude with which he agrees to marry, sight unseen, the second woman proposed by Leonato again confirms that his homosocial male bonds take precedence over any heterosexual feelings of love he may have for either his fallen fiancé or his new one. Claudio's denunciation is as exaggerated as his previous professions of love; he does not act with deep-felt emotion but in accordance with the social decorum for male honour. Rather than disbelieving as incredulous Don John's insinuations against Hero, as would a man who felt true love, Claudio immediately begins to plan how he will shame her before even seeing the "proof" of her infidelity. He does not question what he supposedly sees to verify its validity but chooses rather to put his male honour above the truth. Shakespeare allows the action of the window scene to occur offstage, and thus calls into question for the audience its authenticity in representing reality, but Claudio never stops to consider that what he sees may be a false representation. He displays his rashness in forming a conclusion about Hero, and he shows the instability of his supposed love for her.

The fault for the false denunciation does not lie entirely, however, with Claudio but with the whole of the society in which he lives. Claudio's gullibility in believing Don John's accusation displays how the trick plays upon early modern stereotypes about women's duplicity. As Howard remarks, the "trick at the window silently assumes and

further circulates the idea that women are universally prone to deception and impersonation" (174-5), and Claudio and Don Pedro blindly accept this "cultural construction of the feminine" that leads them to conclude that Hero "has merely been impersonating virtue" (175). They believe that she's "but the sign and semblance of her honour" (4.1.32), an imitation of virtue who is void of any in reality. W. Thomas MacCary explains that Claudio "cannot see her properly, because he sees with other men's eyes, the mind of the past, the myth of women's infidelity and sexual insatiability"; therefore, he loses "the actuality of [his] own experience: by insisting on reference to what [he] think[s] are constant patterns in human experience, [he is] blinded to the present ... —Foucault's classical episteme: the representation of representation" (158). Rather than seeing the Hero that he knows, he sees every woman in history who has ever made a man a cuckold. Claudio and Don Pedro accept this cultural representation of feminine duplicity so easily because it validates their "conventional male wisdom that women are not to be trusted" (Berger 306) and because it also "affords them the added pleasure of having their sense of merit injured" (Berger 307). In Berger's view, "Claudio's bitter but obvious satisfaction in being victimized owes partly to the fact that it reaffirms his moral superiority" (307), and his language reflects this moral opposition. Claudio characterizes himself as having "show'd / Bashful sincerity and comely love" (4.1.53-4) while Hero is "an approved wanton" (4.1.44) more intemperate in blood than "those pamper'd animals / That rage in savage sensuality" (4.1.60-1). Don Pedro's characterization is even harsher, and echoes references to both Katherina and Bianca in *Shrew* (1.1.58, 3.1.88). The Prince calls Hero "a common stale" (4.1.65) which can signify both a prostitute and a decoy-bird that lures hawks. Ironically, the Prince falsely

implies the first meaning although in fact she aptly fits the second meaning when she follows his own plan to trap Beatrice.

The denunciation of Hero so effectively convicts her for a crime she did not commit not simply because of the terms used to describe her, but also because of the manipulation of language that serves to silence her and to leave her helpless to defend herself. The characters in the play are all "aware that language is inextricably implicated in relationships of power" (Slights 173), and Claudio and the Prince do not hesitate to use the power of their aristocratic male language to their advantage in the church scene. Claudio poses the question so that no matter what Hero answers she will be implicated for the crime of which she is accused: "What man was he talk'd with you yesternight, / Out at your window betwixt twelve and one? / Now if you are maid, answer to this" (4.1.83-5). If she gives a name, she is guilty of the alleged crime, and when she doesn't answer the question by giving a name, she is "no maiden" (4.1.87) because her answer is assumed to be a lie. Slights assesses that Hero is "[d]ehumanized by being deprived of language", and in her father's eyes this dehumanization renders her "not a speaking subject but the objectified printed text" of Claudio's story (177). Since Hero has been stripped of language with which to defend herself, and Claudio's story is legitimized by both his own masculine authority and the Prince's colonial authority, Leonato is easily convinced of his daughter's guilt and therefore assumes the role which is expected of him in this situation, that of the outraged patriarch whose own honour has been tarnished. The authority of Don Pedro and Claudio prevents anyone from defending Hero, especially Beatrice and the Friar who despite their ability to manipulate language lack the authority to challenge the word of a prince and a count. Defamed, dehumanized,

defenseless and attacked by both her fiancé and her father, it is not surprising that Hero swoons; as a silenced woman in a patriarchal culture, there is nothing else she can do to express herself.

Claudio and Don Pedro's behavior after hearing of the "death" of Hero further illustrates how gender differences mark the idea of justice in their society. When Claudio believes at the masque that he has been wronged by Don Pedro, "he suffer[s] passively and privately, and the mistake [is] easily corrected" (Slights 181). This early scene stands in marked contrast to his subsequent reaction when he hears that Hero is unchaste and he immediately plans to disgrace her in public. The same contrast reoccurs when he learns of his error in accusing Hero. When Hero is accused, her crime is against all men because she is the representation of all women who have ever cuckolded a man; however, when it is revealed that Claudio and the Prince acted in haste in accusing her, they "find themselves guilty only of a pardonable error in judgment" (Berger 308). Rather than being chastised for his rashness and lack of faith in her virtue, Claudio is rewarded with "Another Hero" (5.4.62) who, "having died for the imagined crime of the independant use of her sexuality, is reborn when rewritten as the chaste servant of male desire" (Howard 181). Like the first, this second, easily replaced Hero is merely an object of male aristocratic gift exchange who rebinds male kinship ties. Howard argues that "the gift of Hero at play's end implies simply that rewards will continue to flow from [paying] obedience" to social superiors such as Don Pedro and Leonato (181). Although her "emphatic assertion of virginity pronounces Claudio guilty" (Berger 313), there is no real retribution to be paid beyond his eulogy at her tomb, a minimal gesture at best. Thus, there is clearly a gender-based inequality in Renaissance judicial notions that allow

a woman to be convicted for no crime at all, while a man may be easily excused and rewarded for the tort of false accusation. There is no acquisition of knowledge to be made from past errors because the consequences of Claudio's actions are effaced; as easily as his wronged bride dies, another appears. Since his actions have no lasting effect, his error is minimized and then overshadowed by the joyous festivities of the ensuing marriages. Claudio does not mature or learn to temper his actions with prudence, as his easy acceptance of Leonato's second unknown bride illustrates. Ironically, he who accuses Hero of being governed blood rather than temperate reason is himself governed by blood throughout the play.

Hero's revelation of her identity in this second wedding scene, "And when I liv'd, I was your other wife; / And when you lov'd, you were my other husband" (5.4.60-1), is telling, for Claudio's love was no more real than her death. Again, a gender-based double standard exists, in this case in terms of love and constancy. While women's love must be eternally true and faithful, the same is not required, nor even desired, of men for whom inconstancy is almost a virtue. Claudio's love for Hero is superficial; he is a man of appearances, more in love with the notion of love itself than his bride. The declaration by which he submits to Leonato's choice of a bride, "I'll hold my mind were she an Ethiopie" (5.4.38), situates his view of love clearly at the level of appearances and ceremony alone, as does his willingness to perform a yearly rite without actually expressing genuine remorse. Claudio is representative of his society in which love is not a privately engendered emotion between two individuals but a series of appropriate public gestures. Since love itself does not always carry the same significance as in a contemporary sense, neither does inconstancy. Male sexual inconstancy is celebrated

because it publicly proves a man's virility. Conversely, female sexual inconstancy publicly proves a husband's virility to be inferior to the man who makes him a cuckold, and is thus the subject of strict social reprimands, as the denunciation of Hero illustrates. There is no distinction between emotional and sexual inconstancy; it is assumed that emotional infidelity, such as talking with another man at a window, is indicative of sexual inconstancy because for a woman an open mouth is associated with other open apertures and for a man a charming, wagging tongue with phallic potency.

The question of cuckoldry is of immense importance, then, to the characters in *Much Ado*, and this concern distinguishes them from the characters in *Shrew*, a play in which, interestingly enough, there are no references to cuckoldry at all, perhaps because absolute male dominance is never truly threatened by the women. *Much Ado* is riddled with cuckold jokes between the characters, but the subject of the pun is not always portrayed as a victim. Implicit in each reference to cuckoldry is the possibility of being the cuckold instead of the cuckolder, as in Claudio's claim that Benedick will be a "double-dealer" (5.4.113) in marriage. Benedick may risk wearing the cuckold's horns, but he does not intend to tame his virility after marrying Beatrice. She recognizes from the beginning that "he wears his faith but as the fashion of his hat, it ever changes with the next block" (1.1.68-70), and knows no doubt that "Men were deceivers ever: / One foot in sea, and one on shore, / To one thing constant never" (2.3.63-5). Having witnessed Claudio's attack on Hero, Beatrice is well aware of the double standard between the sexes and the consequences of suspected female inconstancy, but she does not question male inconstancy and the possibility of Benedick engaging in extra-marital relations. Berger argues that the ideology of the play pretends that "women are

responsible for their sins but men are not. Male deception and inconstancy are gifts that God gives, and their proper name is Manhood" (307). Berger adds that, as the song articulates:

Men are born deceivers whose nature is to be inconstant, untrustworthy, lustful, contentious, and obsessed with honor, status, and fortune. This enables them to think better of themselves, and worse of women. Not only can't they be blamed for what they cannot help, but their inability to control themselves proves their passionate and virile manliness; it is only their inability to control sinful women that threatens to unman them. (308)

The notion that all men are inconstant deceivers and all women are sinful and threaten to cuckold their husband is, of course, a stereotypical generalization, but it is nonetheless a view repeated throughout the play so often that the characters accept it without question. It is the foundation of the accusation against Hero, and the premise upon which the numerous cuckold jokes are founded. Even when Hero is proven innocent and the men learn that not all women are unfaithful as they suspected, their attitude towards marriage does not change and they do not cease to fear being cuckolded. In fact, the men's marriage jokes at the end of the play "reaffirm their commitment to inconstancy" (Berger 312). Rather than learning from the Hero incident and developing trust in their wives, they simply vow to make another man a cuckold before they are made one themselves. The misogyny and distrust of women articulated by Benedick in the beginning of the play is not dispelled by the marriages but rather perpetuated by them.

The principal reason none of the men learn from the Hero scandal to trust women is that they can simply dismiss the whole incident as the work of a bastard and social

misfit. Rather than examining their own views of women upon which Don John plays, they choose to condemn him as entirely responsible and thus exonerate themselves from any wrongdoing at all. Don John is the perfect scapegoat because as a bastard he is both a social inferior whose status is dependent on his legitimate brother's generosity and "a by-product of the frailty named Woman" (Berger 311). Don John, like Gloucester's son Edmund, is "a testimony both to his father's prowess and to his mother's sin" (Berger 311) for not resisting his father until marriage. In the Renaissance, being born in sin marks a bastard as evil and thus makes him the perfect scapegoat so that the legitimate aristocratic men never have to examine their own actions. Unlike Edmund, however, Don John does not attempt to camouflage or deny his illegitimate nature, preferring to be that which he is, a "plain-dealing villain" (1.3.30) who flatters no one and who openly expresses his anti-social nature in this world of wit by declaring, "I am not of many words" (1.1.146). Like women, the bastard does not have a legitimate place in the social hierarchy; therefore, like women, he maintains his silence, speaks only when spoken to when in the presence of legitimate aristocratic men, and is excluded from access to the power which language affords in Messina. He is literally and metaphorically defeated before he even appears onstage.

Margaret, on the other hand, is barely reprimanded for her part in the plot against Hero, and Shakespeare takes great care to see that she is excused because she acts without malice. Borachio specifies that Margaret "knew not what she did when she spoke to me, / But always hath been just and virtuous" (5.1.295-6), and shortly afterwards Leonato repeats, "Margaret was in some fault for this, / Although against her will" (5.4.4-5). Margaret's virtue and maidenhood are not allowed to remain in question

for long, and the audience is assured that her transgression was unconscious. Her crime, however, is not very different from Don John's, but since the intent with which she acts is not as malicious, she is spared punishment. Like Don John who has tried to usurp his brother's power in the wars, Margaret is guilty of a "transgression against hierarchy" because her role in the trick involves the "substitution of maid for mistress" (Howard 176). While she is unconscious of the consequences of her actions, the desire that provokes them is genuine. She later articulates her aspiration to move above her station in the social hierarchy when she asks Benedick, "Why, shall I always keep below stairs?" (5.2.9-10). Thus, even though she is tricked into participating in a ploy which otherwise she might have denounced, Borachio coopts her by playing upon already existing elements of her personality, her desire to accede to the same social status as her mistress.

Following Beatrice's vow to tame herself to Benedick's hand, Margaret adopts Beatrice's abandoned wit and turns it against her in a long burst of mockery of Beatrice's new role as lover. Not long thereafter, Margaret "assumes the role of quick-tongued adversary" with Benedick as a surrogate female wielder of masculine wit. Friedman argues that "the woman who is charged with one kind of speech infraction has also committed another; like Beatrice, she has appropriated masculine wit to puncture the pride of men;" however, he adds, "Beatrice is never overtly faulted for this offense, but her surrogate undergoes a public chastisement for violating the proprieties of feminine discourse" (357). The only explanation as to why one woman is punished but not the other is the difference in their class status. While it is useless for Margaret to aspire beyond her station, her desire may seem justified in her view by the discrepancies of privilege that she observes between herself and Beatrice. Linguistically, Beatrice initially

has more privilege than Margaret; however, she does not retain it for any longer. Beatrice's mouth is stopped by marriage, while "Margaret silently and quickly fades from view, and the verbally transgressive woman as a type is effectually chastened" (Friedman 357). Both effectively lose their verbal power; only the means by which it is taken from them differs.

The silencing of Beatrice in marriage is quite insidious. Contrary to the case of Katherina in *Shrew*, the audience of *Much Ado* does not see an overtly defeated woman prostrate herself at her husband's feet, and Beatrice tames her own protests against marriage much earlier in the play than does Katherina. There is no explicit violence but rather song and dance. Nonetheless, Beatrice is silenced by the end of the play, and it is her silence that defines her as an appropriate early modern wife like Innogen or Hero. "Even though the 'shrewishness' has already been purged from Beatrice's discourse," Friedman explains, "she must undergo a final verbal subjugation" (357) on her path to becoming an acceptable wife, and this subjugation takes place when her mouth is stopped. Both the Quarto and Folio editions of the play attribute the words "Peace! I will stop your mouth" (5.4.97) to Leonato instead of Benedick. Echoing Beatrice's earlier advice to Hero, "Speak, cousin, or, if you cannot, stop his mouth with a kiss, and let not him speak neither" (2.1.292-3), the gesture in this final scene acts as a comic reversal in which the patriarch of Messina reappropriates Beatrice's masculine wit and then turns it against her in order to enforce her feminine subjugation. Leonato interrupts their last skirmish of wit to prevent Beatrice from further using her masculine wit against her new husband, and then he gestures to Benedick to stop her mouth. Friedman argues that "Leonato's intervention endows Benedick with the patriarchal power to manage his wife's

tongue, and the act of accepting this control makes him into a husband" (358). Immediately after Benedick stops her mouth, Don Pedro calls him "Benedick, the married man" (5.4.98) as if the silencing of a woman's tongue is the real rite of passage by which a man assumes his role as husband. Friedman notes that after "Benedick kisses her, Beatrice does not speak another word for the remaining twenty-nine lines of the play" (358). She effectively becomes an obedient, silent wife like Innogen and Hero. While Katherina's submission is placed at center stage, Beatrice's is relegated to the background. Beatrice's subjugation is masked by the general atmosphere of joy associated with marriage as comic closure and the potential for love implicit in the kiss, but the result of her silencing is the same no matter how indirect the method. Her submission to the role of silent wife just before the offstage wedding ceremony sets the tone for the rest of her marriage to Benedick and leaves her confined to this submissive role forever after. Since in Messina language is the key to social power, and those such as Dogberry and Verges who do not master language have no power, Beatrice's sacrifice of her loquacity is a resignation of any social power that she may have previously wielded. Without her verbal mastery, she becomes just another marginalized member of a hierarchical society that only recognizes its aristocratic men.

Much Ado About Nothing, then, is not a romantic comedy but a social comedy. The play does not explore the nature of love but rather the social implications of marriage and the relationship between language and social power. Throughout the play, he who inherently possesses the most power, the colonial prince Don Pedro, is the character who manipulates language to arrange or destroy marriages. He devises the plan to trick Benedick and Beatrice to want to marry each other, and he does so with a discourse that

interpellates them into his conception of traditional gender roles. The power of Don Pedro's language, coupled with his political authority, also condemns Hero and encourages others such as Leonato to accept the prince's own false perception of her. Slights concludes, "Don Pedro's control of social discourse results from the deference paid to his political power. Controlling language is an effective way of controlling the people who use it" (180). At the end of the play, it is Don Pedro, not Leonato or the Friar, who performatively pronounces Benedick a "married man" (5.4.98). The marriages are a testimony to the linguistic and social power he exerts over Messina. Although some may argue that it is Dogberry, Verges, and the nameless sexton who save the day, like the illegitimate scapegoat Don John, they are notably absent from the final scene. While their role may be to teach the aristocratic men to be more innocent and trusting, the method by which they execute this role, through a bumbling accident, does not call into question the superiority of the aristocratic men or force them to reflect greatly on their misjudgment. As Howard remarks, "inferiors correct the 'mistakings' of their betters without ever threatening the essential beliefs of those betters" (177). Like Beatrice's wit or Katherina's tongue, Dogberry and Verges' moment to shine is fleeting, and they are relegated to their proper social position offstage, that is, the margins of the play. At the end of the play, the audience sees only silent, obedient women and the powerful, aristocratic men who dominate them.

Much Ado About Nothing can be described as a revised version of *The Taming of the Shrew* in terms of the subjugation of women in marriage. Several parallels exist between both the male and female characters of the two plays: Katherina and Beatrice, Bianca and Hero, Baptista and Leonato, Petruchio and Benedick, and Lucentio and

Claudio. In *Much Ado*, the dominant traits of *Shrew*'s characters are softened and nuanced, but their motivations remain the same. Bianca is shamed into silence by Katherina's long speech at the end of *Shrew* just as Hero is always intimidated that Beatrice's tongue will "mock [her] into air" (3.1.75) and so remains silent in her presence. Baptista and Leonato are both pleased to find gentleman husbands for their daughters and forge new kinship ties with the grooms. Friedman compares Benedick to Petruchio, suggesting that:

Benedick's predilection for the more belligerent of the two women aligns him with a group of Shakespearean comic heroes, including Petruchio and Theseus, who battle, conquer, and eventually marry rebellious females. Such men take pleasure in the combative nature of this courtship Benedick may ... feel a self-satisfaction akin to Petruchio's at the thought that his now obedient wife has allowed him to tame her. (356)

Equally, Lucentio and Claudio are of the same mold, both being parodies of romantic love in regards to their long, exaggerated discourses on love and their lack of knowledge of the true nature of the woman they marry.

Beyond superficial qualities such as plot and character, however, *Much Ado* can be read as a softened revision of *Shrew* in terms of their common discourse: the necessity of the submission into marriage of unruly women in order to silence the threat that their tongue poses to absolute male dominance. In both plays, the most dominant distinction among the women is the contrast between the speech of the unruly woman and the silent one, and in both cases by the end of the play the overtly verbal woman comes to follow the example of her modest counterpart. The process itself by which this change takes

place is at the core of the plot of both plays, the marriage and taming of Katherina and the trick and marriage of Beatrice. Like Katherina's tongue, Beatrice's wit is at center stage throughout the play because *Much Ado*, like *Shrew*, is "concerned with the social nature of language—with the power of language and with language as an articulation of power" (Slights 173). When at the end of each play these illegitimate female voices are tamed, social power is securely returned to the rightful hands of dominant men. Petruchio recuperates Katherina's tongue to serve his own dominant male discourse, and Benedick stops Beatrice's mouth altogether. Both women receive the care, sustenance, and protection that a husband supposedly provides, but they pay for it at a high price, by forever sacrificing their linguistic freedom. Clearly the common discourse articulated by both plays is that early modern women cannot, and should not, hope to retain any verbal and thus social power once they enter into marriage. They must submit to their husbands in body, will, and soul.

Conclusion

The two plays examined in this thesis, *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, are social comedies that appear on the surface to explore the nature of love and marriage in Shakespeare's England but that in fact promote a discourse in favour of the silence and subjugation of women in marriage as a means of creating and maintaining a social order that gives absolute authority to men.

In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Katherina is presented initially as a disruptive element whose refusal to conform to gendered norms of speech destabilizes the social order. She exerts her own will and refuses to restrain her speech, standing in stark contrast to her silent, modest sister. As a woman who freely uses her tongue, Katherina is a threat to the social order because she may decide to overtly criticize patriarchal traditions, such as the method by which Baptista bargains away her sister to the highest bidder. Petruchio's taming restores the social order by forcing Katherina to conform her speech to traditional gender norms. She no longer questions patriarchy but reinforces it in her final speech by shaming her sister and the widow into obedient silence as well. While Petruchio's main goal is to control his bride's tongue and eliminate the threat that it poses to patriarchy, his taming method is also praised and marveled at by the other men because it forces the physical, sexual, material, economic, and emotional submission of his bride. While the words of Katherina's final speech are designed to teach the women a lesson, the very act of its delivery is a lesson to the men that they too should adopt Petruchio's method if they want their wives to be as obedient as Katherina. Disguised behind the farce, *The Taming of the Shrew* is an instruction manual for early modern men

on the most efficient method of enforcing the total subjugation of their wives.

Much Ado About Nothing is concerned with the same issue as *The Taming of the Shrew*; it simply is not as blunt in the propagation of its message. Women are to submit to their husbands, and if the husband chooses not to use policy or domestic violence, he can still achieve the same result with what appears to be a loving kiss. In the end, all that matters is that the husband stops his wife's mouth because it is a threat to patriarchy, especially in the case of Beatrice who openly questions the institution of marriage and the worth of any man as a potential mate. By entrapping women in marriage for life, the threat that they will question the institution itself is eliminated because they necessarily become complicit in it and dependent on it for their future well-being. They are assimilated to its practices and adopt the patriarchal discourse that ensures its survival in its traditional form.

The message of these two plays for the women in the audience, therefore, can be summed up by the opening words of the song in *Much Ado*: "Sigh no more, ladies, sigh no more" (2.3.62). A "proper" early modern wife should neither express doubt or dissatisfaction towards marriage, nor even release a simple sigh of displeasure. An ideal wife, such as Innogen or Hero, should accept with a smile whatever troubles marriage may bring, be they domestic violence, wrongful accusation, or the loss of linguistic freedom. An early modern wife should "be ... blithe and bonny / Converting all [her] sounds of woe / Into Hey nonny, nonny" (2.3.68-9). She should dismiss with a "boys will be boys" attitude the "fraud of men" (2.3.72), both their sexual inconstancy and the gender stereotypes with which they justify their acts: false accusation, domestic violence, and the total subjugation of their wives. A "proper" wife does not question her husband,

typical marriage customs, or the institution of marriage itself; her voice is silent except to sing the praises of patriarchy.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Shakespeare, William. *Much Ado about Nothing*. Ed. Brian Morris. Arden. London: Methuen, 1997.

---. *Much Ado about Nothing*. Ed. Sheldon P. Zitner. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.

---. *The Taming of the Shrew: Texts and Contexts*. Ed. Frances E. Dolan. Boston: Bedford, 1996.

---. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Ed. A.R. Humphreys. Arden. London: Methuen, 1998.

Secondary sources

Bamber, Linda. *Comic Women, Tragic Men: A Study in Gender and Genre in Shakespeare*. Stanford CA: Stanford UP, 1982.

Bean, John C. "Comic Structure and the Humanizing of Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Eds. Carolyn Lenz, Gayle Greene and Carol Thomas Neely. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1980. 65-78.

Berek, Peter. "Text, Gender, and Genre in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *'Bad' Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespeare Canon*. Ed. Maurice Charney. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988. 91-104.

Berger, Harry, Jr. "Against the Sink-a-Pace: Sexual and Family Politics in *Much Ado about Nothing*". *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 33.3 (1982) : 302-13.

Blake, Ann. "*The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado about Nothing*: A Comparative Study". *Southern Review: Literary and Interdisciplinary Essays*. 14.1 (1981) : 52-63.

Boose, Lynda E. "The Family in Shakespeare studies; or - Studies in the Family of Shakespearians; or - The Politics of Politics". *Renaissance Quarterly*. (1987) : 707-42.

---. "The Father and the Bride". *PMLA*. 97 (1982) : 325-47. Rpt. in *Shakespeare's Middle Tragedies*. Ed. David Young. Prentice Hall, 1993. 207-20.

---. "Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds: Taming the Women's Unruly Member".

- Shakespeare Quarterly*. 42.2 (1991) : 179-213.
- . "The Taming of the Shrew, Good Husbandry, and Enclosure". *Shakespeare Reread: The Texts in New Contexts*. Ed. Russ McDonald. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. 193-225.
- Christensen, Ann C. "Petruccio's House in Postwar Suburbia: Reinventing the Domestic Woman (Again)". *Post-Script*. 17.1 (1997) : 28-42.
- Cook, Ann Jennalie. *Making a Match: Courtship in Shakespeare and his Society*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Cressy, David. "Foucault, Stone, Shakespeare and Social History". *English Literary Renaissance*. 21 (1991) : 121-33.
- Daniell, David. "The Good Marriage of Katherina and Petruccio". *Shakespeare Survey*. 37 (1984) : 23-31.
- Dash, Irene. *Wooing, Wedding and Power: Women in Shakespeare's Plays*. New York: Columbia UP, 1981.
- Deer, Harriet A. "Untyping Stereotypes: *The Taming of the Shrew*". *The Aching Hearth: Family Violence in Life and Literature*. Eds. Sara Munson PhD and Lagretta Tallent MS. New York: Plenum Press, 1991. 63-78.
- Detmer, Emily. "Civilizing Subordination: Domestic Violence and *The Taming of the Shrew*". *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 48.3 (1997) : 273-94.
- Dusinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*. London: Macmillan, 1975.
- . "The Taming of the Shrew: Women, Acting, and Power". *Studies in the Literary Imagination*. 26.1 (1993) : 67-84.
- Everett, Barbara. "*Much Ado About Nothing*: the unsociable comedy". *English Comedy*. Eds. Michael Cordner, Peter Holland and John Kerrigan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 68-84.
- Evelt, David. "'Surprising Confrontations' - Ideologies of Service in Shakespeare's England". *Renaissance Papers*. Eds. Dale B. J. Randall and Joseph A. Porter. The Southeastern Renaissance Conference, 1990.
- Fineman, Joel. "The turn of the shrew". *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. Eds. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. New York and London: Methuen, 1985. 138-59.

- Flesh, William. *Generosity and the limits of authority: Shakespeare, Herbert, Milton*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1992.
- French, Marilyn. *Shakespeare's Division of Experience*. New York: Ballantine, 1983.
- Friedman, Michael D. "'Hush'd on Purpose to Grace Harmony': Wives and Silence in *Much Ado about Nothing*". *Theatre Journal*. 42.3 (1990) : 350-63.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.
- Garner, Shirley Nelson. "The Taming of the Shrew: Inside or Outside the Joke?". 'Bad' Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespeare Canon. Ed. Maurice Charney. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988. 105-19.
- Hansen, Carol. *Woman as Individual in English Renaissance Drama : A Defiance of the Masculine Code*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Hayes, Janice. "Those 'soft and delicate desires': *Much Ado* and the Distrust of Women". *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Eds. Carolyn Lenz, Gayle Greene and Carol Thomas Neely. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1980. 79-99.
- Hodgdon, Barbara. "Katherina Bound; Or Play(K)ating the Strictures of Everyday Life". *PMLA*. 107.3 (1992) : 538-53.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *The Shakespearean Marriage: Merry Wives and Heavy Husbands*. London: Macmillan, 1998.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph A. *The English Family 1450-1700*. London and New York: Longman, 1985.
- Howard, Jean E. "Renaissance antitheatricality and the politics of gender and rank in *Much Ado about Nothing*". *Shakespeare Reproduced*. Eds. Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor. London: Routledge, 1990. 163-87.
- Jardine, Lisa. *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Brighton: Harvester, 1983.
- Jordan, Constance. *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.
- Kahn, Coppelia. "The Taming of the Shrew: Shakespeare's Mirror of Marriage". *Modern Language Studies*. 5.1 (1975) : 88-102.
- Korda, Natasha. "Household Kates: Domesticating Commodities in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 47.2 (1996) : 110-31.

- MacCary, W. Thomas. *Friends and Lovers: The Phenomenology of Desire in Shakespearean Comedy*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. (1930) Tr. W.D. Halls. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1990.
- Mikesell, Margaret Lael. "'Love Wrought These Miracles': Marriage and Genre in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *Renaissance Drama*. 20 (1989) : 141-67.
- Moisan, Thomas. "'What's That to You?' or, Facing Facts: Antipaternalistic Discords in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *Renaissance Drama*. 26 (1995) : 105-29.
- Morris, Pam. *Literature and Feminism: An Introduction*. Oxford UK: Blackwell, 1993.
- Neely, Carol Thomas. *Broken nuptials in Shakespeare's plays*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.
- Nevo, Ruth. *Comic Transformations in Shakespeare*. London & New York: Methuen, 1980.
- Newman, Karen. "Renaissance Family Politics and Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*". *English Literary Renaissance*. 16:1 (1986) : 86-100.
- Peltrault, Claude. "'A Canker...in His Grace': Loi, pouvoir et subversion dans *Much Ado about Nothing*". *Q-W-E-R-T-Y*. 1 (1991) : 11-24.
- Pitt, Angela. *Shakespeare's Women*. Totowa NJ: Barnes & Noble, 1981.
- Ranald, Margaret Loftus. "'As Marriage Binds and Blood Breaks': English Marriage and Shakespeare". *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 30 (1979) : 68-81.
- Rebhorn, Wayne A. "Petruccio's 'Rope Tricks': *The Taming of the Shrew* and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric". *Modern Philology*. 92:3 (1995) : 294-327.
- Rose, Steven. "Love and Self-Love in *Much Ado About Nothing*". *Essays in Criticism*. 20 (1970) : 143-50.
- Shintri, Sarojini. *Woman in Shakespeare*. Dharwad: Karnatak UP, 1977.
- Singh, Jyotsna G. "Caliban versus Miranda: Race and Gender Conflicts in Postcolonial Rewritings of *The Tempest*". *Feminist readings of early modern culture: Emerging subjects*. Eds. Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan, and Dymphna Callaghan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Slights, Camille Wells. *Shakespeare's Comic Commonwealths*. Toronto: U of Toronto P,

1993.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage In England 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.

Weller, Barry. "Induction and Inference: Theatre, Transformation, and the Construction of Identity in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *Creative Imagination: New Essays on Renaissance Literature*. Ed. David Quint et al. Binghampton NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1992.

Weil, Judith . "'Household Stuff': Maestrie and Service in *The Taming of the Shrew*". *The Elizabethan Theatre XIV: Papers Given at International Conference on Elizabethan Theatre Held at University of Waterloo, Ontario, in July 1991* Eds. A. L. Magnusson and C. E. McGee. Toronto: Meany, 1996. 71-82.

West, William H. "Nothing as Given: Economics of the Gift in Derrida and Shakespeare". *Comparative Literature*. 48:1 (1996): 1-18.

Williams, Mary C. "Much Ado about Chastity in *Much Ado about Nothing*". *Renaissance Papers*. (1984) : 37-45.